

A-LEVEL HISTORY

PAPER 1

AND

PAPER 3

BY MOHAMMAD ANWAR

Paper 1 starts from Page 2

Paper 3 starts from Page 64

PAPER 1

INDEX

CHAPTER	PAGE NUMBER
Nationalism	5
Imperialism	20
Russian Revolution	25
Totalitarianism	41
Miscellaneous <u>(Please take a look at these questions, which involve comparisons of issues related with multiple topics)</u>	60

I would recommend that you use the following book for Paper 1 and Paper 3

“Mastering Modern World History”

by Norman Lowe

Paper 1: Modern European History 1789–1939

Source-based study: The Origins of the First World War, 1870–1914

In this study, candidates will explore how conditions and events in Europe during the period 1870–1914 led to the outbreak of World War I. Candidates will also need to examine the historical controversies on the origins of the war.

Theme 3: Nationalism

- Conditions for the development of European nationalism, e.g. the French Revolution, the Napoleonic legacy, impact of social and economic changes, Romanticism, Liberalism, Darwinism
- Italian Nationalism: conditions in Italy and the 1848 Revolutions; the contributions of Mazzini, Cavour and Garibaldi; unification up to 1871
- German Nationalism: the 1848 Revolutions; Prussia, Bismarck and unification in 1871; relations with other European states to c. 1900
- Significance of the development of nationalism for Europe.

Theme 4: The 'New Imperialism', c. 1870–1900

- Causes of the 'new imperialism', nature of the 'new imperialism', effects on Europe of overseas expansion.

Theme 5: The Russian Revolution

- Pre-revolution conditions: Romanov rule and the nature of Russian society; economic developments and social changes; the emergence of revolutionary groups, Marxism and Leninism
- The 1905 Revolution
- Causes of the Revolutions of 1917
- Developments leading to the establishment of the Bolshevik government, the work and importance of Lenin and Trotsky
- The Bolshevik Revolution and Marxism
- Effects of the Revolution on Europe.

Theme 6: Totalitarianism between the Wars, 1919–39

- Conditions for the rise of totalitarianism: effects of World War I, the Great Depression, the failure of collective security, the failure of democratic government
- Aspects of ideology on theory and practice: leadership and the cult of personality, intolerance of diversity, economic structure, political system
- Totalitarian regimes and foreign relations: ideological influences shaping regimes' perceptions of their roles in the world, conduct of foreign policy
- The rise of Fascism: ideology, Mussolini's rise to power, the Fascist dictatorship
- The rise of Nazism: ideology, Hitler's rise to power, the Nazi dictatorship
- The rise of Stalinism: Stalin's rise to power, the Stalinist dictatorship.

NATIONALISM

Paper 1

Assess the impact of nationalism on the 1848–49 revolutions in Germany and Italy.

Examiners will expect answers that are reasonably balanced between Germany and Italy. 60:40 either way - probably in favor of Italy – can merit any. Most candidates are likely to see nationalism as synonymous with support for unification but high credit should be given to answers that are aware of the distinction.

- **Meaning of term nationalism**

Italy

- Good candidates realized that there were different forms of nationalism. For example, they noted that Italian nationalists included monarchists and republicans, centralists and federalists
- Some might argue that anti-Austrian feeling was stronger in Italy than nationalism, which appealed to a minority. Some answers deserved credit when they pointed out the limited appeal of nationalism
- Others, such as the Federalists, favored programmes that were hardly nationalistic but were policies to safeguard the rights of individual states. Here regionalism was more important than support for a larger united country
- Mazzini struggled to win support for his cause. The Carbonari and Young Italy had limited support.
- Risings in the 1830s were put down easily. 1848 was the clearest sign of nationalism but evidence of unity was slight. Although rulers of some states conceded constitutions, they were back in control by the end of 1849.

Germany

- Metternich was as active in Germany as he had been in Italy to secure order and suppress nationalism.
- After 1815, support for a united Germany was confined to a small group of intellectuals and students.
- Candidates might refer to the Carlsbad Decrees (1819) which struck at nationalism and associated liberalism in Germany.
- Nationalism revived by 1848, assisted as in Italy by poor economic conditions.
- During the revolutions of 1848–49, there were calls for a united Germany, culminating in the Frankfurt Parliament. However, its failure was due to limited support as well as poor leadership.
- The attitude of Frederick William IV of Prussia was also crucial. He rejected the offer of the German crown.
- Some very able candidates might argue that nationalism played a minor role in both areas and that the revolutions arose from different grievances and factors. Some social groups were more concerned about economic grievances

Why did the 1848 Revolutions fail in both Germany and Italy?

The highest band will not need a 50:50 balance. 60:40 can merit any mark

Common Reasons

- There was a lack of clear aims in both regions. Although anti-Austrian feeling was a common factor some wanted liberalism but not unity
- others struggled for economic reasons,
- Only a minority sought unification.
- Some favored a monarchy, others advocated a republic.
- There were different opinions about centralized rule and federalism.
- The middle classes tended to be preoccupied with their own interests and did not share the lower orders' priorities of land and employment.
- Limited support for major political changes as both Germany and Italy contained powerful conservative forces that opposed the dangerous changes proposed by revolutionaries

Germany

- In Germany, many princes immediately reacted by granting constitutions which satisfied many who sought change. The aim was not primarily for unification but for more liberal governments. (Give high credit when candidates appreciate the difference between support for unification and liberalism.)
- Popular uprisings divided opinion or perhaps reinforced support for traditional authorities. None of the leading states supported unification. Frederick William IV of Prussia proved unreliable and turned against the rebels.
- The nearest that Germany came to a new unified government was perhaps the Frankfurt Parliament but it proved ineffective. The failure of Frankfurt Parliament reflected the impotence of the middle classes to achieve change.
- In Germany, there were strong princes who used force to restore order, for example in Hesse.
- In Germany, there were divisions among the lower classes.
- It highlighted the division of opinion about a new Germany, for example should there be a greater Germany with Austria or a smaller Germany excluding Austria.

Italy

- In Italy, there were similar differences between radicals. Rural peasants and the lower orders in towns had economic priorities rather than political ambitions.
- Mazzini tried to use the Carbonari, then Young Italy, to drum up support but his followers were always in a small minority. The seizure of Rome and subsequent defeat revealed the limitations of his movement. He was not the paramount leader of the unification movement.
- Others, such as Manin in Venice, had different ideas.
- The Roman Catholic Church was also conservative in Germany but the role of Pius IX's papacy in Italy was more important.
- Italian risings were markedly local in their extent and ambitions. For some, local grievances were most important. For example, Sicily resented rule by Naples.
- Charles Albert of Piedmont tried to provide leadership but was ultimately ineffective.
- Austrian military strength was important. Charles Albert of Piedmont was defeated at Custoza. Their generals were more capable; answers might mention Radetsky in Italy.

The movement for independence and unification was more militant and aggressive in Italy than Germany during 1848-49, yet still at the time of re-unification in 1871 Germany was in a much stronger position than Italy. Assess the reasons why it was so? (theoretical)

- Brief mention of Vienna Settlement where Prussia became more Germanic, while Italy was weakened by annexing Venetia and Lombardy and giving back autocrats their duchies
- In Italy there were various plans for re-unification like of that of Charles Albert, Mazzini and that of under the Pope. Some favored a monarchy, others advocated a republic. There were different opinions about centralized rule and federalism. In Germany there were only 2 plans of re-unification, Kleindeutschland or Grossdeutschland.
- German unification was helped by the presence of the Zollverein (which gave the new country economic strength and single standard of weights and currencies). The movement of people in between the different provinces helped build a sense of unity.
- Meanwhile in Italy there was no such economic unity. Piedmont was the only economically strong industrial state
- Prussia had a vastly superior army that that of Piedmont, which allowed it to deal with Austria with minimal foreign intervention and help
- Bismarck oversaw the whole process of re-unification while Cavour died in 1861. Italy never produced a substantial replacement for Cavour in terms of diplomatic skills.
- Bismarck thus was able to manipulate foreign powers for growth of German nationalism for a greater period of time (Spanish candidature and Luxembourg affair)
- Bismarck never imposed Prussian laws on the other states. These states were allowed to have their own laws and monarchs provided that they swore loyalty to the new German Constitution and the Kaiser.
- Meanwhile, Piedmontese laws were imposed on the other states. It allowed the exploitation of the agricultural south by the stronger industrial north. This was bound to lead to civil war
- Piedmontese governments were weak which was in sharp contrast to the autocratic rule of Bismarck and the Kaiser in Germany

Analyze the reasons for the growth of nationalism in Europe during the period from 1815 to the unification of Germany and Italy (1870-71)

Meaning of term Nationalism

- The nature of nationalism
- Reasons for its growth, supported by references to Germany and Italy. (Candidates may refer to other countries such as France and Russia. Full credit will be given to such discussions.)
- Nationalism, whilst weak in 1815, was encouraged by the changes that resulted from the French Revolution and especially from the effects of Napoleon Bonaparte's rule. (the reduction in number of provinces, the new judicial system and a network of road and railways)
- Effects of the Vienna Settlement on the German Confederation (which developed a vague sense of nationalism) and on Austria's hold over Lombardy and Venetia (which weakened as nationalism grew)
- There were early attempts in the 1820s and 1830s either to express or suppress nationalism. Carlsbad Decree (1818) showed Metternich's increasing unease at the development of nationalist sentiment in Germany

- The importance of the 1848-9 revolutions which, although failures in Germany and Italy, provided an inspiration to those who wished for the unification of Germany and Italy. Failure of these exposed the weaknesses of nationalist forces at that point and provided a lesson.
- Failures of 1848-49 did not discredit nationalism as a force **BUT** they discredited the current methods used to achieve that end. In Germany, it highlighted the importance of Prussia within Germany whilst realistic Italians such as Cavour saw the need for foreign assistance to defeat Austria.
- In Germany, nationalism had an economic appeal, for example through the Zollverein.
- Bismarck might not have been a German nationalist, rather a champion of Prussian interests, but he harnessed nationalism to achieve his aims.
- In Italy, although Mazzini, the ultra-nationalist, did not achieve his aims of a united Italian republic, Cavour was forced to recognize nationalism as a force especially as represented by Garibaldi
- There was a growing awareness of national consciousness although there was also a strong regional or provincial feeling that was evident in Italy and Germany. Piedmont or Italy? Prussia or Germany?
- High credit should be given when candidates discuss how far Bismarck and Cavour were German and Italian nationalists rather than champions of Prussia and Piedmont

Assess the strengths and weaknesses of movement for German Unification from 1815-1848?

Strengths

- Brief mention of Vienna Settlement where Prussia became more Germanic and acquired the industrialized Rhineland states.
- German unification was helped by the presence of the Zollverein (which gave the new country economic strength and single standard of weights and currencies). The movement of people in between the different provinces helped build a sense of unity.
- The revolution of 1848 failed, nonetheless, the nationalist got close to unification by the formation of Frankfurt Parliament
- Frederick William IV at once seemed open to German unification (once wearing the colours of German flag). He seemed to have rejected the crown due to fear of Metternich
- Metternich was overthrown in the revolution of 1848. This allowed breathing space for German nationalists

Weaknesses

- Brief mention of Vienna Settlement where Prussia had to absorb urban Catholic Rhineland states, who resented rule by the rural Protestant Prussians
- The constitution of the German Confederation was designed to maintain the current internal political situation and the integrity of individual states (not to promote nationalism)
- The Carlsbad Decrees of 1818, further limited free speech and hindered the propagation of nationalist ideas amongst intellectuals
- The failure of revolutions demonstrated the inability of the middle class to achieve social and political change

Assess the strengths and weaknesses of movement for Italian Unification from 1815-1848? **(theoretical)**

Strengths

- The contribution of Carbonari and Mazzini's Young Italy in popularizing the cause of unification
- Charles Albert declared war on Austria and was able to secure Lombardy from Austrian control
- Metternich was overthrown in the revolution of 1848. This allowed breathing space for Italian nationalists

Weaknesses

- Brief mention of Vienna Settlement where Austria annexed Lombardy and Venetia. Despotism was given back the control of their duchies
- Disturbances in Italy were more concerned with regional disputes and economic conditions rather than desire for nationalism. Sicily resented rule by Naples. The revolutions of 1820 was caused by high taxes and a corrupt government, while the 1848 revolution was caused by famine and demand for better wages
- The failure of revolutions demonstrated the inability of the middle class to achieve social and political change
- Mazzini failed to defend the Roman Republic against the French assault
- Venetian republic collapsed and Charles Albert was defeated by the Austrians at Custoza

Why did Piedmont play a leading role in the unification of Italy from 1848 to 1871?

Monarchy

- Charles Albert played an important, if ultimately unsuccessful part in the revolutions of 1848-49, but he put Piedmont at the centre of resistance to Austria's power in Italy.
- Victor Emmanuel II did not play a very active part personally but gave weight to Piedmont's position in the Risorgimento.
- Victor Emmanuel and his government recognized the historic importance of Rome, which then became the capital of the kingdom, although the constitution closely reflected that of Piedmont.

Economic and Diplomatic Strength

- As a constitutional-monarchical state, Piedmont was better able to secure support from the governments of other countries, especially France, Britain and Prussia.
- Its economy was more developed than other Italian states, especially in the south. Thus it could be relied upon as reinforcements by France
- It had a larger army but still had to rely on outside military and diplomatic assistance.
- From 1850 as Minister of Agriculture, Marine and Commerce, then Minister of Finance, Cavour improved the economy and related parts of the state, such as communications. Prime Minister from 1852, he built relationships with other European governments and strengthened the army.
- Candidates can explain his policies and methods to 1861 to extend Piedmont's influence. This was firmly established within the new Italy by the time of his death and it continued to 1870.

No Alternative to Piedmont

- Other groups were divided in their aims and lacked the resources and leadership to succeed.

- Negative reasons for Piedmont's importance might include the weakness of the republicans and those who pursued more populist policies.
- This might include Mazzini and his followers although Garibaldi was persuaded to surrender his gains in the south to monarchist Piedmont/Italy.

'The aims and methods of Cavour were completely different from those of Mazzini.' How far do you agree with this judgment?

The key issue is the comparison of Cavour and Mazzini. Answers should be reasonably balanced in their treatment of the two men. 60:40 either way can deserve any mark band

- Differentiate between aims and methods and support the argument by sound knowledge.

Aims

- both wished to make Italy an independent state and saw Austria as the major stumbling block
- In their aims, Mazzini always sought the unification of the entire Italian peninsula. Cavour began by seeking to make Piedmont a more important and extended state in northern Italy and was initially reluctant to embrace the southern states.
- Mazzini was a democratic republican. Cavour was a monarchist whose ideas of democracy were more limited.
- Mazzini wished Italians to gain independence by themselves; Cavour aimed to win European support for his designs.

Methods

- In methods, Mazzini embraced revolutionary methods, for example in the 1830s and in 1848. He tried to build an alliance of all classes although he failed to do so. Cavour began by strengthening Piedmont. He opposed revolutions but manipulated plebiscites to give the appearance of popular support for his policies. Diplomacy, especially with Napoleon III of France, was a vital means of isolating Austria and supplementing the weak Piedmontese army.
- To the dismay of Mazzini and Garibaldi, Cavour was willing to surrender some Italian territories to gain his wider ends (Nice and Savoy to France). Although not an ally of the Roman Catholic Church, Cavour saw the importance of not alienating the papacy, unlike Mazzini
- Cavour can be seen as working within the system whereas Mazzini was always an outsider. A study of specific developments, such as Mazzini's attempted revolutions in the 1830s and in 1848-49, and Cavour's achievements in 1858-61 can be used to highlight the contrast.

Who of Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini contributed most to the unification of Italy by 1871?

Cavour

- Cavour laid a firm foundation for unification by re-organizing Piedmont.
- He was a successful politician who managed Piedmont with a combination of skill and bribery.
- He was a realist and ensured that he obtained foreign assistance, especially from Napoleon III's France, before confronting Austria.
- He preferred to extend Piedmont's influence by plebiscites, apparently democratic but actually carefully managed.
- It might be argued that unification went further than he intended but his acceptance of Garibaldi's gains in the south confirmed his pragmatism and he was careful not to confront the Papacy.
- By the time of his death (1861), Italy was unified with the exceptions of Venetia and Rome.

Garibaldi

- Garibaldi made his name in Italy and outside by his contribution to the failed revolutions of 1848–49.
- He did as much as anybody to popularize the cause of Italian unification. The 1860 invasion of the south was successful militarily and had knock-on effects by forcing Cavour to recognize the momentum of pressure for a larger Italy.
- Although his later career was less successful, his particular claims were to push for the unification of the peninsula as a whole and to win the support of the lower orders.

Mazzini

- Mazzini led the cause in the 1830s and 1840s, for example through the Carbonari and the 1848–49 revolutions.
- It might be claimed that his ideas were unrealistic: a secular democracy achieved by Italians alone.
- However, although he was to be less successful in practical terms than either Cavour or Garibaldi, his claim to have been the most important contributor depends largely on the way in which he began the struggle. Except for the monarchy, the final shape of Italy closely resembled his programme.

'Bismarck's foreign policy was more successful before the unification of Germany in 1871 than afterwards.' How far do you agree with this judgment?

The key issue is the comparison and contrast of the two periods of Bismarck's foreign policy. However, it is reasonable to expect a fair balance between the two periods. 60: either way can merit any mark band.

Before 1871

- Candidates will surely agree with Bismarck's success to 1870 - 71. He outwitted Austria, relegating it to a less important role in Germany but still maintaining its alliance in spite of imposing a decisive military defeat.
- France was overwhelmingly defeated but in a way that did not scar Prussia as the aggressor in the eyes of other countries.

After 1871

Success

- There is likely to be more disagreement about his success after 1871. Success can be seen in the maintenance of a general peace and the inability of France to gain revenge for the battle of Sedan.
- His treaties, for example the Dreikaiserbund, put Germany at the heart of European diplomacy with seemingly strong allies.
- The Triple Alliance was agreed with Austria and Italy whilst the Re-insurance Treaty seemingly maintained friendly relations with Russia.
- Germany was generally on good terms with Britain.

Failure

- On the other hand, he had created a dangerous and lasting rival in France whilst the attempts to maintain friendship with both Austria and Russia might have been doomed to failure in view of their rival interests in the Balkans.
- Some candidates might refer to imperial policy; this is not a necessary part of the question but should not be dismissed as irrelevant.

Nevertheless, Bismarck placed Germany in an extremely important European position.

Why was Bismarck more successful than the revolutionaries of 1848–49 in unifying Germany?

Examiners should expect a reasonable balance. 60:40 either way can merit any mark

- Prussia's economy was strong; candidates can discuss the importance of the Zollverein
- Bismarck was helped by Prussia's strong military power whereas the earlier revolutionaries had been militarily weak.
- He was supported by William I whereas Frederick William IV spurned the possibility of a German crown. However, Frederick William IV did introduce a comparatively liberal constitution that became attractive to other German states.
- Bismarck's authoritarian attitude and his willingness and ability to override objections in Prussia, for example from the Liberals, were a contrast to the divisions and uncertainties of 1848-49
- Bismarck was more skilful in handling the other German states as he was the minister of a universally-recognized monarchy, thus he was more successful in dealing with other countries through his diplomacy and use of war.
- Candidates can illustrate this through the Danish War (1864), the Austro-Prussian War (1866) and the Franco-Prussian War (1870).
- Meanwhile, Austria was a weaker rival by the 1860s and less able to prevent German unification.

'Bismarck did not plan the unification of Germany. He merely reacted to events.' How far do you agree with this judgment on the period from 1862 to 1871?

There is a view, partly based on a feeling of inevitability, admiration for Bismarck's prowess and his own claims after unification had been achieved, that German unification was carefully planned. A counter-view is that he sought primarily to secure Prussia's position, and especially the position of William I against the Liberals, took advantage of the (often mistaken) policies of other states and ended by establishing the new German Empire in 1871. Some candidates might adopt one argument wholeheartedly. This might deserve a mark in Band 1 if argued effectively. However, answers in this band will normally need some consideration of both judgments. On the other hand, this is not a Question in which examiners will look for a balanced argument. The question begins in 1862 and candidates should take care when referring to earlier development but it will not be irrelevant to point out that

- Bismarck had already developed strong anti-Austrian feelings when he was a Prussian representative at the Diet.
- His appointment was due to pressures on the Prussian monarch from the Liberals, especially over the army budget.
- His early preoccupations were to defeat these Liberals and to disarm and weaken Austria, for example in the Schleswig-Holstein and Austro-Prussian Wars (1864 and 1866).
- Candidates might consider how far Bismarck was responsible for provoking these crises.
- The largely Protestant North German Confederation, dominated by Prussia, might well have been as far as Bismarck wished to go at that point.
- There are different explanations of developments to 1871. Did he provoke France, which was a danger because of its potential links to the largely Catholic southern German states, or was he pushed because of Napoleon III's mistaken diplomacy?
- Certainly, Bismarck used the Ems Telegram as a device to provoke both French and German opinion but the linked issues of the Spanish succession and the Hohenzollern Candidature were not of his making.
- Bismarck ensured that Prussia also dominated the new Germany, which could have been planned before hand or improvised

How consistent were Bismarck's aims and methods from 1862 to 1871?

The key issue is the extent of Bismarck's consistency.

The 'consistent' line is that Bismarck always sought German unification and that his methods –especially his willingness to use war – did not change. The wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870) were simply consequential stages in the same story.

A broader argument about 'consistency' that might be more convincing is Bismarck's defense of Prussian interests rather than his pursuit of unification. For example, it could be argued that Bismarck was consistent because he always saw the interests of Prussia rather than Germany as a priority. More evidence of consistency might be seen in his anxiety not to isolate Prussia but to find external allies to support his policies.

- The 'inconsistency', although offered less frequently, is that he was only an opportunist who took brilliant advantage of events that were often outside his control.
- The most successful answers should consider how far his aims changed after 1866. Did he wish to stop after creating the North German Confederation and destroying Austria's influence in Germany?
- It is likely that he did not set out to unify all of Germany. His first aim was to unify the northern Protestant states around Prussia. He was probably persuaded to accept the need to incorporate the southern Catholic states after the defeat of Austria.
- Another inconsistency was that, to 1867, he saw Austria as a rival but he then sought Austria's friendship in the struggle against France. After using France as a friendly power in the struggle against Austria, Bismarck was to fight the final war for unification against Napoleon III.
- Opportunism was an element that might be considered. For example, he could not predict Napoleon III's mistakes. His methods went beyond fighting wars; diplomacy played an important part. Candidates are very unlikely to know much about pressures on Bismarck within Prussia apart from the Budget quarrel with the Liberals.

Examine the most important problems that faced Bismarck in unifying Germany during the period from 1862 to 1871.

Answers might be thematic, for example, political, diplomatic, military or economic. Alternatively, they might consider the problems of the successive stages: the domination of Austria and the establishment of the North German Confederation, the dominance of Prussia over the other states, usually called the southern states, and then the final conflict with France.

- Bismarck was appointed because of the budget crisis and faced opposition from the Liberals.
- diplomatic: the ways in which Bismarck outwitted Austria, first by using its co-operation to advance Prussian power in the Danish/Schleswig-Holstein question, then the isolation of Austria largely through better relations with France (Napoleon III hoped for territorial gains) and Russia (Bismarck ensured that Prussia backed Russia in the Polish rising).
- By 1870, France was isolated and made to seem the aggressor over the Spanish succession. Reference might be made to the Ems Telegram. The military factor might be discussed.
- Although candidates might assert the superiority of the Prussian army, especially with the reforms of Moltke, Prussia's victory against both Austria and France was not assured.
- William I was sometimes nervous about Bismarck's policies and he also faced difficulties with the Liberals. Bismarck pushed through the necessary budget in the face of Liberal opposition.
- From 1866, some of the southern states were unenthusiastic about Prussia's dominance and saw French protection as a better alternative.

Why was it that Prussia unified Germany?

The key issue is the reasons for the importance of Prussia in German unification. **A key discriminating factor for marks in Bands 1 and 2 will be the ability to go beyond Bismarck's role. It can hardly be denied that his contribution was vital but Bismarck alone will not take candidates to the highest marks.**

Prussia's Economy

- Prussia became more Germanic due to Vienna Settlement. It also acquired the industrialized Rhineland states.
- Before Bismarck, Prussia had already established its importance as the best hope of those who wished to unify Germany. It was the only German state with a significant army (but not considered equal to Austria's).
- Its economy was more advanced and the Zollverein played an important part not only economically but also in giving Prussia political precedence.

Role of Monarchy

- The 1848 Revolution was a failure. Frederick William IV refused the offer of the German crown from the abortive Frankfurt Parliament (probably due to fear of Austria).
- William I was not radical but he opposed Austrian power in Germany as this was an obstacle to growth of Prussian power

Bismarck

- From 1862, Bismarck's role became more important but reference might be made to the work of Moltke and Roon.
- Diplomacy allowed him to make an ally of Austria whilst the lenient Peace of Prague (1866) meant that Austria was not permanently alienated from Prussia and Bismarck.
- Diplomacy was used to good effect to give him a free hand in the Austrian war and isolated France before the Franco-Prussian War.
- The use of war depended on the contributions of others and there is evidence that Bismarck was doubtful about success before the Austro-Prussian War whereas he feared that Napoleon III would be willing to negotiate before the 1870 war.
- His handling of the North German Confederation from 1866 and then his achievement of the unification of all Germany in 1871 can be interpreted as successful diplomacy.
- The new German Empire reflected Prussia's dominance.
- Candidates might examine his aims and consistency. How far did he wish to unify Germany and did he change? These points will be relevant but are not essential to the question.

Why were monarchists more successful than the republicans in unifying Italy by 1871?

Candidates can be expected to have knowledge and understanding of Cavour, as the most important monarchist, and Garibaldi and Mazzini as leading republicans. The question ends in 1871 and the most successful candidates are expected to show some knowledge and understanding of developments after the death of Cavour in 1861, especially the acquisition of Venetia (1866) and the final incorporation of Rome (1871).

Success of Monarchy

- Victor Emmanuel II became King of Italy in a monarchist country. Cavour and fellow monarchists did not alarm the governments of other countries (thus Piedmont was open to diplomatic help) and more conservative forces within Italy as much as the republicans.
- His policies enabled the monarchists to win the crucial support of Napoleon III's France.
- Britain and Bismarck's Prussia also played their part.
- The monarchist state of Piedmont-Sardinia was the richest in Italy.
- Cavour began public office in ministries handling the economy and he developed commerce, improved the transport infrastructure and strengthened the army.

Weakness of Republicans

- The republicans depended more on popular support within Italy and this was shown to be inadequate, especially in the revolutions of 1848-49. Insurrection could not deliver a united Italy.
- The social class was more concerned with a relatively liberal constitution and a better economic climate rather than unification

Importance of Republicans

- Nevertheless, the contribution of the republicans was not negligible and candidates might note the ways in which Garibaldi helped to unify the south.
- Mazzini provided the initial impetus.
- Cavour probably adapted his original intention to limit Piedmont to a northern expansion but later had to accept total unification due to the appeal of a united Italy created by the republicans (who had popularized the cause)

Assess the claim that the assistance of foreign powers was the most important reason why Italy became unified during the period from 1848 to 1871.

Foreign Powers

- Among the foreign powers that played a role, the most important was France. (It can also be pointed out that France impeded steps towards the integration of Rome in 1848–49 and at the end of the specified period.) Napoleon III's support for Piedmont and Plombières (1858) proved to be a turning point although he withdrew after the battle of Solferino. Piedmont gained Lombardy, the first major step towards the unification of the peninsula. It had gained vital assistance from a powerful foreign army against Austria.
- It can be argued that Venetia was acquired (1866) as an indirect result of the Austro-Prussian war
- Whilst Rome was integrated as a result of Napoleon III's defeat by Bismarck's Prussia.
- Britain's policy and contribution represented benevolent neutrality.

Actions of Leaders

- Alternative explanations might include the contributions of the three great Italian leaders, Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini. Their aims and methods varied but, to different degrees, each was important.
- For example, Cavour reorganized the government and economy of Piedmont; he made the cause of Italy respectable among other powers. He arranged plebiscites in the central states
- Garibaldi's march on the south and moves from Sicily to Rome added another dimension.
- Mazzini can be seen as the inspiration for much of the movement although his vision of a republican Italy did not come to fruition.

Why was Bismarck a successful leader of Prussia during the period from 1862 to 1871?

His success was not inevitable. Candidates must explain the serious internal and external problems, and considered how he dealt with them.

- He was successful because he recognized that the increase of Prussia's power depended on the weakening of Austria. Austria was strong as the leader of the German Confederation but he believed that it could not lead a struggle against liberalism.
- He was able to take a broad view, aware of the importance of very different factors, for example 'blood and iron'. He renewed the Zollverein and agreed a free-trade treaty with France but excluded Austria.
- He managed to persuade, rather than force, other German states to accept the primacy of Prussia.
- German Liberals were reassured by the formation of the North German Confederation in 1866 because it included a parliament elected by universal suffrage. This hid the continuing influence of the Prussian monarchy and therefore the authority of Bismarck.
- He was determined and willing to take risks, as when he pushed through the army budget against the opposition of the Liberals in Prussia.
- Whether or not he conceived a grand design or whether he was an opportunist can be argued by candidates. In either scenario, he was adept at taking advantage of opportunities.
- This is seen in the three wars in which he involved Prussia, with Austria against Denmark (1864), against Austria (1866) and against France (1870). He was an able diplomat and managed to make his adversaries seem the aggressor in each case.
- He could also persuade the Kaiser as shown by his insistence on treating Austria leniently after 1866
- He persuaded other countries to remain neutral: Britain, France and Italy in 1866 and Austria in 1870. It might be claimed that he was lucky. The victories against Austria (Sadowa / Königgratz) and France (Sedan) were crushing but

quick victories had not been anticipated. He was lucky in the circumstances that led to the Danish and French wars; the issue of the Hohenzollern candidature and the bungled French reaction could not have been anticipated.

IMPERIALISM

Paper 1

What was 'new' about imperialism in the later years of the nineteenth century?

- By the turn of the twentieth century, Africa and Asia had become vast colonial territories of European powers.
- The swiftness of the process was marked, contrasting with the slower earlier development of colonial empires.
- There were new attitudes to empire, especially the feeling that they could relieve some of the economic problems in Europe. There were searches for raw materials and markets. Some saw empire as a promising outlet for investment.
- The strategic interest was not new but empires loomed larger in the European balance of power. Popular interest was greater, for example in Germany

Explain the factors which attracted European imperialism either to Africa or to Asia in the later nineteenth century.

- Defining the Scramble of Africa. In 1870, 90% of Africa uncolonized and in 1900 only Liberia and Ethiopia were left.
- Answers can develop to examine the factors that were more European based but encouraged by the condition of Africa or Asia. These regions were mostly outside European control in the mid-nineteenth century and they were seen as a vacuum that could be filled.
- Or at least European powers should ensure that others did not fill the vacuum.
- There was the potential of raw materials and markets in economies that were rudimentary when compared with Europe. Credit should be given when specific European countries are discussed.
- Empires were seen as a barometer of national power. The new Germany sought increased influence overseas in spite of the misgivings of Bismarck.
- The French Third Republic saw Empire as a means to restore the greatness of the country that had been humiliated in 1870
- Leopold II of Belgium saw the Congo in terms of personal power
- The discovery of gold and diamonds was a further impetus for colonialism and rivalry.
- Egypt provided a centre of tension between Britain, France and Germany. The Suez Canal was seen as vital to British interests further east, especially in India
- Governments came under pressure from their populations and the media/newspapers. Disraeli and Bismarck were first reluctant about colonies but used it for Social Imperialism
- To spread their religion
- To some extent governments were committed by the actions of individuals such as Rhodes in South Africa.
- A few had hopes that empire might be the solution to growing populations but few emigrated to the new territories (Algeria is the best example with a million native French, who left only in the early 1960's)

Were the motives for European imperialism in the later nineteenth century more aggressive than defensive? Explain your answer.

- The reasons might be assessed separately ('A was defensive, B was aggressive, C was defensive.') but the structure should be coherent.
- Britain saw itself as defensive because of its long history of imperial involvement; it regarded Germany as aggressive.
- On the other hand, Germany would argue that it was defending its interests. Economic expansion saw countries try to gain control of larger areas but they sought to gain the resources to enhance their economies.
- France could be seen as defensive in trying to regain some of its respect lost after the humiliation of 1871
- Humanitarian efforts might be seen as either defensive or aggressive: candidates might interpret them as evidence of cultural aggression.
- Certainly, the Europeans were aggressive as far as the colonized regions were concerned; these could do little to defend themselves and were not a threat as such
- Governments tried to defuse possible tensions, for example at the Conference / Treaty of Berlin (1884–85) where spheres of influence were agreed, but with limited success

'Imperialism resulted in more problems than benefits.' Assess this judgment on the effects of imperialism on Europe in the later nineteenth century.

The key issue is the effects of imperialism on Europe.

- Problems included growing tensions in international diplomacy, for example the rivalry between Britain, France and Germany.
- Another problem was the failure of many colonies to produce the profits that were envisaged.
- Benefits included the prestige of gaining world-wide empires.
- Some industries were encouraged.
- Technology was encouraged.
- Some people believed at the time that the mission of 'Social Darwinism' reflected well on European states
- Social Imperialism resulted in short term benefits but a long disaster

Explain the problems European countries faced in promoting imperial expansion during the later nineteenth century.

- There were problems in communication.
- Governments were sometimes involved in enterprises because of the actions of local officials, for example Britain and Cecil Rhodes. The governments got into problems because of the actions of these individuals
- Sometimes different policies were favored. For example, Bismarck was less enthusiastic than German public opinion.
- Public opinion could cause problems, sometimes pushing politicians such as Bismarck further than they would wish to go in promoting overseas expansion and sometimes being critical when there were failures overseas
- In spite of hopes for profits, imperial expansion could be expensive. Imperialism resulted in tensions between countries and added to military costs because larger and more expensive navies were needed.
- Colonies did not actually provide the economic returns they were thought to be doing
- There was the danger of war and reference can be made to some crises such as Britain and France's involvement at Fashoda (1898).
- Some candidates might slant the question to use 'problems' as a device to explain the causes of imperialism, for example economic advantage or strategic interests. This will be valid as long as the link is made between causes and problems.

How far did European governments support imperial expansion in the later nineteenth century because of the pressure of public opinion?

- Governments were often forced into imperial adventures in order to placate public opinion. For example, Disraeli and Bismarck were both initially reluctant to engage in imperialism but both came to see the domestic advantages.
- The public saw colonies as evidence of a country's strength.
- They were attracted by the stories of individuals whose heroism or self-sacrifice made them popular heroes. Livingstone and the epic search of Stanley were British examples, Karl Peters was German, and France had its missionary heroes.
- Public opinion might be linked to Social Darwinism, the sentiment that European countries had a duty to improve the lot of backward peoples.
- Candidates can also discuss the importance of economic and political factors. Economic issues might include the idea that surplus capital needed areas for investment, the need for raw materials, and the stimulus to find other markets away from increasingly protectionist Europe.
- However, good candidates might argue that much imperial activity was centered on regions that delivered few economic advantages, especially Africa.
- Political factors might include the perceived need to secure national interests by keeping up with, or ahead of, other countries. Examples might include Franco-British rivalry in North Africa, for example Fashoda, German activity in south-east and South-West Africa, and rival claims in Southeast Asia and China.
- Social Imperialism
- To Britain, colonies were a continued necessity of its world role.
- France saw empire as evidence of recovery after the 1870 defeat by Germany.
- Germany, especially under William II, embarked on a policy of Weltpolitik to secure a place in the sun

Assess the results of 'New Imperialism' for European governments in the late nineteenth century.

- Governments gained prestige and power. The best example is the British Empire but other examples that might be cited are Germany's wish for a 'place in the sun', French ambitions to compensate for the loss of prestige in the Franco-Prussian War and Italy's desire to be recognized as a major country.
- The complementary effect was that governments were involved in rivalries, for example Britain and France in northern Africa and Britain and Germany in southwest Africa. Several examples of imperial crises might be examined, for example Fashoda and Morocco. There were also rivalries in Asia.
- Candidates might consider economic effects. Colonies were seen as profitable, providing raw materials and markets.
- However, more critical answers might be aware of the limits of the economic gains. Raw materials were obtained but Africa and Asia did not provide large markets.
- The empires were also expensive to maintain and defend.
- Governments were exposed to the pressures of public opinion. A number of politicians were initially unconvinced by the advantages of imperialism, for example Disraeli and Bismarck, but were persuaded to go down this route because of public opinion. Disraeli made much of imperial Britain later in his career.
- This resulted in long term disadvantages like jingoism
- At the same time, they often did not control the actions of 'the man on the spot' but had to react to events. Reference might be made to Cecil Rhodes and Karl Peters.
- Answers on imperialism often discuss Social Darwinism but, as with other factors, it will be necessary to link this to the key issue.

Assess the reasons for success of British imperialism

- The British possessed a powerful navy and were able to ward off any challengers. German attempts to organize a continental wide pact against British failed as no one dared to send troops to help the Orange Republics in Africa
- The British had started earlier in colonizing different parts of the world. East India Company (which lasted from 1600 to 1857) was able to strike gold in Bengal in 1757.
- This gave them experience in managing colonies and control of important routes
- British colonies were profitable as compared to the French colonies. The TransAfrican railway only yielded 2 million francs annually instead of the much hoped 100 million francs
- The British were willing to use force to defend their colonies and routes to India (the Golden Sparrow) like Tunisia in 1905 against the Germans and Egypt against the French at Fashoda in 1898
- Bismarck was willing to compromise with British on territorial disputes on Africa in return for isolating the French and opposing the Russians in Mediterranean
- British imperial policy was focused and practical. British would prevent a major continental power from becoming too strong and otherwise stay neutral (this was so as the case when British sent troops against Napoleon in early 1800s and then against the Russians in 1855)

RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Paper 1

A BRIEF NOTE ON TROTSKY'S CONTRIBUTION (as required by syllabus, see page 4, theme 5 and point 4)

1904

- Lenin and his supporters, the Bolsheviks, argued for a smaller but highly organized party while Martov and his supporters, the Mensheviks, argued for a larger and less disciplined party. In a surprise development, Trotsky and most of the Iskra editors supported and joined the Mensheviks. The Mensheviks believed that Russia was not ready for the communist revolution as the bourgeoisie revolution (a pre-requisite for the proletariat revolution) had not occurred

1917

- After an unsuccessful pro-Bolshevik uprising in Petrograd (July days), Trotsky was arrested but was released later in the aftermath of the failed counter-revolutionary uprising by Kornilov.
- After the Bolsheviks gained a majority in the Petrograd Soviet, Trotsky was elected Chairman on 8 October. He sided with Lenin against Zinoviev and Kamenev when the Bolshevik Central Committee discussed staging an armed uprising and he led the efforts to overthrow the Provisional Government headed by Kerensky.
- The following summary of Trotsky's role in 1917 was written by Stalin in *Pravda*, 10 November. "All practical work in connection with the organization of the uprising was done under the immediate direction of Comrade Trotsky, the President of the Petrograd Soviet. It can be stated with certainty that the Party is indebted primarily and principally to Comrade Trotsky for the rapid going over of the garrison to the side of the Soviet and the efficient manner in which the work of the Military Revolutionary Committee was organized."
- After the success of the uprising on 7–8 November, Trotsky led the efforts to repel a counter-attack by Cossacks
- Allied with Lenin, he defeated attempts by other Bolshevik Central Committee members (Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, etc.) to share power with other socialist parties. By the end of 1917, Trotsky was unquestionably the second man in the Bolshevik Party after Lenin
- After the Bolsheviks came to power, Trotsky became the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs. Trotsky also led the Soviet delegation during the peace negotiations in Brest-Litovsk

1918-21

- Trotsky and the government responded to the Civil War with a full-fledged mobilization, which increased the size of the Red Army from fewer than 300,000 in May 1918 to one million in October,
- and an introduction of political commissars into the army. The latter were responsible for ensuring the loyalty of military experts (who were mostly former officers in the imperial army) and co-signing their orders. Trotsky also insisted that former Tsarist officers should be used as military specialists within the Red Army, with a combination of Bolshevik political commissars to ensure the revolutionary nature of the Red Army
- Trotsky also gave the order for the suppression of the Kronstadt Rebellion in 1921, the last major revolt against Bolshevik rule

How far was the economy of Russia different from the economies of Western Europe before 1914? (You should refer to Russia and at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

Agriculture

- Candidates might argue that the major difference was that the Russian economy was still heavily dependent on agriculture and in a primitive form when compared with the major countries in western Europe.
- Serfdom had been abolished (1861) but the condition of most of the peasantry, who comprised a very large proportion of the population, changed little after emancipation. There was little incentive to produce more or to modernize. Redemption payments were heavy and the Mir inhibited change.
- Agriculture was also a major element of the economies of major countries in western Europe but it was becoming modernized. Fewer people were employed in it but production increased with changed methods.
- Stolypin (Prime Minister 1906–11) tried to improve agriculture by encouraging the growth of the kulak class and loosening the hold of the Mir. Production did improve but not enough to change the situation radically. However, there were signs of change in Russia. Railways were built, allowing Russia to export more, but the exports were heavily agricultural. However, he was not supported by Nicholas II and the majority of the governing classes.

Industry

- It did not have the industry to compete with other countries. Industrial production was small scale, not in large factories that were increasingly common in the west. Witte was Minister of Finance (1892–1903) and then Prime Minister (1905–06). He saw the need to industrialize to avoid reliance on imports. This involved the encouragement of foreign investment in Russia. He was very successful, especially in gaining loans from France.
- However, the adverse exchange rate meant that loans came at a heavy price. Production of coal, iron and oil increased rapidly and, at the turn of the century, the annual growth rate outstripped that in western Europe. But total output still lagged behind more advanced countries.
- High tax rates to raise money for repaying the French was an important cause of the 1905 revolution

Middle Class

- Russia had a small middleclass and economic policies were mostly driven by the need to satisfy the reactionary interests of the large landholders.

'The underlying causes of the 1905 Revolution in Russia were not political. Whatever else the revolutionaries wanted, it was not the overthrow of the Tsar.' How far do you agree with this claim?

Social Causes

- The basic cause was probably social discontent and especially the consequences of the burden of taxation that followed from Witte's policy of industrialization.
- Peasants wanted their mortgage payments to be written off, while the workers wanted better working conditions

Immediate Causes

- In addition, the Russo-Japanese War was an immediate factor. Defeat did not have only military repercussions. It was a blow to Russian morale and seemed to limit Russia's potential as a great power (until it became more active in the Balkans).
- Father Gapon's March at St. Petersburg led to the violent suppression known as Bloody Sunday and this was accompanied by risings and strikes elsewhere.
- Dissatisfaction spread among the middleclass and some elements of the military, particularly the navy (the Potemkin).

Political Causes

- However, there is little evidence that Lenin and the Bolsheviks played a major role. Lenin was in exile and returned to Russia too late to play an important, even less successful, role.
- With a comparatively small number of radicals, there was no significant demand at that time for the abolition of the monarchy.
- However, there were more voices for constitutional concessions by the Tsar

- The Tsar was weakened and decided to woo the liberals and the peasants, while attempting to crush the workers
- He conceded the October Manifesto (1906) and the mortgage payments were forgiven. But the Revolution was not primarily a protest against him (that's why the revolution stopped when Nicholas moved to improve conditions of the middle class and peasants). He was still held in considerable esteem. The marchers at St. Petersburg carried icons and pictures of Nicholas II. That is why wh

Social protest is an umbrella term for varied demands.

How far was Nicholas II personally responsible for the problems of the Tsarist regime in Russia from 1905 to 1914?

Candidates can discuss Nicholas II's personality.

- He was indecisive and prone to depend too much on advice from others, particularly the more reactionary, these including Pobedonostev and Alexandra, his wife.
- He was remote and had little understanding of what was happening in Russia.
- His prevailing instinct was to oppose change for fear of appearing weak
- Whilst appointing some reforming ministers such as Witte and Stolypin, he gave them little support.
- Persuaded to grant the October Manifesto with a Duma after the 1905 Revolution, he immediately issued the Fundamental Laws (1906) which emphasized autocracy
- He gave no support to the Duma and agreed with those who wished to limit its activity, including interfering in elections.
- He was not interested in reforming the administration, mostly headed by people who were appointed because of their compliance rather than their ability.
- Overall, whilst Russia was changing during these years, he wished for continuity.

On the other hand, it can be argued that many, or even most, of the problems were outside his control. Russia was backward socially and economically.

- Ministers were preoccupied with maintaining their positions rather than governing well.
- He was not personally responsible for defeat in the war against Japan (1904–05). The Russian army and navy were weakened by years of neglect and complacency.
- The 1905 Revolution was not aimed at him personally because most of the protestors were confident that he would improve matters if he were made aware of them.
- The economic situation that he inherited was poor but, it can be argued, was improving at the beginning of the twentieth century.
- The social system was deeply embedded in Russia and the forces of reaction far outweighed those who advocated reform.
- The size of Russia might be pointed out and it included regions that were very different, some with strong nationalist tendencies.
- The only groups that were keen to change were the middle classes but they were small in number. The peasantry was conservative, as was the aristocracy.
- Candidates can discuss the outbreak of World War I. Nicholas II was in charge of foreign policy but it can be argued that he was swept along by the popularity of a policy to protect the Serbs
- The police were widespread but not very effective. Although many were prosecuted and sent to internal or external exile, the police system failed to halt the spread of dissident ideas. For example, Lenin was in exile for most of this period but managed to keep in contact with sympathizers within Russia and to distribute pamphlets and newsletters.

How stable was the tsarist regime in Russia on the eve of the First World War in 1914?

... There were political divisions... A series of strikes demonstrated the unrest in society, for example the Lena Gold Fields. However, credit should be given when candidates understand some of the economic improvements in pre-war Russia. External trade increased. More railways were built. Nevertheless, some candidates might refer to the military. Whilst the failings were revealed in World War I (after the question), and the

The case for stability might include

Economy

- A growing economy due to work of Peter Stolypin, from 1906, he was first Minister of the Interior and then briefly Prime Minister. He encouraged the growth of the kulaks and brought about some reform in agriculture.
- Serge Witte was Minister of Finance to 1903 and later Prime Minister. He encouraged commerce and industry. Foreign loans were negotiated. Communications improved, for example the Trans-Siberian Railway. Railways almost doubled in this period. The volume of imports and exports more than doubled

Political

- Stolypin also aimed to increase religious toleration, extend education and reform local administration to allow some decentralization
- The absence of an effective domestic opposition. The regime seemed to have weathered the crisis of 1905.
- The police system, supported by a loyal army, kept dissent under control (unlike in 1917). The Tsar had the support of the Orthodox Church
- There seemed little chance of a revolution, even less of a Bolshevik revolution, in 1914. Many of their leaders, such as Lenin, were in prison or in internal or external exile

Social

- Nicholas II's personal position was strong
- The government was backed by the most of the nobility, there was little resistance by the small middle class, and the peasantry largely accepted tsarism

Against stability were

Tsar

- The Tsar was indecisive and prone to depend too much on advice from others, particularly the more reactionary, these including Pobedonostev and Alexandra, his wife.
- He was remote and had little understanding of what was happening in Russia.
- His prevailing instinct was to oppose change. He was unwilling to concede reforms for fear of appearing weak
- Whilst appointing some reforming ministers such as Witte and Stolypin, he gave them little support. There were some evident, but limited, successes. He was not interested in reforming the administration, mostly headed by people who were appointed because of their compliance rather than their ability.
- The Tsar's circle of family and courtiers were not held in high regard.

Economy

- The Russian economy lagged behind those of other industrialized country and depended largely on an unreformed agrarian sector: it was more backward than Britain, France, Germany and even Austria. Taxes had to be increased to pay off foreign loans
- Peasant reforms had largely failed only 10% of land had been converted to farms
- Ministers were preoccupied with maintaining their positions rather than governing well.

Political

- Tsar wasted the opportunity to win wider support after the 1905 Revolution by insisting on autocracy (Fundamental Laws) and ignoring the possibilities offered by the Duma, which had been set up under the October Manifesto.
- The franchise was successively narrowed to make them more conservative. The regime relied on autocratic means of maintaining its power. The four Duma since 1906 achieved little.
- There were few entrepreneurs and the most powerful groups were not interested in developing a modern economy
- The policy of Russification was popular in Russia but other racial groups suffered discrimination that caused unrest completely suppressed.

Workers and Military

- There were still signs of unrest, including strikes that were put down forcefully (for example the Lena Gold Fields Massacre, 1912) but they did little to shake the government
- War with Japan 1904–05 demonstrated weaknesses in the army and navy; there was massive investment and some modernization from 1906. However, these improvements had not resulted in significant change by 1914 although the other major countries saw Russia as a potentially powerful military force.

Overall, by 1914 Nicholas II's autocracy was still intact and there were few signs of imminent change, even less a revolution that would bring down the monarchy

'The First World War was the most important cause of the Russian Revolution.' How true is this claim?

Why was the First World War so important in the downfall of the Romanov regime and the victory of the Bolsheviks?

The key issue is the link between the First World War and the events of 1917. Candidates have to explain how the World War led to collapse of Romanov rule and then of Provisional Government. Candidates might take either of two approaches.

- Either, 1914–17 might be seen as the culmination of a long decline of tsarist government, with less attention being given to the wartime period. In essence the war exposed the structural weaknesses of the government, which were previously kept hidden
- Alternatively, answers might begin in 1914. In particular, the Bolsheviks were not in a strong position in 1914

World War (Romanov)

- Early victories were followed by heavier defeats. The battle of Tannenberg was disastrous for Russia. Arms were soon in short supply, making Russia's manpower ineffective.
- News of defeats and the suffering of soldiers could not be kept from the Russian population.
- A backward economy crumbled during the war and could not feed people.
- From 1916, the number of strikes and military mutinies increased. The effects of sharp inflation were severe. Food was in short supply, not because of low production but because of the inadequacy of the railways when priority was given (inefficiently) to the war effort. The resulting inflation ruined an economy that had been improving by 1914 but was still too weak to sustain the pressures of the conflict.
- The Tsar's decision to take personal command showed his lack of ability as a military leader but it also discredited him politically. Russia was left to the rule of Tsarina Alexandra and Rasputin. Their reputation had been maligned
- The war meant that radical and revolutionary groups could not be suppressed as they had been in the past.
- Political instability was reflected in the rapid turnover of ministers, each equally incapable (4 prime ministers, 6 ministers of domestic affairs, 3 war ministers and 3 foreign ministers). The February 1917 Revolution was the first climax but not the end of the effects of the war.

World War (Provisional Government)

- Kerensky and the Provisional Government decided to continue the war as a matter of honor. The events from February to October unfolded against the background of the war. The Provisional Government faced the same problems as had Nicholas II.
- In spite of their later propaganda, Lenin and the Bolsheviks were not important in this rising.
- Kerensky and the Provisional Government failed to establish a stable government. They tried to deal with grievances about food and land but ineffectively. The many political groups could not be managed for example the role of the soviets when the Provisional Government was in charge
- The war continued unsuccessfully and the resulting grievances increased.

Other Factors (Kornilov affair and Lenin's Role)

- Although Lenin and the Bolsheviks were checked in the July Days, Kornilov's attempted coup discredited Kerensky.
- The October Revolution showed the ability of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, although a minority, to take decisive action.
- Lenin persuaded a reluctant Central Committee to seize power. The role of Trotsky in organizing the revolution can also be mentioned. His plans worked out without a hitch
- Lenin's promise of major reforms and slogans such as 'All power to the soviets' had an enthusiastic response.
- Lenin soon abandoned his offer of a coalition government to install the Bolsheviks firmly in power.

Why did the tsarist regime in Russia survive the 1905 Revolution but not the February 1917 Revolution?

Army

- Candidates might argue that the role of the army was a key difference. In 1905, its support was an important factor in the defeat of the Revolution. (But candidate might note the Potemkin naval mutiny.)
- By 1917, Nicholas II had lost its support as the army fell apart following the losses in World War I.

Opposition

- Candidates might compare the dangers presented by the opposition in 1905 and 1917. 1905 saw a comparatively limited movement of protest, centered on St. Petersburg. There were other risings in towns and among the peasantry but they were uncoordinated and poorly led. The protests were not against tsarism or the Tsar as such and
- Nicholas II was able to win time by offering the October Manifesto. By 1917, he was not able to win time by offering concessions.
- The Duma was mistrusted and often ignored. Stolypin was given little backing (his reforms failed) and his death was not regretted by Nicholas II.

War

- The social and economic damage caused by the World War 1 was horrendous. This was no match for the defeat against Japan in 1904-05. The impact of World War I was much greater. The morale of the army was shattered whilst it had devastating effects on the civilian population
- Nicholas II had taken personal command and his own reputation as a leader suffered. Any gains made since 1905 were negated. St. Petersburg was again the centre of disturbances but they spread more widely and more violently when Nicholas II lost control
- Tsarina and Rasputin's reputation also fuelled growing suspicion and hatred of the Tsarist system

Candidates should take care when examining the role of radicals. Lenin and his associates were not involved in 1905. He and many of his associates were in exile. Nor did the Bolsheviks play an important role in the February Revolution. Lenin stated that he did not expect a revolution

Why did the Bolsheviks replace the Provisional Government in Russia in 1917?

Good answers were able to contrast the failure of Kerensky and the Provisional Government with the success of Lenin.

Some candidates made the excellent point that the victory of the Bolsheviks was unexpected, even in the summer of 1917. Answers were given credit when they explained why the Bolsheviks emerged as the victors.

More moderate essays sometimes assumed their success. They explained why the Provisional Government failed and then simply announced that the Bolsheviks carried out another revolution

Political Weakness

- The 'Provisional' status of the government was a weakness and it did not call elections for a Constituent Assembly until it was too late.
- Power was shared with other groups, such as the Soviets.
- Kerensky could not get to grips with the widespread grievances in Russia, for example economic distress, the demands for land distribution and the concessions to nationalities
- The crisis of the July Days showed the weakness of the Provisional Government although Lenin had to withdraw to Finland.
- The Kornilov Affair represented another crisis.

Continuation of World War

- The Provisional Government continued the war and was involved with the failure of the Brusilov offensive in June-August. The Russians now could not launch an offensive
- Deserting soldiers continued to return from the home front when peasants overtook land from the landlords. The soldiers did not wish to miss out (as most of them were from rural areas)

Strengths of Bolsheviks

- The influence of the Bolsheviks was spreading rapidly in the Soviets and elsewhere. Trotsky became a significant leader when he joined the Bolsheviks.
- Above all, Lenin's leadership was decisive. His popular slogans, 'All power to the Soviets', 'Peace, land and bread' won considerable support.
- He also secured support among soldiers. He persuaded a reluctant Central Committee to support a coup
- Trotsky's plans went off without a hitch

Why did Lenin and the Bolsheviks gain power in 1917?

Good answers were able to contrast the failure of Kerensky and the Provisional Government with the success of Lenin.

Some candidates made the excellent point that the victory of the Bolsheviks was unexpected, even in the summer of 1917. Answers were given credit when they explained why the Bolsheviks emerged as the victors.

More moderate essays sometimes assumed their success. They explained why the Provisional Government failed and then simply announced that the Bolsheviks carried out another revolution

- There is no need to provide much background to the events of 1917; good answers will probably summarize these quickly. It was relevant to discuss the background to 1917, including the problems of the tsarist regime from about 1905
- The rest of the answer is same as that of the previous question
- The question allows candidates to explain the downfall of the tsarist regime but answers that end with the outbreak of the revolution and assume the victory of Lenin and the Bolsheviks will be too limited for the highest band and will probably not be able to get more than 18 marks.

How far had Lenin achieved his aims by the time of his death in 1924?

The key issue is the achievements of Lenin. **It will be appropriate to examine Lenin's aims but candidates should not spend too much time on developments before 1917.** The most successful answers should consider both his successes and his failures and come to a considered balance of judgment.

Successes

- In 1917, Lenin took the Bolsheviks to power
- The war with Germany was ended. Lenin made the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with sufficient realism to recognize that peace necessitated the surrender of large swathes of Russian territory
- He then led the new government to victory against the Whites in the civil war. There was not only a danger to the central Bolshevik government but also to the integrity of the state as the war was fought from the Baltic to the east. The problem was solved, and candidates might note the contribution of Trotsky to the Bolsheviks' victory, but at a heavy price
- He then transformed Russia until his death, establishing the supremacy of the communist Bolsheviks.
- Many of the foundations were laid then, including the murder of Nicholas II and his family which made a royalist restoration impossible, and the establishment of a one-party state.
- He was unchallenged personally

Failures

- On the other hand, the war was ended at a terrible cost to Russia. Lenin's economic measures, especially War Communism. War Communism was initially seen as the answer, not only to fight the civil war, but also to exert the authority of the Bolsheviks over parts of Russia that were not involved in the war
- More died in the civil war than in the war against Germany
- The system was inherently inefficient and the government was foiled by workers and peasants who had no incentive to produce surpluses
- War Communism had to be revised in the New Economic Policy and survival was achieved at the cost of abandoning Marxist communist principles. However, there is evidence of a return to his earlier policies just before his death.
- Some of the improvement was due to naturally better harvests whilst a conservative peasantry was still suspicious of the government.
- A Five-Year Plan had some success in reviving industry.
- The use of terror to suppress opponents set a blue print for future Communist leaders especially Stalin
- Lenin did not act quickly to take on the inner party bureaucracy. His only method to prevent dissent was the ban on faction (which Stalin exploited). He failed to make his will public, which ultimately led to a leadership crisis

Examiners should not underestimate well argued claims that Russia never became a communist state as wished by Lenin

- Lenin combined Marxist theory with a willingness to accept compromise. Yet the proletariat did not gain power. Marx did not envisage a personal dictatorship.
- Lenin promoted the Bolshevik party, not the proletariat, as the agency of change and power.

Why was Lenin able to become the ruler of Russia in October 1917?

- Some well-organized answers were structured in two parts. They explained the weaknesses of the Provisional Government that created a vacuum in Russia and then discussed the factors that were to be advantageous to Lenin
- In 1903, when Lenin became the recognized leader of the Bolsheviks after splitting from the Mensheviks. It was Lenin's closely knit devoted revolutionaries, who brought the revolution (in contrast to the Menshevik belief)
- He saw the value of propaganda and 'Iskra', his newspaper, was influential in spreading his ideas
- Lenin proved adept at taking advantage of opportunities, for example in his return to Russia in April 1917 with the help of Germany.
- Before this, Lenin and the Bolsheviks had been of little importance in shaping events in Russia. However, the years before 1917 showed his determination and ability to be the leader of the minority Bolsheviks.
- He was to be proved right after the February Revolution, when he withdrew support from the Provisional Government and published the April Theses, throwing in his lot with the Soviets. His advocacy of 'Peace Land and Bread' was successful in winning popular support.
- Although the July Days were a setback, he proved to be resilient especially after the Kornilov coup.
- It was Lenin who provoked the Bolsheviks into seizing power in October.
- Candidates might argue that Lenin's success was facilitated by the weakness and failure of rivals. Kerensky did not provide the leadership that would win wide support. Some of his policies proved fatal, for example the continuation of the war against Germany.
- There were some sound accounts that questioned the later communist claims that the October Revolution represented a national revolution. These candidates were aware of the limited numbers who backed the Bolsheviks, although Lenin overcame this problem in the successful October Revolution.
- The question ends in October 1917. References to the later period can be included in a brief conclusion but more substantial discussions will not be relevant

Who did more to establish communism in Russia during the period from 1917 to 1939: Lenin or Stalin?

The key issue is the comparison of Lenin and Stalin in the establishment of communism in Russia. A split of 60:40 either way can merit any mark.

The definition of Marxism/Communism. It is the creation of a classless state, prefaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat, after the fall of bourgeois capitalism. Private property and wealth would give way to the economic division of resources according to need

Lenin

- The case for Lenin will probably rely heavily on his role in the October 1917 Revolution when the Bolsheviks gained power.
- He then transformed Russia until his death, establishing the supremacy of the communist Bolsheviks.
- Many of the foundations were laid then, including the murder of Nicholas II and his family which made a royalist restoration impossible, and the establishment of a one-party state.
- **However**, his work was incomplete. War Communism failed and the New Economic Policy (NEP) can be construed as a return to some non-communist practices.
- However, credit should be given to candidates who understand that the supremacy of the party and of Lenin himself did not mean the disappearance of other groups, e.g. Mensheviks and Social Democrats by 1924 although their influence was much reduced.

Stalin

- Some aspects of Marxism developed by 1939. Russia / the USSR became a republic. The class system was transformed with the disappearance of the aristocracy, kulaks and the middle class
- Stalin took a tougher line, using state planning to direct all aspects of the economy and curbing all real or imagined survivals of private enterprise
- The entire state, including the military and culture, followed the communist party-line.
- Opposition, real or imagined, was crushed. By 1939, the entire pre-revolutionary social structure had disappeared.

Examiners should not underestimate well argued claims that Russia never became a communist state.

- Lenin combined Marxist theory with a willingness to accept compromise. Yet the proletariat did not gain power. Marx did not envisage a personal dictatorship.
- Lenin promoted the Bolshevik party, not the proletariat, as the agency of change and power.
- This was pushed further by Stalin. The purges were justified as a defense of the party against political and economic opponents. The 'dictatorship' of the many became dictatorship by a small minority
- Stalin might be described as setting an agenda that was more Stalinist than communist.
- State did not wither away; it became an important aspect of daily life.
- Both Lenin and Stalin had to offer incentives to industrial workers and managerial class like extra holidays and trips. (Thus a classless society was still not present)
- There was no form of democracy. However, this is likely to be a minority approach.

How far do you agree that, up to 1939, Stalin carried out more extensive social and economic changes in Russia than the Romanov tsars?

Stalin

- To support the claim in the question, it might be argued that the suppression of the kulaks destroyed an entire social class.
- Economic changes, for example the Five Year Plans (1928–32, 1933–37 and 1938–42), saw an emphasis on industrial production. Heavy industry and its necessary components were the priority.

Romanovs

- A contrary case might be argued that the Romanovs were responsible for the emancipation of the serfs (Alexander II 1861).
- The Romanovs also introduced reforms in education and local administration that were ultimately to have great effects although their immediate results were limited.
- In the late nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, the reforms of Witte and Stolypin were influential. Production increased. Railways spread. Investment from abroad boomed. Stolypin reformed agriculture and introduced changes in educational provision.
- It can therefore be argued that the Romanovs did more to change the basis of Russian society and the economy. Some excellent answers argued that, whilst Stalin was more of a reformer, some changes had been introduced by the Romanovs, although limited in scope and often reluctantly

How important was the impact of Marxism on Europe up to 1939?

The definition of Marxism/Communism. It is the creation of a classless state, prefaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat, after the fall of bourgeois capitalism. Private property and wealth would give way to the economic division of resources according to need

- The key issue is the reaction to Marxism. The 'Communist Manifesto' was written in 1848 and 'Das Kapital' in 1867. They formed the basic expression of his ideas. Their appeal stemmed from their presentation of an alternative justification of political and economic structures, which advocated the triumph of industrial proletarian forces and the inevitable decline of capitalism.
- If explaining the origins of Marxism, candidates should not spend too long on descriptions of the Industrial Revolution. Marxism made an important, but not exclusive, contribution to socialism, which had many followers in industrial societies.
- Marxism was international in its appeal, a contrast to narrow nationalism. Its intellectual justification contrasted with traditional bases of socio-political beliefs and included hostility to religion and hence to the position of churches.
- Candidates can use its spread to Russia, Germany and France as examples. Radical political parties applied Marxism. It became a feared ideology because of many of the points noted above.
- Established interests saw it as revolutionary and subversive. Marxism was also thought to be intolerant of other political beliefs.
- Autocracies and liberal democrats opposed it before 1914 (fearful of another French Revolution) and the Russian autocracy was swept away partly by Russian Marxists, who then formed a government and a one-party state
- Some of the most successful answers examined the limits of Marxism. For example, they considered how far Lenin and Stalin departed from Marxist theories.
- Bismarck feared Marxist influence and tried to suppress its followers. Mussolini and Hitler rose to power partly because of the fear of Marxism in Italy and Germany respectively.

- Whilst apparently similar to Marxism in some respects (for example, they both advocated a form of socialism), Fascism and Nazism saw themselves as very different, especially in the contrast between the internationalism of Marxism and the nationalism of their ideas.
- Marxism in Italy and Germany threatened the powers of businessmen and other established social classes, backed by the Churches. It seemed to justify disorder (which justified the disorder used by the Fascists and Nazis).

Explain which had the greater effect on Europe by 1939: World War I or the Russian Revolution.

For marks in Bands 1 and 2, examiners will expect a reasonable balance; 60:40 either way might be appropriate.

- World War I helped to establish weak democracies in central Europe but, perhaps more importantly, it helped to bring dictatorships to power. Reference might be made to Germany, Italy and Russia.
- It had severe economic effects on the participants in the war and indirect consequences by creating unstable conditions after 1918. Particular reference might be made to the effects of reparations on Germany.
- The war continued to affect diplomacy, especially with the arguments over the best way in which to deal with Germany.
- Within Germany itself, the war continued to have an impact on the Weimar Republic (hyperinflation) then on the Nazi regime. There might be little on social effects because these are largely outside the scope of the syllabus.
- The Russian Revolution obviously affected Russia most but some good candidates might argue that the war created the conditions for the dominance of Lenin and the Bolsheviks and therefore indirectly of Stalin.
- Communism was largely confined to Russia to 1939. There were communist movements in other European countries, for example in France and Germany, but they failed to win power and were perhaps most important as the focus of right-wing animosity.
- Stalin gave intermittent and ultimately unsuccessful help to the Republicans in the Spanish Civil War.

Candidates are very unlikely to be aware of the cultural aspects of communism in the inter-war period

How far did Stalin, to 1939, continue the policies of Lenin?

- Stalin claimed to continue Lenin's policies. This was necessary for any post-revolutionary leader.
- One of the justifications for the purge of Trotsky and his followers was that they departed from Lenin's teachings.
- Stalin gained power by claiming to be Lenin's true successor, although candidates can explain how he manipulated himself into power.
- Some might claim that Stalin's purges were different from the methods used by Lenin. Their scale was greater, although Lenin had insisted on one-party government and the dominance of the Bolsheviks.
- However, Lenin was more pragmatic than Stalin and his personal role, whilst dominant, was not as obtrusive and destructive as that of Stalin.
- The 'cult of personality' was more pronounced under Stalin.
- Stalin cancelled the features of the NEP that were associated with private enterprise, although Lenin justified the NEP as a (necessary) temporary measure
- The policies of collectivization went much further than Lenin advocated.
- On the other hand, the structure of the state was very similar under both men.

TOTALITARIANISM

Paper 1

'The most important reason for Hitler's popularity in Germany from 1933 to 1939 was propaganda.' How far do you agree with this view?

Propaganda

- Propaganda served two purposes, to represent Hitler's greatness and the Nazis' achievements and, on the other hand, to discredit enemies and alternative views.
- Hitler probably used propaganda more successfully than any other totalitarian ruler although some would put Stalin as his equal.
- Goebbels, his most faithful and fanatical follower, was employed as Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda. Through him, Hitler dominated newspapers and other forms of publishing, radio, the cinema and a variety of arts such as architecture.
- It allowed crucial developments such as the Night of the Long Knives (1934) and Kristallnacht (1938) to be represented as victories against enemies of Germany.
- There were also other forms of propaganda. Hitler as Führer was supreme and the Führer Principle meant that he was unchallenged by any section of the state, including the military.
- Populist policies such as the 'People's Car – Volkswagen' and slight, but welcome, rewards for some groups might be examined. The Germans were impressed by the scale and effectiveness of Nazi meeting
- The economy was portrayed as enjoying unlimited success. The truths of under-achievement, continuing unemployment and low wages were concealed.
- Candidates can discuss foreign policy developments to 1939. Propaganda was used to highlight Hitler's achievements in making Germany great again.

The question asks whether propaganda was 'the most important reason' for Hitler's popularity. This invites candidates to discuss other reasons.

Strong Government and Popular Measures

- However, there was wide support for right-wing policies and the end to the uncertainty of Weimar governments in Germany.
- Many of the Nazis' policies had wide support. The dictatorship of the Enabling Act was popular but perhaps partly because of propaganda that exaggerated the threat from communists.
- Candidates can discuss whether the anti-Semitic policies in the 1930s were popular. Historians differ in their assessments.
- The Nazi government provided more employment.

Foreign Policy

- It strengthened Hitler's hold over. These include rearmament and withdrawal from the League of Nations after demands for equal military status were refused. A risky series of foreign policy initiatives, such as sending soldiers into the demilitarized Rhineland, increased support. The pro-German Saar plebiscite (1935) was popular, as was the Anschluss with Austria (1938).
- Most Germans probably realized little of the dangers of expansion into Eastern Europe and the takeover of Czechoslovakia. Propaganda represented this as the justified reunion of Germans in that region

However, there were some underground opposition groups like the 'Edwin Pirates'

How important was the 'cult of personality' to Hitler's rule in the period to 1939?

The key issue is the assessment of the 'cult of personality' as a cause of Hitler's success in his rule. Hitler and his associates took care to present him in a favorable light to Germans.

- He was portrayed as a father-figure who was paternalistic but not autocratic, harsh and illegal in his methods.
- He was seen as the one man who could save Germany from the communist threat and who could restore Germany to its former greatness after the defeat of Germany in 1918 and the weakness of the Weimar Republic.
- He combined all the elements of the state. This view was reflected in all of the media, including the increasingly important radio and cinema.
- The rallies, such as those at Nuremberg, enhanced the effects of his appeal. The question asks 'How important...?' and candidates can examine other reasons, although many of these can be linked to Hitler's personality.

- The Nazi government provided more employment.
- The Germans responded to the persecution of unpopular minorities.
- The favourable, or weak, reactions of foreign governments enhanced the popularity of the regime which pursued policies to re-unite divided Germans in Austria and Czechoslovakia. Most Germans believed that Versailles had been an unjust settlement. Some background to Hitler's accession to power can be given but the major part of answers should deal with the years to 1939.

'The unpopularity of the Versailles settlement was the most important reason why Hitler gained power in 1933.' How far do you agree with this judgment?

The key issue is the reasons why Hitler came to power in 1933. Candidates might continue the explanation throughout 1933 by explaining the sequence of events from his appointment as Chancellor to the introduction of the Enabling Act. However, answers that end with the Chancellor's appointment can merit any mark. The question asks candidates to consider particularly the importance of the

- Versailles settlement dismantled the German military. Colonies were surrendered. There were territorial concessions in Europe, especially the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France and the loss of areas in the east to Poland. People who were regarded as German were living in other countries. Reparations had to be paid. Unification with Austria was forbidden. The War Guilt clause attributed blame for the First World War to Germany.
- Hatred of the settlement, the 'stab in the back' and the 'November Criminals' united Germans. This can form the basis of a good answer.
- Article 48 gives the President vast 'emergency' powers/ Proportional voting means lots of small, powerless parties and frequent changes in government
- The Army and the Judges were right-wing, so right wing elements were treated lightly
- Changes of government were frequent.
- Extreme right and left-wing parties caused tensions. 1919 – Spartacists led by Rosa Luxemburg & Karl Leibknecht/ Workers Councils seized power across Germany/ Communists took power in Bavaria. – Red Army rebelled in the Ruhr.
- 1921 Right-wing agitation – 1920 Kapp Putsch - rebellion in Berlin / Nationalist terrorists murdered politicians (Rathenau 1922)
- However, high credit should be given to candidates who understand the limited appeal of the Nazis in the 1920s. The Munich Putsch (1923) was put down easily. The army and the Junkers/traditionally strong right-wing social classes continued to exert influence.
- Nevertheless, Weimar seemed to have been more successful in the 1920s. It alleviated the worst economic effects of the war, came to agreements about the repayment of reparations and was accepted as a leading member of the League of Nations.

- The death of Stresemann was a blow and it can be argued that the Wall Street Crash (1929) that drove the Weimar Republic off-course.
- Hitler himself was an effective leader. He built up the Nazis through organization and propaganda to become the second largest party in the 1930 election and the largest in 1932 – but they actually lost support in a later election that year.
- He kept his nerve when others, such as von Papen, thought that they could control him, refusing to accept any office except Chancellor.
- Also he was determined just like at time of Munich Putcsh. Stresemann called off the strike in the Ruhr – seemed like another surrender Mussolini had seized power in Italy by a ‘march on Rome’ in 1922 – Hitler hoped to copy but had failed but not given up
- Hitler learned from his mistakes. He changed his strategy of getting into power from open rebellion to election success. He sought legality to destroy the Weimar. He also realized he needed support of big businessmen so he tried to arouse further fear of communism

By 1939, how far had Hitler resolved the domestic problems that had faced the Weimar Republic?

It will be difficult to argue that Hitler was completely unsuccessful but many candidates might judge he was completely successful. Candidates might tackle the question either issue by issue (e.g. the economy, then government) or sequentially (Weimar then Hitler). Both can be equally valid.

- Weimar had political problems, emerging from military defeat and the unpopular Versailles settlement.
- Proportional Representation made it difficult to elect a government with stable majorities.
- The power of the President, e.g. the authority to suspend civil liberties, represented an authoritarian aspect that benefited the right-wing.
- Extremist groups on right and left had an influence greater than their numbers might suggest (e.g. Spartacists Rising and the Kapp Putsch).
- Weimar Germany had severe economic problems in the early 1920s (hyperinflation) and again after the Wall Street Crash.
- Hitler secured complete power through the Enabling Act (1933) and the establishment of a one-party state.
- He put down the communists. Some candidates gained credit when they explained how and why particular policies appealed to specific social groups. For example, Hitler's anti-communism was more popular among the middle class, the business community and the army than among industrial workers
- He took over the trade unions and their property by wooing them to join a national trade union. Hitler then made sure that the national trade union was totally subservient to him
- He suppressed the SA, a militant right-wing group, to seek the support of the army so Hitler could become President after Hindenburg. The aristocratic Junker class was appalled at the thug like nature of Rohm and his associates (they were of lower classes). The army was also impressed by Hitler defiance of Versailles and secret (later public) rearmament
- His economic policies helped to stabilize the German economy (brought unemployment from 6 million to around 1 million in 1936, and there was a shortage of skilled workers around 1939) although it can be argued that his success was exaggerated. Wages were low and working conditions were poor but were masked by promises of the 'People's Car' and free holidays etc
- Brief outlines of foreign policy could be made relevant when Hitler's policies were contrasted with those of the so called 'November criminals' who had agreed to the virtual destruction of the German military and its loss of territories. These include rearmament and withdrawal from the League of Nations after demands for equal military status were refused. A risky series of foreign policy initiatives, such as sending soldiers into the demilitarized Rhineland, increased support. The pro-German Saar plebiscite (1935) was popular, as was the Anschluss with Austria (1938).
- His personal appeal, supported by powerful propaganda, contributed to his success. Hitler was seen as defender of German values and the Aryan race
- He united the country through a combination of populist policies and terror. Terror helped him crush opponents. Populist policies helped him malign his enemies as enemy of Germany like Rohm
- However, there were some underground opposition groups

How accurately has Hitler's government of Germany from 1933 to 1939 been described as 'totalitarian'?

- Totalitarian is generally used to describe a regime that tries to control all aspects of life, not only political government but also the economy, religion, thought and culture. It is commonly associated with extreme forms of propaganda and terror.
- Accounts that are restricted to descriptions of Hitler's one-party state might be worth Band 5 but could be worth more if well-explained.
- The Enabling Laws gave Hitler dictatorial powers. Other parties were suppressed.
- Hitler as Führer was all powerful. (Some might refer to Führer Law or the Führer Principle.)
- The Concordat (1933) with the Papacy went as far as he dared to control religion. (Not as far as Stalin but further than Mussolini.) The rights that were negotiated with the Roman Catholic Church were widely disregarded. An attempt was made to set up a Nazi Church but with little success.
- The economy was directed centrally. Private industry continued but served the interests of the state and increasingly the military demands of Hitler.
- Independent trade unions were suppressed and much was made of the small concessions to the workers of free holidays that camouflaged the real nature of working conditions.
- Nazi models dominated all forms of culture (whilst the hierarchy pilfered foreign art that was officially disapproved of).
- Propaganda promoted the idea of Hitler as supreme and all-powerful leader.
- Hitler used the SA (Brownshirts) before he came to power to crush opponents and impose the Nazi party on critics. On coming to power, he wished to win the support of the army who were suspicious of the SA. Röhm also advocated a continuous revolution. The leaders of the SA were destroyed in the Night of the Long Knives (1934) in line with the demands of the army
- However, this did not mean an end to terror. The SS, under Himmler, enjoyed considerable power and was a brutal force. The Gestapo was formed by Göring in 1933. Their courts, if used, were outside the responsibility of normal courts but even these were presided over by compliant judges...
- Terror was employed against real or imagined enemies of the Nazis; these included minority racial groups, especially the Jews (although the worst aspects of the Holocaust appeared after 1939). Minorities, especially the Jews, were treated harshly. Reference might be made to the Nuremberg Laws (1935) and Kristallnacht (1938)
- Censorship was extensive. Newspapers, radio and films justified terror as determined action to suppress enemies of the people.
- The courts did not interfere with the excesses of the regime. Non-compliant judges were dismissed.

How accurate is the claim that the effects of World War I were the most important reason for the rise of totalitarian governments in Europe during the period to 1939? (You should refer to at least two of Germany, Italy and Russia in your answer.)

The key issue is the causes of the rise of totalitarian governments and especially the assessment of the effects of World War I.

- Meaning of totalitarian regime. Totalitarian is generally used to describe a regime that tries to control all aspects of life, not only political government but also the economy, religion, thought and culture. It is commonly associated with extreme forms of propaganda and terror.
- Why totalitarian, rather than liberal, governments prevailed in a selection from Germany, Italy and Russia
- The war had serious political effects. It destabilized an authoritarian regime in Russia and destroyed the reputations of governments in each of the three countries. In Russia, the tsarist regime of Nicholas II and the more liberal government of Kerensky fell largely because of their involvement in the war. Lenin was then able to establish a single party state. Post-war democratic governments in Germany and Italy were neither content with the outcome of the conflict.
- The German Weimar government was blamed for agreeing to the humiliating Versailles settlement.
- Italy did not receive its expected gains after the war.
- Economic consequences were clear. The immediate impact of the war was severe. Germany had to pay particularly heavy reparations. (High credit should be given to the answers that consider the economic losses to Russia that followed from the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk). Italy owed huge debts to USA
- However, good candidates might point out that the economic crisis that preceded the Nazis' period of power arose more from the Wall Street Crash than from the post-war crisis.
- In Germany and Italy, the war led to the growing appeal of ultra-nationalist groups whilst it confirmed communist leader, Lenin and then Stalin, in power in Russia. Nationalism was an important factor in Germany and Italy but less influential in Russia in 1917.
- With this basis, candidates can explore other factors in the rise of totalitarian governments, such as the personal appeal of leaders and their use both of propaganda and terror to enforce obedience.
- Perhaps some might mention the willingness of democratic forces to accept Hitler and Mussolini as leaders of their country before their excesses were evident. (Von Paupen and the King of Italy)
- Party organization might be referred to; the Nazis, Fascists and Bolsheviks proved to be more adept in winning power than their opponents

Why, by 1939, had Stalin been able to impose totalitarian rule on the Soviet Union?

Candidates can consider a variety of factors, including personal, political and economic issues, but the focus should be on 'totalitarian'. The question begins in 1924, with the death of Lenin. Good candidates will consider the factors that led to

Totalitarian is generally used to describe a regime that tries to control all aspects of life, not only political government but also the economy, religion, thought and culture. It is commonly associated with extreme forms of propaganda and terror.

Political

- Stalin's rise to sole power by about 1929. This was partly based on his position as Secretary of the Communist Party, giving him leverage over many officials, and partly on his personal gift for intrigue. Indeed, his position as party chairman remained crucial to his power. He was able to appoint yes men in important positions (so he could outvote his enemies) and also transfer rivals to far away areas or unimportant posts in the party
- It is possible that Lenin and Trotsky planned to remove Stalin but Lenin's death gave Stalin his opportunity (which he did not waste)
- He outwitted Trotsky and used Zinoviev and Kamenev as allies in his bid for power (in advocating Socialism in One Country). He then supported Kamenev against Zinoviev in supporting NEP. He then got rid of Kamenev from the party by arguing that NEP was uncommunist
- He did not become prime minister until 1941. It meant that, although his power was overwhelming, it was used indirectly and was theoretically subject to the will of the party. This gave an appearance of populism and democracy which strengthened rather than weakened his hold over affairs.

Terror

- Throughout the 1930s, he used purges to free himself of old allies and possible rivals. (Kirov's assassination ordered by Stalin was used as an excuse for show trials of Kamenev, Zinoviev etc). Kirov was head of party in Moscow and proposed reforms in Stalin's economic plans
- Stalin ordered the assassination and also gave him a state funeral (he carried the coffin as well). This gave him protection from possible suspicion and helped him use the murder as a tool to get rid of enemies of the people
- And the purges went further, to destroy any groups that might be unreliable. The Communist Party was decimated and the officer class in the army, navy and air force suffered similarly. The effect of this was to increase Stalin's dictatorship beyond all previously known bounds in Russia

Propaganda

- However, propaganda hid this dark side, portraying Stalin as the Father of the People, Lenin's Heir and Defender, and the Great Modernizer.
- Russian history was studied through books which were attributed to Stalin (for example, the 'Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union'). Trotsky was dismissed as a foreign agent and his old Menshevik views were shown proof of his hatred of USSR
- Lenin had already established Russia as a one-party state (and USSR was on its way to becoming a totalitarian state) and Stalin insisted on his claim to be Lenin's successor and the true safeguard of Marxist-Leninism.

Agricultural and Industrial Reforms

- Reference can be made to economic changes in industry and agriculture but these factors should not be presented completely descriptively but must be linked to the question (as to how they strengthened Stalin's grip on power). The Five-Year Plans were drawn up to meet Stalin's demands. A new class was created (party capitalist). These managerial workers had extra holidays and other privileges like bread delivered to home. They had an inherent interest to saying yes to Stalin

- For example, the suppression of the Kulaks arose partly from Stalin's determination to put down a troublesome group, as well as from ideological reasons. It also gave Stalin the opportunity to export grain for buying industrial machinery (this in turn gave people employment. No one wanted to oppose Stalin's reforms for fear of losing their job or house)

How far was Mussolini a 'totalitarian' ruler of Italy to 1939?

Totalitarian is generally used to describe a regime that tries to control all aspects of life, not only political government but also the economy, religion, thought and culture. It is commonly associated with extreme forms of propaganda and terror.

Political

- It was based on the rule of the single leader. (Mussolini was described as the Duce.)
- In 1924, his Fascists won a large majority but he went further to crush the opposition. The Fascists were probably responsible for the murder of Matteotti, a socialist leader. This was a part of the violence used by Mussolini's supporters such as the Blackshirts.
- Representatives of other political groups withdrew from the Chamber of Deputies (the Aventine Secession), giving Mussolini a free hand.
- Local officials were appointed rather than elected or nominated by independents.

Propaganda and Terror

- Mussolini did assert personal primacy in Italy. He was a showman who embraced the media, was happy in public appearances and an effective orator.
- However, the practical gains were exaggerated by propaganda. He aimed to be the new Caesar, restoring the splendors and emulating the achievements of the Roman Empire.
- The adoption of the name 'Fascists' was significant. Mussolini copied the figure of Caesar in publications and medallions. Roman architecture was copied and Roman ceremonies were the model for Fascist celebrations. This was a thoroughly impractical element of his rule.
- Special courts were used for political offences.
- Censorship was imposed but it was not complete
- Opposition suffered persecution, including the murder of Matteotti.

Economy

- The economy was run in the interests of the state. He co-operated with big business but also carried through large-scale public works, for example building new towns and draining the Pontine Marshes. By 1939, the largest industrial enterprises were state run.
- To a large extent, Mussolini had achieved his aims of a Corporative State.
- Independent trade unions were banned.

On the other hand, candidates can argue that the police system and persecution were not complete.

Political

- Mussolini was not the head of state. Italy was still a monarchy although Victor Emanuel III played little part after Mussolini's initial installation in 1922 following the March on Rome. The monarchy was not a major problem until after 1939 but Mussolini took care to handle the King respectfully and realized that his power was, to some extent at least, dependent on the support of the church.
- Policy alone could not make a success of the 'Battles' that Mussolini announced. The Lateran Treaties (1929) recognized the popularity and power of the Papacy. Mussolini got the better terms in the agreement but the settlement recognized that his power was not complete.

Economical

- Private industries continued, winning the support of industrialists who were protected.
- State control of the economy resulted in partially effective policies.

Social

- Underground newspapers and other writing survived. Non-fascist art continued, as did non-fascist newspapers. Critics who kept the expression of their opinions within check escaped prosecution.
- There was little organized anti-Semitism before 1939.

There is no need to discuss foreign policy and any discussion that is included should be linked to the key issue. It might be argued that he saw foreign intervention and expansion as reflections of his own glory although the policies were also popular in Italy by 1939.

'How far' invites candidates to consider the limitations of totalitarianism in Italy. There should be some evidence of this in Band 1 answers. For example, candidates might contrast Mussolini's rule with the extent of terror and suppression in Germany or Russia/USSR.

How far had Mussolini achieved his aims in domestic policy by 1939?

It might be argued that Mussolini's most important aim was to gain and secure personal power. His programme was to impose an extreme right-wing government on Italy and to carry out political, economic and social reforms that would reflect this.

Sucesses

- In 1924, his Fascists won a large majority but he went further to crush the opposition. The Fascists were probably responsible for the murder of Matteotti, a socialist leader. This was a part of the violence used by Mussolini's supporters such as the Blackshirts.
- Representatives of other political groups withdrew from the Chamber of Deputies (the Aventine Secession), giving Mussolini a free hand.
- In 1925 he gained complete power and used it to curb the trade unions, much of the press and independent judicial officials.
- However, his search for complete control was modified by a realistic willingness to compromise with the powerful papacy; hence the Lateran Treaties (1929).
- He co-operated with big business but also carried through large-scale public works, for example building new towns and draining the Pontine Marshes. By 1939, the largest industrial enterprises were state run.
- To a large extent, Mussolini had achieved his aims of a Corporative State.
- Mussolini did assert personal primacy in Italy. He was a showman who embraced the media, was happy in public appearances and an effective orator.
- However, the practical gains were exaggerated by propaganda. He aimed to be the new Caesar, restoring the splendors and emulating the achievements of the Roman Empire.
- The adoption of the name 'Fascists' was significant. Mussolini copied the figure of Caesar in publications and medallions. Roman architecture was copied and Roman ceremonies were the model for Fascist celebrations. This was a thoroughly impractical element of his rule.

On the other hand he was not completely successful

- The lower classes benefited from some state-controlled activities such as holiday camps but their standard of living was hardly improved. The trains did run on time - or at least the international expresses did when local railway services had to give way. Inflation remained high.
- Private industries continued, winning the support of industrialists who were protected.
- A number of agricultural reforms had limited success, for example the Battle for Grain when unsuitable land was brought under cultivation.
- Policy alone could not make a success of the 'Battles' that Mussolini announced. The Lateran Treaties (1929) recognized the popularity and power of the Papacy. Mussolini got the better terms in the agreement but the settlement recognized that his power was not complete.
- Mussolini was not the head of state. Italy was still a monarchy although Victor Emanuel III played little part after Mussolini's initial installation in 1922 following the March on Rome. The monarchy was not a major problem until after 1939 but Mussolini took care to handle the King respectfully and realized that his power was, to some extent at least, dependent on the support of the church.
- It might be argued by some candidates that Mussolini did not intend to exert the same ferocious dictatorship as in Nazi Germany and the USSR.
- Censorship was not complete. Critics who kept the expression of their opinions within check escaped prosecution.
- There was little organized anti-Semitism before 1939.

How similar were the Nazi dictatorship in Germany and the Fascist dictatorship in Italy to 1939?

It is reasonable to expect a balanced discussion. 60:40 either way can merit any mark. The most successful essays might well deal with a series of relevant factors, examining how far they show similarities and differences. However, sequential accounts, for example Germany first then Italy, might be very sound if points of comparison and contrast are made consistently.

There were similarities in ideology.

- They were totalitarian (meaning of term), intolerant of alternative theories and parties.
- Nazism and Fascism promoted the interests of the state above those of individuals. Individuals and groups were encouraged to identify with the state, for example the young.
- Power was concentrated at the top in the hands of one man: Führer or Duce. The personal importance and contributions of the leaders were emphasized.
- They were very nationalistic in outlook.

There were similarities in policies

- In practice, both governments enforced their powers through harsh laws and police forces.
- Some economic policies were similar, especially the use of public works and heavy state-intervention.
- State propaganda was used to win and maintain support for the regimes.

However, there were differences.

Terror and Propaganda

- Italian Fascism was not as extremely suppressive as Germany's Nazism.
- For example, there was little overt anti-Semitism in Italy by 1939. Opponents were persecuted but there were no concentration and extermination camps.
- Underground newspapers and other writing survived in Italy. Non-fascist art continued, as did non-fascist newspapers

Political Control

- Mussolini was not the head of state unlike Hitler. Italy was still a monarchy although Victor Emanuel III played little part after Mussolini's initial installation in 1922 following the March on Rome. The monarchy was not a major problem until after 1939 but Mussolini took care to handle the King respectfully and realized that his power was, to some extent at least, dependent on the support of the church. Hitler's power was supreme
- They were different in their policies to religion, although both made agreements with the Papacy, and their racial policies diverged, at least to 1939. Hitler tried to set up a Nazi Church and also persecuted the Churches when they opposed his extermination camps

How similar was the German nationalism of Bismarck to that of Hitler?

The key issue is the comparison of German nationalism in two periods. There should be a reasonable balance between the two periods. 60:40 either way might merit any band. **Candidates might argue that the differences/contrasts were more evident than the similarities.** This will be a very viable approach.

Meaning of term nationalism

Differences

- It is possible to argue that, at least to 1871, Bismarck was more a champion of Prussian interests than a German nationalist. He was careful to preserve Prussia's interests in the constitution, government and policies. Bismarck was preoccupied for much of his career with the interests of Prussia and his attitude to German nationalism must be seen in this context. Hitler was a German nationalist from the beginning
- On the other hand, Hitler's nationalism was more violent; it led him to suppress minorities within Germany who were seen as non-German, such as the Jews. German nationalism was highly racial, with the advocacy of Aryan values.
- Although Bismarck did have anti-Catholic and anti-socialist views, he did not purge these elements. Yes, he passed anti-Catholic and anti-socialist laws yet he was also careful to not to go too far
- He reversed Kulturekampf with the election of a new Pope and created the 1st modern socialist state to overcome the appeal of the Socialists
- Bismarck's foreign policy proved that, whilst maintaining Germany's national interests, he was careful not to appear expansionist after 1871. Hitler started out to merge with ethnic Germans but became expansionist when he took over whole of Czechoslovakia

Similarities

- Bismarck used German nationalism effectively in the 1860s, especially to unify the northern and southern states from 1866 to 187 (also a factor in the Schleswig-Holstein crisis). Hitler also used nationalism to unify all different classes in Germany
- Socialist publications were banned after Bismarck's repeated threats to get Reichstag dismissed and new elections called if the bill wasn't passed. Hitler also banned Communist publications etc
- Although there were other reasons for Hitler's rise to power, his use of the weapon of German nationalism was important just like it was for Bismarck

How similar were the methods by which Hitler and Stalin governed Germany and the USSR respectively during the 1930s?

The key issue is the comparison of Hitler and Stalin and examiners will look for reasonable balance. 60:40 either way can merit any mark band.

Similarities

- Nazism and Communism promoted the interests of the state above those of individuals. . Very high credit should be given to answers that make sense of the similarities between Nazism and Communism (both demanded absolute loyalty to the state)
- They were totalitarian (meaning of term), intolerant of alternative theories and parties. Their countries were one-party states.
- Power was concentrated at the top in the hands of one man. Both asserted their dictatorial power. Enemies, and sometimes those who were only suspected, were purged.
- They both controlled the police and the army
- They used propaganda to enhance their personal importance and to promote the cause of Nazism and Communism. Both were dear leaders.
- Some economic policies were similar, especially the use of public works and heavy state-intervention to kick start heavy or armament industries. The managerial classes knew their privileges depended on saying yes to the leader

Differences

- There were some differences. Difference of ideology between Nazism and Communism. Nazism was nationalist (Marxism was an international ideology). Most importantly Nazism was wholly opposed to Communism
- Hitler's policies were probably more populist than Stalin's, perhaps because of the different economic policies that they pursued.
- The drive for industrialization and increased agricultural production in the USSR resulted in policies against entire classes such as the kulaks. This was not the case in Germany, where Hitler co-operated with the industrialist class
- Hitler's control over the army throughout most of the 1930s was not as great as that of Stalin.
- Stalin organized show trials (with forced confessions) to publicly charge and punish his opponents, while Hitler preferred the easy way of assassination (without trial)
- On the other hand, whilst the number of those who were persecuted, or purged, in the USSR was considerable –perhaps larger than in Germany in the 1930s –
- There were different targets of purges. There were racial and 'moral' enemies in Germany. The Jews did not suffer so much as class in the USSR during this period although individuals and even some Jewish groups did because of anti-Semitism.

Explain the similarities and differences in the economies of Nazi Germany and the USSR in the 1930's?

The key issue is the comparison of the economies of Nazi Germany and the USSR in the 1930s. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance between the two countries. 60:40 can merit. Candidates are most likely to achieve a high mark when they adopt a comparative approach, dealing first with similarities and then with differences.

Similarities

- In both countries, the state (that is the ruling party or even the ruler) was prescriptive about the economic structures that were followed.
- Neither state was democratic. This meant that there were either no democratic economic decisions, as in the USSR, or few, as in Germany.
- Economic structures were important elements of a totalitarian government. Central direction was paramount. The Four-Year and Five-Year Plans in Germany and the USSR respectively might be discussed.
- The workers had no rights independent of the state. Trade unions were merely a façade for state-controlled organizations, for example the Labour Front in Germany.
- The role of these was to support not modify, even less to oppose, state policies. A common feature was the emphasis on industrialization which was designed to serve the interests of the state.
- Nazi Germany saw much investment in armaments and in public works that reflected well on the regime. In the USSR, Stalin was determined to make a quick leap forward in modernization.

Differences

- Among the differences were the approaches to agriculture. Stalin's USSR was ruthless in its determination to reform the agricultural system through collectivization.
- In Germany, there were few changes to the system of ownership in spite of the creation of government cartels.
- Private enterprise was allowed in Germany and many businessmen were supporters of the Nazi Party because of the opportunities that it gave them.
- Hitler modified the Party's former adherence to socialist programmes. His regime has been described as a mixture of state capitalism and state socialism
- Private enterprise disappeared from the USSR when Stalin abandoned Lenin's NEP. All citizens became employees of the state.
- The question asks about economic structures but some candidates might also assess success and failure. This can be given credit although it will not be a requirement for any band.
- For example, although the Soviet economy had many problems, the USSR was less affected than Germany by the Wall Street Crash because its economy was more insulated from the West

Examine the similarities and differences between Marxism and Fascism/Nazism. (You should refer to developments in Russia and either Italy or Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the comparison of Marxism and Fascism. **An acceptable, but moderately successful, approach will be to deal separately with the two ideologies and supplement this with a few brief statements either in an introduction or conclusion that represents a comparison.**

A better structure might still be based on a sequential study but one that considers the same issues in turn; the comparison will be more deliberate here.

The best way to tackle the question will be to adopt a more consistent comparison, highlighting issues such as leadership, attitudes to democracy and economic policies and linking these to Marxism and Fascism.

Answers should be reasonably balanced between Marxism and Fascism. 60:40 either way can deserve any mark band.

Ideology

- Marxism was based on the class struggle and on the primacy of economic forces. Capitalism and parliamentary rule gave power to the capitalist/bourgeois class. The proletariat would inevitably triumph but through revolution with the overthrow of the oppressors. Fascism was based more on nationalist than international foundations. It was not hostile to capitalism although it envisaged an important role for the state in directing economies.
- Nazism and Communism promoted the interests of the state above those of individuals. . Very high credit should be given to answers that make sense of the similarities between Nazism and Communism (both demanded absolute loyalty to the state)
- It can be effectively that Stalin's government, and Lenin's to some extent, did not represent true Marxism whereas Hitler and Mussolini reflected the true nature of Nazism and Fascism They were totalitarian (meaning of term), intolerant of alternative theories and parties. Their countries were one-party states.

Political System/Terror/Propaganda

- Power was concentrated at the top in the hands of one man. Both asserted their dictatorial power. Enemies, and sometimes those who were only suspected, were purged.
- They both controlled the police and the army
- They used propaganda to enhance their personal importance and to promote the cause of Nazism and Communism. Both were dear leaders.
- Like Marxism, but with a different justification, it opposed a democracy that might represent the views of different groups, hence its totalitarian tendencies.
- The leader, Führer or Duce, in theory embodied the will of the nation.
- Hitler's policies were probably more populist than Stalin's, perhaps because of the different economic policies that they pursued.
- On the other hand, whilst the number of those who were persecuted, or purged, in the USSR was considerable –perhaps larger than in Germany in the 1930s –
- There were different targets of purges. There were racial and 'moral' enemies in Germany. The Jews did not suffer so much as class in the USSR during this period although individuals and even some Jewish groups did because of anti-Semitism.

Economic Policies

- Some economic policies were similar, especially the use of public works and heavy state-intervention to kick start heavy or armament industries. The managerial classes knew their privileges depended on saying yes to the leader
- The workers had no rights independent of the state. Trade unions were merely a façade for state-controlled organizations, for example the Labour Front in Germany.

- The role of these was to support not modify, even less to oppose, state policies. A common feature was the emphasis on industrialization which was designed to serve the interests of the state.
- Fascist Italy and Nazi saw much investment in armaments and in public works that reflected well on the regime. In the USSR, Stalin was determined to make a quick leap forward in modernization.
- The drive for industrialization and increased agricultural production in the USSR resulted in policies against entire classes such as the kulaks. This was not the case in Germany and Italy, where capitalists supported their governments

How different were Stalin's policies in governing Russia to 1939 from those of Nicholas II?

The key issue is the contrast between Stalin and Nicholas II. Examiners can look for a balanced approach. 60:40 either way can merit any mark. Candidates are free to argue that the similarities were more important than the differences:

Similarities

- They were both autocrats and suppressed political opposition
- Their secret police operated outside the law. The Cheka and OGPU were quite active
- They represented a personal cult of government. Stalin and the Tsar were considered benevolent fathers
- They had different attitudes to religion and the Church. Church was one of the pillars of support for Nicholas while Stalin dismissed it as a capitalist's tool to keep hold of the masses
- Some economic policies were similar, especially the use of public works. (see under miscellaneous)
- Foreign policy can also be discussed

Differences

- Nicholas II was personally weak, open to advice especially from the Tsarina. He allowed some courtiers and Rasputin to have too much influence. Stalin shared power with nobody. He destroyed those who helped him to power, including Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin.
- Their ideologies were different. Stalin claimed, justifiably or not, that his regime was based on Marxism. Nicholas II ruled by divine right.
- Stalin regarded economic change as a high priority while, Nicholas II was averse to change
- Stalin's rule was more brutal. The millions of casualties went far beyond the numbers who were prosecuted/persecuted by Nicholas II.
- Stalin's control of the army was more thorough (with the help of purges). Stalin was more concerned about a subservient if rather weak army rather than a strong one (which was preferred by Nicholas II)
- Their economic policies were different. Stalin pushed through radical reforms in agriculture and industry that had wholesale social implications. Kulak class was annihilated.
- Nicholas II allowed some economic reforms – for example the policies of Witte and Stolypin – but they were not particularly important to his conservative mind. The nobility and kulaks (who were his enthusiastic supporters) were still in control of rural areas

Nicholas II and Stalin were both autocrats. Why then was Stalin more successful than Nicholas II in governing Russia?

The key issue is the comparison of Nicholas II and Stalin in their treatment of opposition. The answers should be reasonable balanced. 60:40 either way can merit any mark band.

- Both the Tsar and the Communist leader insisted on their personal autocracy.
- Both used a fierce police system and their regimes were backed up by the army (Nicholas II until 1917).

- Key to the fall of Nicholas II in 1917 was the war. Stalin avoided a major war until 1941. (The question and the syllabus end in 1939.)
- Nicholas was faced by diverse political parties, some of which were revolutionary, and he failed to overcome political criticism by 1917. Stalin enforced Lenin's one-party state.
- He went further than Lenin in imposing his will on the Bolsheviks through purges. Stalin although he continued to use the danger of revolution to justify his purges.
- However, Stalin purged the army to ensure its loyalty to an extent that went far beyond their loyalty to Nicholas II.
- The legal system was subordinate to their policies. However, there were differences. Nicholas II generally kept within the law, although the law was heavily on his side. Courts were more subservient to Stalin.
- Stalin was more unscrupulous, for example in the pursuit and murder of Trotsky. Punishments were heavier and more wide-scale under Stalin.
- The extent of an opposition that was persecuted under Stalin was much greater; Nicholas II did not decimate a social class as Stalin did to the kulaks.
- Nicholas II was a weak man who did not give an effective lead, the opposite to Stalin.
- Nicholas II and Stalin had secret police which were active beyond the normal laws but the OGPU, then the NKVD, was much more effective than the tsarist Cheka.
- Russia faced economic problems during Nicholas II's reign and during the rule of Stalin, but Stalin turned failure to the appearance of success for Russia and for himself personally, partly through propaganda.
- Industrial workers suffered more under Tsar than Stalin. Although the first 5 Year Plan under Stalin involved certain excesses, the following period gave the workers a minimum wage, health insurance and holidays. Industries were also spread out like in Asian Russia (to prevent concentration and therefore agitation by workers in big cities)
- Stalin looked for enemies in all sections of society. From 1906, Nicholas II allowed some latitude to the opposition in the Dumas; there was no equivalence under Stalin.
- By 1917, Nicholas II had lost his personal reputation as the Father of Russia; Stalin took on this mantle

MISCELLANEOUS

Paper 1

Which was the greater threat to autocracy in the nineteenth century, industrialization or political liberalism?

The key issue is the comparison of industrialization and liberalism as threats to autocracy. Examiners will look for an understanding of the terms 'autocracy', 'industrialization' and 'political liberalism'; the last is likely to be more demanding.

- Industrialisation challenged the traditional social structure, especially the role of the greater landowners, who were autocratic in outlook.
- It also created problems for autocratic monarchies because the demands arose for political and social reform.
- Liberalism was especially a movement of the middle classes. It reflected the greater influence of these in the nineteenth century. There was a demand for more participation in government and administration, including changes to the franchise and more representative institutions.

Which of Nationalism and Marxism was the greater danger to governments before 1914?

Nationalism

- Although it can be argued that nationalism emerged during the French Revolution, candidates are not expected to show knowledge of all of the period from 1789 to 1914. They can choose salient developments. However, 1914 is the given end point and discussions of post revolutionary Russia or nationalism during the 1930s cannot be given credit.
- It is possible to argue that both factors were disruptive although both were intended to remedy grievances. European governments in the early nineteenth century believed that nationalism was a dangerous effect of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic empire.
- One of the major concerns of most of the major powers was to limit it, for example in the Congress of Vienna and through the internal and external policies of Metternich. Rulers in Italy and Germany felt threatened. Prominent among the extreme results of nationalism were the 1848 Revolutions and, although the threat seemed to have been overcome in 1859, it actually continued until the unification of Germany and Italy in 1870–71.
- Some might be aware of the prevalence of nationalism in tsarist Russia. The tsars had to decide how to deal with the disparate groups within the Russian empire. Mostly they adopted a policy of coercion but some reforming ministers such as Stolypin advocated concessions.
- Some candidates might link nationalism to Imperialism; overseas expansion was a powerful sign of national power.
- Others might use their knowledge of the causes of World War I to discuss Balkans nationalism.

Marxism

- Marxism emerged from the writings of Marx, complemented by Engels. The 'Communist Manifesto' was published in 1848 and the first volume of 'Das Kapital' in 1867.
- Marxism taught the fundamental importance of economic systems. Capitalism would be replaced by communist socialism as the industrial proletariat supplanted the bourgeoisie.
- Such ideas were thought dangerous by governments and governing classes.
- There was some evidence of Marxist influence in the 1848 revolutions in France and Germany.
- Later Bismarck perceived the danger to the new German Empire. Marxists were also linked to instability in France, for example in the Paris Commune
- He moved against the socialists by banning socialist publications and also then created the 1st modern socialist state in a bid to limit the appeal of socialists
- In Russia, the Marxists, especially Lenin's Bolsheviks, were persecuted by the tsarist government.
- Britain was less affected by Marxism although it was a highly industrialized country.

Which of Bismarck and Marx had the greater effect on Europe to 1914?

The key issue is the comparison of the influence of Bismarck and Marx. Examiners will expect some balance but strongly argued cases with 70:30 balance might deserve Band 1 (21–25),

Bismarck

- Bismarck's unification of Germany was very important and is relevant but candidates need to point out the strength of the new German empire. For the first time (at least in many centuries), Germany became a major European power
- His influence after 1871 is in the syllabus and candidates can be expected to understand how he made Germany a foremost international power. It can be argued that his impact on Europe was greater after 1871. Franco-German relations became a central aspect of European diplomacy to 1914
- Although a reluctant imperialist, Bismarck began a process of German imperial expansionism that had consequences for the rest of Europe during the Conference of Berlin (1884-85)
- Some candidates considered how far his attempts to build international alliances to safeguard Germany had the opposite effect by endangering peace, especially because of his treatment of France
- Germany's domestic policies reinforced conservative authorities.

Marx

- Marx's 'Communist Manifesto' was published in 1848.
- 'Das Kapital' began publication in 1867.
- Marx's ideas did not result in a Marxist state by 1914 but the number of Marxists was increasing in France, Germany and Russia. Marxism provided a challenge to right and left-wing opinion.
- The better responses considered the groups to whom he appealed and explained why others were opposed to his views.
- In France and Germany his ideas appealed to political radicals (but not as much in Britain and some might refer to Russia). They played a part in the 1848 French Revolution and a more important role after the war with Prussia, for example in the Paris Commune.
- In France and Germany, trade unions and left-wing political thinkers were much influenced.
- On the other hand, it can be claimed that the sum of Marx's influence by 1900 was limited.

The question is about Europe to 1914. This will allow candidates to consider the lead-up to World War I and the condition of Russia in 1914 but discussions of Lenin and the 1917 Revolution in Russia will not be relevant unless included in a conclusion.

Which was the more significant for nineteenth-century Europe: Liberalism or Imperialism?

- Liberalism was based on a belief in the freedom of citizens, extending to the franchise, government, speech, religion and trade (although few candidates might mention this). Britain might be used as an example of a country that was comparatively Liberal in the nineteenth century.
- The early years of the French Revolution saw liberal demands reflected in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Liberalism might be seen in the watchwords of liberty, equality and fraternity.
- However, the course of the Revolution to 1799 and then Napoleon's regime showed Liberalism in retreat. From 1815, the reaction to the French Revolution and to Napoleon saw autocracy in the ascendancy, but Liberals continued to press for change.
- From 1815, the rest of the nineteenth century saw a series of gains and losses for Liberalism in France.
- Liberal movements emerged in Germany but 1848 saw the limited achievement of Liberalism at that point.
- Bismarck was hardly Liberal when unifying Germany and governing the new German Empire.
- In Italy, Liberalism might be identified with Mazzini, to a lesser extent with Cavour and Garibaldi. The syllabus does not include a study of Italy after 1871.
- Some might refer to Russia as an illiberal state.
- Imperialism had political, military and economic significance for Europe – or at least for some European countries.
- It became an element in the balance of power and changed economic patterns.
- On the whole, Liberalism's effects were mostly internal or domestic whereas Imperialism had both domestic and external repercussions.

PAPER 3

INDEX

CHAPTER	PAGE NUMBER
Origins of Cold War	67
Globalization of Cold War (General)	81
Globalization of Cold War (Specific)	100
Crisis of Communism and the End of Cold War	109
Nuclear Arms Race	122

I would recommend that you use the following book for Paper 1 and Paper 3

“Mastering Modern World History”

by Norman Lowe

ORIGINS OF COLD WAR

Paper 3

TIMELINE

(YOU MUST REMEMBER THE MONTHS FOR EVENTS OF 1945 FOR THE UN QUESTION, MONTHS FOR OTHER EVENTS ARE NOT REQUIRED. BUT YOU MUST NOT FORGET THE SEQUENCE OF THESE EVENTS)

1945

- Yalta (February)
- Potsdam (July)
- Dropping of atomic bombs on Japan (August)

1946

- Elections in Eastern Europe except Poland
- Stalin's Re-election speech (February)
- Kennan's Telegram (February)
- Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech (March)

1947

- Aid to Greece (March)
- Truman Doctrine (March)
- Marshall Plan and European Recovery Program (June)
- Cominform formed (September)

1948

- Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia (February)
- New currency and end of price controls in Allied zones (June)
- Berlin Blockade (June)

1949

- Formation of NATO (April)
- End of Berlin Blockade (May)
- West Germany formed (August)
- USSR tests its first atomic bomb (September)
- East Germany formed and China turns Communist (October)

1950

- China-USSR treaty of alliance

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE ORIGINS OF COLD WAR

Traditionalist (1945-60's)

Cold War was due to mainly the actions of Stalin

- Stalin's alleged renegeing of promises made at Yalta over. Stalin extended the boundaries of Poland into parts of Eastern Germany (so as to serve as an extended buffer state). The Red Army had expelled the Germans living in Eastern Germany, which bordered Poland
- The USSR was an expansionist power in Eastern Europe (in line with Marxist-Leninist ideology which suggested an ultimate goal of world domination) and only unity and resolve by the USA and its western allies could prevent further expansion
- Stalin's re-election speech was seen as a prelude to an attack

Revisionist (1960-1980's)

Cold War resulted due to the policies of USA and the actions of Truman. Revisionist interpretation developed due to the disillusionment of the majority of American public and academics with the Vietnam War (which was bloody and unnecessary). This forced them to question the traditionalist interpretation and re-examine the causes of Cold War

- Many referred to his brash and aggressive manner in meetings with the Soviets, in particular, his first meeting with Foreign Minister Molotov
- use of atom bomb in Japan without informing USSR
- Threatened nuclear attack on the USSR over the Soviet occupation of northern Iran in 1946.
- The case for Truman's responsibility is summed up in the quote:- 'I'm tired of babying the Soviets', made in January 1946.
- Truman Doctrine was the first openly antagonistic action of the Cold War
- open declaration that USA intended to contain communism and had no intention of returning to isolationism
- It was effectively the first formal declaration of American intent to resist what it saw as Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe.
- The Truman Doctrine established the containment policy which was to characterize subsequent American actions both before and after 1949. Allied with the Marshall Plan and American determination to protect its own economic interests, the Truman Doctrine set the USA on a path of formal opposition to the USSR. It was in reply to this that the USSR launched Cominform
- Truman exaggerated the Soviet threat in Europe in order to force a Republican controlled US Congress to grant aid under the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan
- Truman Doctrine significantly changed relationships between superpowers, and was a key factor in subsequent problems – e.g. Berlin, NATO etc

Post Revisionist (1970-80's)

Cold War was due to misunderstandings between the two sides. This interpretation developed during the Détente (a time of cultural exchanges, meetings etc. This gave an opportunity to assess the point of view of the opposing bloc)

- Stalin had felt USA and Britain delayed Second Front deliberately. He was also suspicious of Truman's use of atom bomb against Japan (before USSR could land its troops on Japanese soil)
- Iron Curtain speech of Churchill, in 1946, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan of 1947 were both seen as attempts by the USA to impose its economic and political views on all Europe. Hence, this led to the Soviet refusal to allow states such as Czechoslovakia to join
- Stalin was paranoid about security of USSR. Soviet control over East Europe was perceived by the USA and the West as an attempt at Soviet expansion in line with Marxist-Leninist ideology which suggested an ultimate goal of world domination. USA did not understand the USSR's desire for security following the destruction and devastation caused to the USSR in the Second World War
- The role of Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam where he was accused by the West of not honoring the promises he made, most notably, over Poland.
- The creation of Cominform to enhance Soviet control of Communist parties of Europe.
- The Berlin Blockade Crisis of 1948-9 was perceived as a deliberate attempt to force the western Allies out of West Berlin. The blockade was seen in the west as a an aggressive act, not a defensive response to the possible reunification of Germany
- US feared the spread of communism and the repeat of the problems associated with appeasement

Post-Post revisionist (1990's onwards)

Cold War was due to mainly the actions of Stalin

- The main point here is the (partial) opening of the Soviet archives (after 1991). The US archives were open long before the 1980s, which would have distorted the study of the topic. Western analysis of Soviet policies had to be based on a few, limited sources plus a large amount of (expert) supposition Soviet analysis would have been of an orthodox Marxist kind, dissidents excepted. Since the late 1980s there will have more opportunities for Western historians to study the archives and to interview survivors of the postwar era while Russian historians can take a less ideological stance.
- A second front in Europe in 1942 would have been "a completely impossible operation for them," Stalin's foreign minister, Viacheslav Molotov later acknowledged. "But our demand was politically necessary, and we had to press them for everything."
- Stalin that he had long since given up the Lenin—Trotsky goal of world revolution in favor of "socialism in one country," a doctrine that seemed to imply peaceful coexistence with states of differing social systems. But that is a misunderstanding of Stalin's position. What he really did in the late 1920s was to drop Lenin's prediction that revolutions would arise spontaneously in other advanced industrial countries; instead he came to see the Soviet Union itself as the center from which socialism would spread and eventually defeat capitalism Stalin himself explained to the Yugoslav communist Milovan Djilas in 1945: "whoever occupies a territory also imposes his own social system.... It cannot be otherwise."
- "Stalin looked at it this way," Molotov recalled: "World War I has wrested one country from capitalist slavery; World War II has created a socialist system; and the third will finish off imperialism forever."
- Khrushchev put it more bluntly: "No one inside the Soviet Union or out had Stalin's trust."
- Stalin was involved in the assassination (apparent suicide) of popular Czech Foreign Minister Masaryk, who wanted to accept the Marshall Plan

How far do you agree that the Cold War broke out in Europe in 1947-9 because the USA and the USSR disagreed fundamentally about how they should treat the shattered European economy?

Students should discuss both economic and political issues.

Economic

- The disagreement was twofold: firstly, whether the allies should take action at all; secondly, if so, whether the German economy should be brought back to life to stimulate the surrounding economies.
- In each case, the West said yes, the USSR said no. Both required the injection of large amounts of American money, in the form of the Marshall Plan. The revival of the German economy also required the restoration of a single German currency. USA needed market for its goods produced by a huge economy (due to expansion in boom years of WW2). USA would enter into a post-war depression otherwise
- On this the Allies could not agree; the Soviets particularly wanted to help themselves to German industrial equipment and squeeze reparations from the Germans. Thus the Berlin Blockade occurred in 1948. This direct confrontation widened East-West divisions and led to the formation of NATO in 1949
- By 1948-9 the Cold War had early begun. The reasons for disagreement over economic policy could be the basis for discussion about the different explanations for the outbreak of the Cold War.

Political

- Did the USSR oppose economic reconstruction because it wanted to strengthen its hold on central Europe – perhaps with an eye to expanding further westwards – as the **traditionalists and the post-post revisionists** would argue?
- Or did the USA force the pace in 1947-8 in order to further its economic interests and political ambitions, which is what **revisionist** historians believe?
- Finally, was the disagreement and division more the result of misunderstanding and mistrust, the line which is taken **by post-revisionists**? They just misunderstood each other, in part blinded by their ideological obsessions.
- This discussion could bring in other factors, such as Kennan's Long Telegram and the Greek civil war.

How far do you agree that the US policy of containment was based on a mistaken interpretation of Soviet aims and ambitions?

This can be seen as either a critique of the traditional thesis or part of the post-revisionist explanation for the outbreak of the Cold War. The former sees the USSR as causing the Cold War, the latter that the two superpowers misread each other's aims and intentions.

For support of the hypothesis, students may state:

- The main argument for containment being a mistake is the **revisionist thesis**, which argues that (a) the USSR was not expansionist but that (b) the USA, for economic reasons, was.

To negate the hypothesis, the students may state:

- **Traditionalists** argue that, in 1945-9, the USA had to act to contain an ideologically driven, expansionist USSR. The best and most significant example of this view was Kennan's Long Telegram of February 1946, from which followed the policy of containment in the Truman Doctrine a year later.
- Some might want to mention the **post-post-revisionist thesis** which emerged in the 1990s. Here the view is that new evidence from the Soviet archives supports the traditional thesis, that the USSR was expansionist.
- Some may point out that both sides misinterpreted each other (**Post-revisionist**)

There is plenty for candidates to consider, almost too much. Higher bands should be reserved for those who do analyze and evaluate rather than simply describe and explain pre-digested theories.

Which of the following has the best claim to mark the start of the Cold War: Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech, 1946; the Truman Doctrine, 1947; the Berlin Blockade, 1948-49?

Explain your answer.

Note that the question asks which event marked the start of the Cold War and not which caused the Cold War. Many will overlook this distinction. Suggest maximum of Band 3 for those who focus wholly on the causes of the Cold War, however well done.

- Answers should consider which event marked the end of the pre-war era and the start of the Cold War, which was a kind of boundary marker.
- And, ideally, some kind of definition of 'Cold War' is desirable in order to provide a framework for analyzing the relative importance of the three events. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**
- By **mark**, we can mean that **"an open declaration by one side that it intends to formally challenge and contain the opposing side by taking action that was bound to provoke a deliberate response"**
- For this question, we can argue that Truman Doctrine marked the beginning of the Cold War as it led to Marshall Aid. It was more than just pure benevolence but a device to win over the European continent. On one hand, we had the brilliant success of Communism in an agro-based Russia, which was now the graveyard of Nazi juggernaut, and on the other hand, we had the appeal of the dollar
- **Implementing the Doctrine led to the creation of a single currency in West Berlin and West Germany. Stalin understood this to be an attempt to lure the Eastern European satellites into the western camp**
- Iron Curtain Speech and the Berlin blockade can be discussed

- Truman Doctrine marked the start of Cold War as it waws more than just words (as opposed to the Iron Curtain Speech) and that it led to the Berlin Blockade
- It would be worthwhile to point out that the Truman Doctrine **marked** the beginning of the Cold War, but the Cold War was itself **caused** by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.
- Also note that candidates can provide an alternative only if they have provided convincing arguments why none of the three events properly mark the start of the Cold War.

How far do you agree that neither the USA not the USSR intended to cause the Cold War?

Candidates will be expected to discuss the reasons for the outbreak of the Cold War after 1945. The question is framed in a way to encourage discussion of the **post-revisionist** view which suggests that neither Super Power deliberately set out to start a Cold War. Instead the Cold War was caused by misinterpretation of intention by the other Super Power.

Post Revisionist

- Soviet control over East Europe was perceived by the USA and the West as an attempt at Soviet expansion in line with Marxist-Leninist ideology which suggested an ultimate goal of world domination
- The role of Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam where he was accused by the West of not honoring the promises he made, most notably, over Poland. There were no free elections in Poland and Eastern Europe. Even where coalition governments existed, the Communists had more power than their number suggested. Establishment of communist regimes (by arrests, executions and propaganda) across east and central Europe, in particular, the brutal creation of a communist regime in Czechoslovakia in 1948.
- The Berlin Blockade Crisis of 1948-9 was perceived as a deliberate attempt to force the western Allies out of West Berlin as another example of this strategy.
- On the Soviet side, the Iron Curtain speech of Churchill, in 1946, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan of 1947 were both seen as attempts by the USA to impose its economic and political views on all Europe.

Traditionalist and Post Post-Revisionist

- Candidates may also counter the claim by putting forward views associated with the traditional, revisionist and post post-revisionist interpretations. They may state, in support of the **Traditionalist and Post Post-Revisionist** view, that the USSR was an expansionist power in Eastern Europe and only unity and resolve by the USA and its western allies could prevent further expansion.

Revisionist View

- They may state, in support of the **Revisionist** point of view that Truman did not become president until April 1945 and had not participated in the Yalta negotiations of February 1945. Many referred to his brash and aggressive manner in meetings with the Soviets, in particular, his fist meeting with Foreign Minister Molotov. They also referred to his threat of nuclear attack on the USSR over the Soviet occupation of northern Iran in 1946.

- The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan were important contributory factors in starting the Cold War after 1945. Truman exaggerated the Soviet threat in Europe in order to force a Republican controlled US Congress to grant aid under the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan.
- Creation of NATO could also be cited as evidence of this view.
- Candidate's may offer long-term causes of the Cold War, such as the success of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 but this approach must be linked to events from 1945

How far was Truman personally responsible for the development of the Cold War in Europe to 1949?

Refer to traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist views.

Revisionist View

- On the role of Truman, candidates may mention his aggressive style;
- the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan;
- Truman's role in the Berlin Blockade and the creation of NATO in 1949.
- They may contrast Truman's style and policies with those of his predecessor FDR.
- Candidates may also wish to contrast Truman's role with that of US policy in the sense that up to April 1945 FDR was in charge. From 1945 to 1946, Truman's policy was in formation and therefore Truman had limited impact personally on the development of the Cold war.
- From 1947 with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, Truman's policy of containment played a major role in the Cold War's development.
- They may mention Truman's role in the practical application of containment in the Berlin Blockade 1948–49 and the formation of NATO 1949.

Traditionalist and Post Post-Revisionist

- Candidates may also counter the assertion in the question through reference to the historical debate which also highlights, in the traditional and post post-revisionist view the importance of Stalin and the USSR in developing the Cold War.

Post Revisionist

- The post revisionist view which highlights the concepts of misjudgment of the motives of each superpower by the other may also be mentioned Soviet control over East Europe was perceived by the USA and the West as an attempt at Soviet expansion in line with Marxist-Leninist ideology which suggested an ultimate goal of world domination
- The role of Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam where he was accused by the West of not honoring the promises he made, most notably, over Poland. They also mentioned the establishment of communist regimes across east and central Europe, in particular, the brutal creation of a communist regime in Czechoslovakia in 1948.
- The Berlin Blockade Crisis of 1948-9 was perceived as a deliberate attempt to force the western Allies out of West Berlin as another example of this strategy.
- On the Soviet side, the Iron Curtain speech of Churchill, in 1946, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan of 1947 were both seen as attempts by the USA to impose its economic and political views on all Europe.

‘US President Truman’s fear of communism was the main cause of the Cold War in Europe between 1945 and 1949.’ How far do you agree?

Candidates will be expected to show knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cold War in Europe 1945–49 and to deploy this in order to reach a conclusion regarding the validity of the hypothesis. Essentially, the question supports the revisionist school.

➤ **Arguments which might be used to support the hypothesis could include:**

Revisionist viewpoint (Fear of Communism)

- use of atom bomb in Japan without informing USSR
- Threatened nuclear attack on the USSR over the Soviet occupation of northern Iran in 1946.
- The case for Truman's responsibility is summed up in the quote:- ‘I’m tired of babying the Soviets’, made in January 1946.
- possibly misjudged Stalin’s actions in Eastern Europe
- response to Churchill – ‘iron curtain’ speech
- response to Kennan – ‘Long Telegram’
- ending lend-lease
- Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan
- Truman exaggerated the Soviet threat in Europe in order to force a Republican controlled US Congress to grant aid under the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan
- end of USA policy of isolationism

But were Truman’s actions due to fear of communism, or fear of its impact on the USA’s status and economic prosperity, or due to his own inexperience?

- US need for a market place in Europe (Fear of US losing its economic prestige due to post war depression)
- New and inexperienced. Truman did not become president until April 1945 and had not participated in the Yalta negotiations of February 1945. Roosevelt trusted Stalin, Truman did not

➤ **Arguments which might be used to challenge the hypothesis could include:**

Traditional viewpoint

- Stalin’s role:- paranoid about security
- actions in Eastern Europe, especially Poland
- felt USA and Britain delayed Second Front deliberately
- suspicious of Truman’s use of atom bomb against Japan
- Cominform and Berlin Blockade
- However, both Churchill and George Kennan were cited as contributing to the breakdown of East-West relations.

Post Revisionist viewpoint

- misunderstandings between USA and USSR regarding their true intentions
- USA did not understand the USSR’s desire for security following the destruction and devastation caused to the USSR in the Second World War. As a result, the creation of Soviet satellite government in Eastern Europe was perceived as Soviet expansionism.

- Also, the Soviet response to the creation of Bizonia with the Berlin Blockade of 1948–1949 was also seen as an aggressive act, not a defensive response to the possible reunification of Germany. Misjudgment could also account for the USSR response to the Marshall Plan. Hence, this led to the Soviet refusal to allow states such as Czechoslovakia to join
- long-term problems between capitalism and communism (temporarily disguised during WWII)
- US fears of communism spreading and of repeating the problems associated with appeasement
- Soviet fears of yet another invasion from Western Europe and Truman's threat of atomic bombing over the issue of Northern Iran in 1946

'The Truman Doctrine was a symptom not a cause of the Cold War.' How far do you agree?

To support the hypothesis, candidates would need to demonstrate that the Cold War had effectively already started before the Truman Doctrine was announced in 1947 – e.g.

- long-term problems between capitalism and communism (temporarily disguised during WWII)
- Soviet fears of yet another invasion from Western Europe and Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe
- US fears of communism spreading and of repeating the problems associated with appeasement
- power vacuum in Europe and especially the issue of what should be done with Germany
- the USA's need to secure markets in Europe – fear of drifting back into depression
- USA's possession and use of atom bomb and delays in opening the Second Front
- misunderstandings between USA and USSR regarding their true intentions (i.e. the Post Revisionist viewpoint)
- Growth of antagonism between Yalta (Feb 1945) and Potsdam (July 1945). Political, economic and ideological differences were already evident at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences
- Truman replacing Roosevelt

To challenge the hypothesis, candidates would need to demonstrate that

- Truman Doctrine was the first openly antagonistic action of the Cold War
- open declaration that USA intended to contain communism and had no intention of returning to isolationism
- It was effectively the first formal declaration of American intent to resist what it saw as Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe. The Truman Doctrine established the containment policy which was to characterize subsequent American actions both before and after 1949. Allied with the Marshall Plan and American determination to protect its own economic interests, the Truman Doctrine set the USA on a path of formal opposition to the USSR
- In reply USSR launched Cominform
- Truman Doctrine significantly changed relationships between superpowers, and was a key factor in subsequent problems – e.g. Berlin, NATO etc

Other causes could be

- Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech and the Long Telegram
- Candidates may argue that the Berlin Blockade has a better claim to be a turning point in the development of the Cold War, since it marks the first time that the USA and the USSR came into direct conflict with each other.

How far has the collapse of the USSR affected the historical debate about the origins of the Cold War?

The main point here is the (partial) opening of the Soviet archives. The US archives were open long before the 1980's, which would have distorted the study of the topic. Western analysis of Soviet policies had to be based on a few, limited sources plus a large amount of (expert) supposition. Soviet analysis would have been of an orthodox Marxist kind, dissidents excepted. Since the late 1980's there will have more opportunities for Western historians to study the archives and to interview survivors of the postwar era while Russian historians can take a less ideological stance.

Candidates have the opportunity to discuss the challenging nature of historical interpretations of the origins of the Cold War. They may be able to explain that since 1945 there have been a variety of interpretations concerning the origins of the Cold war

Traditional/orthodox interpretation

- This was dominant from the mid 1940s to the 1960s, and suggested that responsibility, lay with Stalin and the USSR.
- Stalin's alleged renegeing of promises made at Yalta
- Such interpretations cite the Soviet takeover of Eastern Europe , in particular, in Czechoslovakia
- and the Berlin Blockade Crisis.
- In support of the argument candidates may cite contextual information such as the Marxist-Leninist idea of spreading communism across the globe.

Revisionist interpretation

- This developed between 1960-1980 and tended to lay responsibility with the USA and, in particular, President Truman.
- In support of this interpretation candidates may mention Truman's aggressive/abrasive manner in dealing with Molotov, which contrasted with FDR;
- the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan and
- the creation of NATO.

Post-revisionist interpretation

- This was dominant from 1980-1990 and suggests the Cold War began because of misperceptions and misjudgments by both the USA and USSR.
- They may mention divisions over Germany,
- German reparations,
- the creation of Bizonia,
- the Greek Civil War, and the
- defensive nature of Soviet policy in Eastern Europe.

Post-post revisionist view

- Finally, candidates may mention that since the collapse of the USSR evidence has come to light after 1991 which reinforces the traditional/orthodox interpretation (John Lewis Gaddis).

How far has the historical debate about the origins of the Cold War changed since the collapse of the USSR in 1991?

The main point here is the (partial) opening of the Soviet archives (after 1991). The US archives were open long before the 1980s, which would have distorted the study of the topic. Western analysis of Soviet policies had to be based on a few, limited sources plus a large amount of (expert) supposition. Soviet analysis would have been of an orthodox Marxist kind, dissidents excepted. Since the late 1980s there will have more opportunities for Western historians to study the archives and to interview survivors of the postwar era while Russian historians can take a less ideological stance.

- There are two approaches to this question. The first and probably the most common is an assessment of the impact of new information on the old theories, about which opinions vary. Some identify a fourth perspective, the post-post-revisionist school, which bears a close resemblance to the traditional interpretation.
- The second involves an attempt to use the causes of the collapse of the USSR to reflect upon the causes of the Cold War. Thus the subsequent impact of the loss of the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe in 1989 shows the importance to the USSR of the region and thus might support part of the revisionist case.
- And the economic weakness of the USSR, as revealed by the 1980s, could be taken to undermine post-revisionist arguments in that the Cold War was not the result of superpower misunderstandings. The USSR could not afford to let go of Eastern Europe. This again helps strengthen the traditional school of thought.

‘The Marshall Plan caused the division of Europe and thus the Cold War’. Discuss this assertion.

The best candidates noted the significance of ‘thus’ in the question and debated the argument whether that the Marshall Plan was the cause of the Cold war and not its consequence. The weakest answers came from those who quickly turned the question around into a description of the three schools of history – traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist.

To support the hypothesis, candidates would need to demonstrate that

Revisionist interpretation

- The Marshall Plan marked American determination to protect its own economic interests
- In reply USSR launched Cominform
- Marshall Plan significantly changed relationships between superpowers, and was a key factor in subsequent problems – e.g. Berlin, NATO etc
- The rejection of Marshall Plan led to dismal results for Communists in Czechoslovakia and hence the coup in 1948
- Marshall Plan was more important than the Truman Doctrine as it forced the different European countries to pick sides. Whether the USSR with the Molotov Plan, or the USA with the Marshall Plan? Remaining neutral meant poor economic conditions

To challenge the hypothesis, candidates would need to demonstrate that the Cold War had effectively already started before the Marshall Plan was announced in 1947– e.g.

- long-term problems between capitalism and communism (temporarily disguised during WWII). These were both conflicting ideologies, which both claimed world domination
- USA’s possession and use of atom bomb

Post-revisionist interpretation

- misunderstandings between USA and USSR regarding their true intentions (i.e. the **Post Revisionist viewpoint**). Soviet fears of yet another invasion from Western Europe and Stalin’s actions in Eastern Europe. Stalin was suspicious of western intentions due to delays in the opening of the Second Front
- US fears of communism spreading and of repeating the problems associated with appeasement
- the USA’s need to secure markets in Europe – fear of drifting back into depression

Traditional/orthodox interpretation

- Stalin’s alleged renegeing of promises made at Yalta
- In support of the argument candidates may cite contextual information such as the Marxist-Leninist idea of spreading communism across the globe.
- Truman’s aggressive manner and the Trumann Doctrine (part of revisionist interpretation but cant be grouped here with the Marshall Plan due to wording of the question)
- Churchill’s ‘iron curtain’ speech and the Long Telegram (part of revisionist interpretation but cant be grouped here with the Marshall Plan due to wording of the question)

Alternatively to challenge the hypothesis, candidates can demonstrate that the Cold War really started AFTER the Marshall Plan was announced in 1947– e.g.

- Creation of brutal Communist regime in Czechoslovakia
- Berlin Blockade Crisis (1st time where the two armies faced across each other ready to respond to any aggression)

GLOBALIZATION OF COLD WAR (GENERAL)

Paper 3

TIMELINE

1950-53

Treaty of Alliance between China and USSR (1950)

Korean War

1953

Arbenz overthrown in Chile by CIA

Mossadeq overthrown in Iran by CIA

1954

French surrender in Vietnam. American involvement begins in Vietnam

1956

Suez Crisis

1959

Castro overthrows Batista in Cuba

1961

Lumumba overthrown and killed by CIA in Congo

Failed invasion of Bay of Pigs (Cuba)

1962

Cuban Missile Crisis

USSR becomes a global naval power

Nkrumah overthrown by the army and the CIA in Ghana

1967

Six Days war (Middle East)

1973

End of war in Vietnam (beginning of Détente)

Allende overthrown in Chile by the CIA. General Pinochet installed

Yom Kippur war (Middle East)

1975

Mozambique becomes a Marxist state

1976

Angola becomes a Marxist state

1979

USSR invades Afghanistan (end of détente and beginning of 2nd Cold War)

SS20 missiles installed in Eastern Europe by USSR

1981-83

USA installs Pershing and Cruise missiles in Europe

Rapid arms buildup and SDI under Ronald Reagan

Why did the Cold War spread outside Europe in the period from 1950 to 1975?

Candidates will be expected to show knowledge and understanding of the globalization of the Cold War 1950–75, and to deploy this to provide a rational argument as to why it occurred. Relevant content could include:

Significance of actions and beliefs of regional powers/superpowers

- US fear of domino theory according to NSC-68 (1950)
- USSR wanted to spread the revolution in line with Marxist ideology
- Communism in China.
 - perceived as a threat by USA due to Treat of Alliance with the USSR in 1950. Truman came under fire for allowing China to turn red.
 - China supported ‘communist’ groups in Indo-China (Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia). This led the USA to mistake post-colonialist socialist independence struggles as ‘Communist backed takeovers’. Thus the USA managed to actually increase support for Communist/Socialist groups

Significance of regional conflicts – how and why these became part of the Cold War

- Korean War:
 - Involvement of USSR and China
 - USA fears of communism spreading – public opinion in USA
 - ‘containment’ and attempted roll back, then containment’
 - Cuba:
 - Castro, a Liberal-Nationalist, becoming a ‘communist’ due to expediency
 - Role and motives of USSR
 - US action to prevent Soviet missiles being placed on Cuba
 - Vietnam:
 - French, Japanese and Chinese influences
 - US fears of domino theory
 - UN opposition to US action– outcomes
 - Laos and Cambodia turn Communist
 - US involvement in Chile, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Iran, Indonesia, Ghana, Uruguay, Bolivia, East Timor etc
 - Middle East:
 - At crossroads between the West, the Communist Bloc and Third World Asia and Africa
 - Involvement of USA and USSR
-
- Characteristically, the best responses will **be focused** and **provide more than one example**
 - analyze/evaluate both the spread of the Cold War and the reasons for it
 - reach a reasoned conclusion as to why the Cold War was globalised

Who or what was responsible for the globalization of the Cold War?

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**
- Most of the candidates were able to mention the Korean War as a possible starting point in the Globalization of the Cold War

The prime suspects will be the leaders of the superpowers, the USA and the USSR –and perhaps China.

- Some candidates mentioned the collapse of the European overseas empires in the 1950s and 1960s which resulted in the involvement of the two superpowers. Both the USA and the USSR wanted to win over these states before the other side had a chance to do so
- The USA's responsibility might be evident in NSC-68 (April 1950), which argued the need to counter Soviet 'design for world domination' and 'Soviet efforts ... now directed towards the domination of the Eurasian land mass'. With the North Korean invasion of South Korea occurring two months later, Truman ordered a massive expansion of US military power. Even before then, in 1949, the USA was intervening in South East Asia to contain the spread of communism in states such as Malaya and Indonesia. In the 1950s, the USA used the CIA to overthrow nationalist regimes in Iran (1953) and Guatemala (1954) while Eisenhower and Dulles intervened in the settlement of Vietnam and, after the Suez crisis (1956), in the Middle East.
- The USSR's responsibility is harder to pinpoint, in part because the documentation is incomplete. Stalin was cautious, as evidence - his reluctance to support North Korea's attack on South Korea. Khrushchev was more reckless but still gained little support from Third World states. Cuba under Castro in 1961 was the first country to welcome Soviet support, thus leading to the Cuban missile crisis. From the mid 1950s, and especially after 1962, the Soviet navy was rapidly expanded in order to provide the USSR with a global reach it had hitherto lacked.
- As for China, it tried to establish itself as leader of the Third World, especially after the Sino-Soviet split of 1960, which confirmed US fears about Communist expansionism. Finally, the regional crises in many parts of the globe helped globalize the Cold War but only in that the USA, in particular, obsessed with the Communist threat, felt bound to intervene, e.g. Korea and Vietnam.

'The globalization of the Cold War between 1950 and 1975 was caused by the USA's misguided and irrational fear of Soviet intentions.' How far do you agree?

Candidates will be expected to show knowledge and understanding of the globalization of the Cold War, and to deploy this in order to reach a reasoned conclusion regarding the validity of the hypothesis.

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

Content in support of the hypothesis could include:

- the nature and purpose of US containment policy
- NSC-68 – **regarded USSR as fanatics** wanting to spread communism around the world. It failed to realize that aside from public speeches (meant for public consumption), the **USSR was careful** in its policies as shown by Stalin's reluctance in wholly supporting North Korea during the civil war
- fears regarding communism in China after 1949 – USA **incorrectly** saw USSR and China as one Communist bloc
- USA became involved in a series of regional conflicts, whose causes were more to do with post-colonial nationalism than communist world domination e.g. Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Chile, Mozambique, Angola
- failure of roll-back (like Cuba) because of popularity of national leaders like Castro. USA thought that it could enforce leadership changes at will without taking into account the support for the current leaders. Although Castro was backed up by the USSR, so was Batista backed up by the USA. Castro survived because he was popular; while Batista wasn't.

Content to challenge the hypothesis could include:

- USA's fears were justified. Stalin's explicit notion of communist world domination; Khrushchev also believed in this, although felt that it would come naturally
- NATO and Warsaw Pact rivalry
- nuclear arms race
- Soviet involvement in essentially regional disputes – e.g. Korea, Middle East
- fears of domino theory seemed justified as South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia all turned Communist (1975) after the American withdrawal in 1973
- USA had to respond to the very real threat of Soviet nuclear weapons in Cuba (1962)
- USA's need to protect her economy and prestige as the forerunner of the capitalist world being threatened by Communism

'The globalization of the Cold War in the period between 1950 and 1975 was caused by the expansionist ambitions of the USSR.' How far do you agree?

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the globalization of the Cold War between 1950 and 1975, and to deploy this in order to address the validity of the hypothesis.

➤ **Arguments in support of the hypothesis might include**

- Stalin's overt statements regarding world revolution
- Soviet support for the communist take-over in China
- NATO and Warsaw Pact
- nuclear arms race
- fears of domino theory seemed justified
- USA had to respond to the very real threat of Soviet nuclear weapons in Cuba
- USA's need to protect her economy and prestige
- Soviet involvement in Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Africa and the Middle East

➤ **In order to achieve balance**

- the nature and purpose of US containment policy
- NSC-68 – regarded USSR as fanatics wanting to spread communism around the world
- fears regarding communism in China after 1949 – USA incorrectly saw USSR and China as one Communist bloc
- USA became involved in a series of regional conflicts, whose causes were more to do with post-colonial nationalism than communist world domination e.g. Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Chile, Mozambique, Angola
- failure of roll-back (Laos and Cambodia turning Communist 1975)
- candidates may argue that the Cold War was globalised because of the USA's overreaction to what it incorrectly perceived as a Soviet attempt to encourage world-wide revolution
- this led to containment, roll back and the domino theory
- USA's actions in Korea, Vietnam, South East Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East could be cited as evidence to substantiate this point

➤ **It could be argued that the USA and the USSR share equal responsibility for becoming involved in essentially regional conflicts for their own strategic, diplomatic or prestige reasons.**

How far was the USA's policy of containment responsible for the globalization of the Cold War in the period from 1950 to 1985?

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

➤ Arguments in support of the hypothesis might include

- Containment was the main cause.
- NSC-68 and the Truman Doctrine forced the US into a global stance against the development of communism even where local regional conflicts were more to do with nationalism than support for global communism.
- US belief in the domino theory, in particular in relation to Southeast Asia. US involvement in the Korean War; the US involvement in Indo-China culminating in the US-Vietnam war of 1963–1973;
- opposition to communism in Latin America, in particular Cuba
- US involvement against leftwing regimes in Africa all suggests that containment helped globalize the Cold War.

➤ Arguments to challenge the hypothesis might include

- The alternative US policy of **roll back** was more to blame in such areas such as Cuba, Guatemala and Chile.
- They may also state that **both Soviet and Communist Chinese expansionist** policy forced the US and its western Allies to react to communist actions e.g. Congo, Angola, Mozambique, Afghanistan etc.

'The Cold War was essentially a war of words.' How far does a study of the Cold War, as 'fought' across the globe from 1960 to 1980 support this assertion?

The thesis is that essentially the Cold War from around 1960 onwards was essentially a war of words, that neither superpower intended to use its military might to attack the other to gain territory. Instead, the aim was to use what is now sometimes called 'soft power' in order to gain political influence rather than territorial control.

There were three reasons why this might have been the case:

- firstly, realization that military conflict meant nuclear conflict, which would be too risky;
- secondly, establishment of nuclear parity in the 1960s
- thirdly, the changing international situation, which was moving from bipolarity to multi-polarity.

- Decolonization and the Sino-Soviet split made for a more complicated world. Thus the Cold War became a struggle for economic and cultural superiority.
- The military conflicts which did occur, all regional, involved the armed forces of one superpower only.

The counter-thesis is that the Cold War in the 1960s and 1970s was much the same as that of the 1950s and 1980s in that these decades saw occasional major crises –

- Vietnam and Afghanistan (just in) – interspersed with periods of improved relations. This was in sharp contrast to Cuba, where there was little fighting
- But it could be argued that the Cuban missile crisis was a form of military conflict, one for the nuclear age. A naval blockade is more than just words. And at the height of the crisis a Soviet anti-aircraft battery in Cuba did shoot down a U-2 reconnaissance plane, killing the pilot
- But even in Vietnam and Afghanistan, no direct fighting between US and USSR troops took place
- The Middle East in 1973 was one such major crisis, often overlooked, when US forces were put on Def Con III alert, the only occasion during the Cold War apart from the Cuban missile crisis when US forces were put on a state of higher alert.

How far was the USSR responsible for the beginning of détente and the start of the Second Cold War in the years 1963-1985?

In support of hypothesis, the students may state

USSR Responsible for Détente

- The easing of tension following the Cuban Missile Crisis after Khrushchev took the 1st step to withdraw the missiles (1962)
- The Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the creation of the Molink (permanent phone link between the Kremlin and the White House, to prevent misunderstandings) were largely due to insistence of USSR
- They could mention the role of Brezhnev in creating the conditions for a thaw in East-West relations from 1969. USSR was stagnating and needed western technology to modernize. Furthermore, USSR needed American grain to overcome local shortage
- This led to SALT1; international cultural exchanges; the end of the Vietnam War and the Helsinki Accords (both 1975)

USSR Responsible for 2nd Cold War

- For the second part of the answer candidates could refer to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the placing of SS20 missiles in East Europe (both 1979)

To negate the hypothesis, the students may state

USA and Sino-Soviet Split Responsible for Détente

- An important factor for détente was the development of the Sino-Soviet split.
- USSR actually did support North Vietnam and the Arab States in the 1960s (thus increasing Cold War tensions)
- USA was more important in creating the atmosphere for detente due to the roles of Nixon and Kissinger in accepting peaceful co-existence and going to China and the USSR. The USA was trying to lessen the burden of an arms buildup due to its long involvement in the Vietnam War. Export of grain and technology would increase profits of western farmers and firms

USA Responsible for 2nd Cold War

- For the second part of the answer candidates may mention the actions of the Carter administration from 1979-1981 and the Reagan administration 1981-1985 in developing US military capability. Reagan's role in creating the conditions for the Second Cold War: the massive arms buildup of the USA from 1981, Star Wars (SDI), the deployment of Cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe in 1983 and NATO Operation Able Archer in 1983.

To what extent did the USA attempt to 'roll back' communism, rather than merely contain it, in the period 1950 to 1985?

- Offer definitions of both roll back and containment. **“Rollback is the strategy of forcing change in the major policies of a state, usually by replacing its ruling regime. Containment means preventing the expansion of that state”**

ROLLBACK 1st

- Korea candidates may mention that US policy began as an attempt to contain the North Korean invasion of South Korea but then developed into a war to conquer North Korea (roll back)
- In Latin America, US policy attempted to roll back Leftist regimes in Guatemala in 1954, Cuba in 1961 and through Operation Mongoose, from 1962 onwards.
- The US also helped overthrow (roll back) the leftist regime of Allende in Chile in 1973 after it tried to enforce trade sanctions on it to deliver a warning to rest of Latin countries of risks when taking over American multinational corporations
- US also overthrew Patrice Lumumba in Congo and Nkrumah in Ghana
- In Africa, US, through its surrogate, South Africa, attempted to roll back the communist regime in Angola and in destabilize the leftist regime in Mozambique.

CONTAINMENT 1st

- However, candidates will also mention that throughout most of the period US policy was one of containment. In South East Asia, the US attempted to prevent communist takeovers of Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam.
- Also, in the Middle East, the US attempted to safeguard the independence of Israel and support it (so to prevent it from falling into the Soviet camp). From the late 1970's the US won over Egypt to the western camp.
- In Afghanistan from 1979, US policy was one of containment

But by and large the US policy settled for containment only and only when rollback had failed like in Cuba after 1962, (North) Vietnam after 1973 and North Korea after 1953. These three communist states were tolerated because they could not be overthrown

'The US policy of containment was a failure in the years from 1950 to 1975.' How far do you agree?

This question offers candidates the opportunity to assess the US policy of containing communism.

- Definition of containment (did it mean no new communist states after 1950, or none in strategically significant regions or merely no military expansion of communism?)

In support of hypothesis, students may state:

- They may state that between 1950 and 1975, communist states were created in North Vietnam in 1954 and subsequently in all former French Indo-China by 1975. All who mentioned Vietnam concluded that containment failed. Not only was South Vietnam 'lost' to communism, but also a partial domino effect occurred with the fall to communism of Laos and Cambodia
- They may also mention that intervention in Congo did not contain Communism in Africa as evident by the creation of Marxist states in the former Portuguese colonies in Africa by 1975. The creation of Zaire under Mobutu thwarted the creation of a pro-Soviet regime under Lumumba. However, the fall of the Portuguese African Empire, in 1975, saw the creation of pro-Soviet regimes in Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique.

To challenge the hypothesis, students may state:

- Containment succeeded in Korea (1950-53)
- They may mention the 1959 Cuban Revolution which led to the creation of a communist regime by 1961. Containment was a success because of Kennedy's policy during the Cuban Missile Crisis.
- In contrast, US policy in the Middle East saw the containment of Soviet influence through the success of Israel in 1967 and its survival in the Yom Kippur War (1973)
- Apart from Cuba, the US prevented the creation of Marxist states in Latin America (e.g. Guatemala in 1954 and Chile in 1973).
- In Europe, communism was contained successfully throughout the period

How successful was the American policy of containment in the period 1950 - 1975?

Containment needs to be defined – did it mean no new communist states after 1950, or none in strategically significant regions or merely no military expansion of communism? How far does it include stopping the arms race? What about economic embargoes?

What about the idea of 'rollback'?

- Korean War;
- the Cuban Missile Crisis;
- the Vietnam War and
- the Middle East up to, and including the War of 1973.

The best answers need to consider each separately and analyze containment in general: a simple answer for each of the 4 might be yes, yes, no, not appropriate.

Was containment successful in some regions and not in others? And how does the policy of detente, as followed by Nixon from 1969, link with containment?

'The globalization of the Cold War in the 1950s and 1960s is clear evidence that both the USA and the USSR had expansionist ambitions.' Discuss.

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

Ideally, 'expansionist' needs defining; it could mean gaining territory, it could mean gaining influence. There is plenty of material available, including all the usual suspects, from the Korean and Vietnam Wars to the Middle East crisis and several crises in Latin America.

- The line that most candidates will probably take is that the USSR was expansionist, the USA defensive. This approach, supported with a range of examples, can reach Band 3.
- However, it could be that the USA was equally expansionist, especially when it came to supporting the economic interests of American capitalism; American intervention in Vietnam could be given this interpretation, as could the formation of supposedly- defensive organizations such as CENTO and SEATO.
- Another possibility is that neither superpower had expansionist aims, that both were acting to defend either their interests or those of their allies; the Soviet decision to place missiles in Cuba was possibly a defensive move.

'The globalization of the Cold War in the 1950s and 1960s is clear evidence that both the USA and the USSR had expansionist ambitions.' Discuss.

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

Expansionist ambitions must fully be defined, probably that of establishing influence or a position of power in the country more than just establishing territorial hegemony over the area. This makes a useful distinction between influence or power and hegemony. It would have been even better had it separated influence and power and force. Sometimes the use of military force marks the loss of political power over a client state

- Most based their answers on analysis of the main regional conflicts of the era: the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Middle East. Knowledge of these various conflicts was usually sound and often up-to-date, e.g. the Korean War.
- The reality was that the Cold War provided to superpower intervention its own momentum; each had to establish its influence in order to negate its opponent's efforts. Establishing influence could be interpreted as expansionist
- The one crisis about which misconceptions were common was the Middle East. Two assertions in particular stood out. Firstly, that the USA intervened in the 1950s and 1960s in order to secure supplies of oil. If so, why did it intervene on the side of Israel, much hated by the Arab states who controlled the oil? And until 1970, the US was a net exporter of oil.
- The second common assertion was that the USSR intervened in order to gain access to a 'warm water port'. In the age of ICBMs, the USSR would gain little from such a port. Also, which port did the Russians have their eye on?

'The Cold War did not become truly global until after the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.' How far do you agree?

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

In support of the hypothesis, candidates could mention that before 1962 the Cold War was centered largely on Europe and Asia.

- They may state that the Korean War (1950-53) made the Cold War more global by extending it beyond Europe into the Far East and South East Asia. However, the Cuban Missile Crisis extended the Cold War into the Americas (regarded as American sphere of influence) and, after 1962; the Cold War was extended to Africa and the Middle East.
- Moreover, the Cuban Missile Crisis saw the USA and the USSR in direct confrontation, whereas this had not been the case in earlier issues such as the Korean War.
- Throughout the post-1962, for the first time, the USSR was turning itself into a global naval power
- The Cuban Crisis led to intensification of Cold war rivalry and proxy wars. It led to the US intervention in Vietnam from 1963, superpower tensions over Six Day War in 1967 and the Yom Kippur War in 1973, and struggles for power in southern Africa, following the collapse of the Portuguese empire in 1974, and the Horn of Africa.
- Central America became part of the Cold War from 1979 when the Sandinistas gained power in Nicaragua. South America, however, remained free from obvious Cold War conflicts, as did Australasia.

In challenging the hypothesis, candidates could argue that the Cold War did become 'truly global' as soon as it developed outside Europe.

- Whilst the Korean War did not involve direct confrontation between the USA and the USSR, it did involve the United Nations and, therefore, soldiers from many areas of the world.
- The Korean War was consistently seen as the best evidence for this since it involved the USA, the USSR, the PRC and many other nations through the direct involvement of the UN.
- Moreover, both superpowers were already active in the Middle East and the USA had already become involved in Vietnam prior to 1962.
- Fear of communism had led the USA to become involved in issues in the Americas (e.g. Guatemala in 1953)
- Both the USA and the USSR had significant involvement in the Congo (1960) before the Cuban Missile Crisis.

'More a series of separate regional conflicts than a single global war.' How far do you agree with this view of the Cold War in the period 1950–80?

This is perhaps more challenging than the usual thematic question on globalization of the cold war, especially if it is to be answered well. The quote challenges the orthodox view of the cold war, which is to see the regional conflicts as part of and, by implication, caused by the struggle for mastery between the USA and the USSR.

In support of the hypothesis, candidates could mention

- The implication of the idea that regional conflicts were separate, without a common thread, is that the superpowers were drawn into those conflicts, which only then became part of the wider cold war. And note that 'conflicts' can be political as well as military.
- Thus it could be argued that the USSR and USA were drawn into the Korean War in 1950 (which was in reality a civil war between the north and the south)
- USA was drawn into Vietnam in the early 1960s, whose causes were more to do with post-colonial nationalism than communist world domination
- Both were drawn into the Arab Israeli conflict.
- USSR was drawn into the regional conflict in Cuba (1962). Socialist Castro's attempted partial nationalization led to US trade embargo. USSR offered to buy Cuban sugar. The USA attempted the Bay of Pigs invasion (1961) and Castro announced that Cuba was now a Marxist state and was helped by Khrushchev. Missile bases were set up
- USSR was drawn in to a regional conflict in the Congo (1960). USA's involvement in the Congo was more due to the attempted nationalization of copper mines in Katanga province. Patrice Lumumba (President of Congo) was a socialist, not a communist. US encouraged the province to secede. Lumumba asked for UN help and then that of USSR.

To challenge the hypothesis, candidates could mention

- The crises of 1961 (Bay of Pigs) and 1962 (Missile Crisis) were both caused by direct intervention by both superpowers.. USSR's involvement wasn't just to help a socialist state, but USSR needed to place nuclear missiles close to the US (like American missiles in Turkey pointed at the USSR)

- In the age of détente (1969–1979) candidates may argue that the two superpowers attempted to work together on occasion to limit regional conflict

However, there should be wide scope for argument and analysis. Given that this is probably more difficult than usual, sustained attempts to consider both sides of the argument should be generously rewarded. On the other hand, standard, narrative descriptions of the cold war must receive sparing credit.

'The USA and USSR did not globalize the Cold War, they simply were dragged unwillingly into regional conflict' How far do you agree?

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

In support of the hypothesis, candidates could mention

- The implication of the idea that regional conflicts were separate, without a common thread, is that the superpowers were drawn into those conflicts, which only then became part of the wider cold war. And note that 'conflicts' can be political as well as military.
- Thus it could be argued that the USSR and USA were drawn into the Korean War in 1950 (which was in reality a civil war between the north and the south)
- USA was drawn into Vietnam in the early 1960s,, whose causes were more to do with post-colonial nationalism than communist world domination
- Both were drawn into the Arab Israeli conflict.
- USSR was drawn into the regional conflict in Cuba (1962). Socialist Castro's attempted partial nationalization led to US trade embargo. USSR offered to buy Cuban sugar. The USA attempted the Bay of Pigs invasion (1961) and Castro announced that Cuba was now a Marxist state and was helped by Khrushchev. Missile bases were set up
- USSR was drawn in to a regional conflict in the Congo (1960). USA's involvement in the Congo was more due to the attempted nationalization of copper mines in Katanga province. Patrice Lumumba (President of Congo) was a socialist, not a communist. US encouraged the province to secede. Lumumba asked for UN help and then that of USSR.

To challenge the hypothesis, candidates could mention

- The crises of 1961 (Bay of Pigs) and 1962 (Missile Crisis) were both caused by direct intervention by both superpowers.. USSR's involvement wasn't just to help a socialist state, but USSR needed to place nuclear missiles close to the US (like American missiles in Turkey pointed at the USSR)
- **They may also mention the world view of US policy in the 1950s and 1960s which accepted the domino theory and the fear of communist world domination (thus USA dragged itself into these wars, rather than Communism dragging the USA into these wars)**
- In the age of détente (1969–1979) candidates may argue that the two superpowers attempted to work together on occasion to limit regional conflict

'The Cold War, in the period 1950 to 1979, showed that the USA's fear of communist world domination was irrational.' How far do you agree?

This question offers candidates the opportunity to study the Cold War in a thematic way. It will allow them the opportunity to consider the factors underlying the globalization of the Cold War.

In support of the hypothesis, candidates could mention

- One such factor was the US fear of a global communist conspiracy which was dominated by the USSR and Communist China. The belief that the Soviet Union and China worked together persisted after the Sino-Soviet split had developed. It was only with the advent of détente that the divisions between the USSR and China were accepted by the USA
- Candidates could mention the domino theory as put forward initially by Eisenhower. Although it applied to South East Asia it can be cited as an example of US fears of communism. NSC-68 and the Truman Doctrine forced the US into a global stance against the development of communism even where local regional conflicts were more to do with nationalism than support for global communism like Vietnam
- US intervention in Congo and overthrow of Lumumba was due to the fact that **it feared he was turning communist** (Lumumba was never a communist, he was a socialist. He only asked help of USSR when UN failed to help against breakaway province of Katange, which was instigated by the USA) due to attempted nationalization of copper mines (in which some important Americans had interests)
- Allende was also overthrown by the CIA because it **feared that he was turning communist** as he had appointed some left wing advisers and had refused to break ties with Cuba (this in American eyes made him a Communist)

To challenge the hypothesis, candidates could mention

- To counter this view, candidates could mention the development of Soviet influence outside Eastern Europe as a factor in the development of the Cold War. The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 was a serious threat that needed to be dealt with
- The Korean War was a direct challenge to USA's supremacy in East Asia (Taiwan and Japan). South Korea had been almost totally over run and Truman feared that Taiwan would be next

Which of the two superpowers, the USA and USSR, was the more responsible for the globalization of the Cold War?

- Meaning of the term 'Globalization'. **"Spreading of the Cold war outside Europe"**
- Meaning of the term 'Cold War'. For example, **"Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."**

- The **USSR's** support for the North Korean invasion of South Korea, in June 1950; the Soviet support for Cuba in 1961-63, which includes the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962; the Soviet sponsorship of liberation movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America are all evidence to support the view that the USSR was more responsible.
- The counter claim (that the **USA** was more responsible) could include the creation of defensive alliances which encircled the USSR (NATO, CENTO, SEATO); the domino theory as applied to SE Asia and shown by involvement in Indo-China; US belief that any left-wing government was potentially pro-Soviet and had to be overthrown: Guatemala, 1954 and Chile, 1973.
- They can mention US policies of containment and roll back. The 'domino theory' could explain US involvement in Indo-China
- In addition, candidates may state that they are **equally responsible**. The most obvious example to support this interpretation would be superpower involvement in the Middle East from 1956

Why did the Cold War spread to the Third World in the 1960s and 1970s?

The Third World is taken to mean Africa, the Middle East and Latin America and parts of Asia. It had already spread to what might be called North-East Asia in the 1950s, in the form of conflicts in Korea and over Taiwan.

Examples of the spread of the Cold War include

- The Cuban missile crisis (1962)
- the Vietnam War (1955-73)
- Arab-Israeli conflicts (1956, 1967 and 1973)
- African conflicts in Ghana (1962) and Congo (1962)
- African conflicts following the granting of independence, e.g. Mozambique (1975) and Angola (1976).

The question asks for reasons rather than evidence and so candidates need to identify and, for the highest marks, evaluate different factors. These include:

- The establishment of an agreed, if informal division of power in Europe due to the creation of East and West Germany, NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Neither the USA nor USSR could spread their beliefs in other's sphere of influence in Europe without a major war. The only option remaining was the 3rd world
- Soviet ambitions to become a world superpower. It had already become a global naval power by 1962. USSR had established air and naval bases in Africa and the Middle East. It was looking for new bases and new trading partners
- Chinese ambitions to be the leader of third world communism. Sino-Soviet Split (1960 onwards) meant that China pursued a policy more independent and rebellious of Moscow. China's Great Leap Forward and Communes should be followed instead of Soviet version of industrialization and collectivization
- American determination to contain the ambitions of the USSR and the PRC. American belief that the Soviet Union and China worked together persisted after the Sino-Soviet split had developed. It was only with the advent of détente that the divisions between the USSR and China were accepted by the USA.
- NSC-68 and the Truman Doctrine forced the US into a global stance against the development of communism even where local regional conflicts were more to do with nationalism than support for global communism like Vietnam
- The end of the European empires in Africa and Asia and the ambitions of the new states.

'After 1960, the Cold War was fought in the Third World.' Discuss.

- **Meaning of the term 'Cold War'**. For example, "Cold War was the deterioration in relations between the West and the USSR, to an extent to which one side would try to subvert the existence of the other."
- **Definition of word 'fought'**. Propaganda and electronic surveillance are as much weapons of a cold war as are bombs and missiles.
- **Also the 'Third World' might need defining**. "The Third World is taken to mean Africa, the Middle East and Latin America and parts of Asia"

The easiest way of answering this question would be to list the major crises of the Cold War era

- Before 1960, there was the Korean War world (1950-53), 3rd world
- Arbenz overthrown in Guatemala (1953), 3rd world
- Hungary (1956), Europe
- **Afterwards came the** Berlin Wall (1961), Europe
- Cuban missile crisis (1962), 3rd world
- Intensification in Vietnam (1962-73), 3rd world
- Czechoslovakia (1968), Europe
- Overthrow of leftist Allende in Chile (1973), 3rd world
- Angola and Mozambique (1975-76), 3rd world
- Afghanistan (1979), 3rd world

- The installations of new intermediate nuclear missiles on either side of the Iron Curtain (SS20 and the Pershing/Cruise Missiles) in the early 1980's was also an important aspect of the Cold War (Europe)
- Thus there are exceptions on both sides of the 1960 divide. However after the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 there was less friction in Europe. Ostpolitik in the early 1970's and the Helsinki Agreements of 1975 meant the end of direct conflict in Europe.

GLOBALIZATION OF COLD WAR (SPECIFIC)

Paper 3

TIMELINE

1950-53

Korean War

1954

French surrender in Vietnam. American involvement begins in Vietnam

1956

Suez Crisis

1959

Castro overthrows Batista in Cuba

1961

Failed invasion of Bay of Pigs (Cuba)

1962

Cuban Missile Crisis

USSR becomes a global naval power

1967

Six Days war (Middle East)

1973

End of war in Vietnam (beginning of Détente)

Yom Kippur war (Middle East)

How far do you agree that none of the great powers involved in the Korean War had expansionist ambitions?

- 'None' shows that China is regarded as a great power, along with the USA and the USSR. The traditional Western view was that the two Communist great powers were behind the invasion of South Korea in June 1950 with the USSR taking the leading part. The West saw this as clear evidence of their expansionist ambitions.
- At the time, the USSR said that the attack was a defensive response to South Korean attacks on North Korea. The plans of General MacArthur, the leader of the UN force, could be seen as signs of American expansionism, except that Truman then chose to sack MacArthur and to keep the war a local one.
- Papers released since the end of the Cold War give a very different picture of the motives of the two Communist superpowers (those of the North Korean leader, Kim Il Sung, are a different matter). They show that Stalin and Mao were most reluctant to support North Korean plans to attack the South. Stalin did so only because he was persuaded that the US would not intervene. They also show that the reports of the South Korean attacks were fabricated.
- Furthermore, the intervention of Chinese 'volunteers' in October 1950 was more a defense of North Korea against the Western offensive of the time than of any intent to expand. Candidates can answer this question without necessarily knowing about the latest diplomatic papers.

Why did the USA become directly involved in the Korean War when the USSR did not?

➤ **The USA-**

- that the USA became directly involved in the Korean War as part of its containment policy (although Korea was not in Acheson's original defensive perimeter)
- Truman was convinced that the USSR was behind the North Korean attack on South Korea, and was afraid of repeating the error of appeasing Hitler
- Truman was facing domestic anti-communist public pressure made worse by the fall of China to communism and the fear of domino theory
- US foreign policy based on containment and NSC-68
- Truman also wanted to support the United Nations

➤ **The USSR**

- The USSR, unlike China, had no strategic interests in the Korean area and that Stalin's priority lay in Europe.
- He certainly had no wish to become embroiled in a direct war with the USA at a time when the Soviet Union was still recovering from the devastating effects of the Second World War.
- He only gave Kim permission to attack once he was convinced that America would take no action, and was quick to distance himself when the USA intervened
- USSR supplied weapons and military advisers to North Korea

➤ **Candidates may also mention the significance of China's involvement.**

Assess the relative contribution of the USA and the USSR to the outbreak and outcome of the Korean War.

- The USSR can be held responsible for the start of the Korean War through Stalin's encouragement of Kim Il Sung, of North Korea, in his attempt to reunify the peninsula by force in June 1953.
- During the war the USSR also supplied military material and advisers to the North. In determining Soviet involvement in the outcome of the war (a stalemate followed by a ceasefire) candidates may mention that the USSR supplied advisers and pilots to North Korea.
- Also, since 1991, it has been confirmed that Stalin supported Kim Il Sung's drive to unite the Korean peninsula under communism
- Acheson's speech gave Stalin reason to believe that the USA would not become involved and, therefore, encouraged him to support Kim Il Sung's aggression
- They may also state that it was only after death of Stalin that a ceasefire could be arranged, implying Soviet influence on the Northern war effort.
- They may also state that Soviet influence on the outcome diminished rapidly following the intervention of the People's Republic of China in late 1950.

- The USA can be held responsible for the outbreak of the war because of the mixed signals given to South Korea and the USSR about US resolve.
- Acheson's speech about the US defense perimeter in East Asia could be cited as an example.
- Once the war began US involvement, at first, prevented the fall of South Korea, involved the invasion of North Korea which led to Chinese intervention and US resolve forced a stalemate/ceasefire by 1953.

- Also candidates could mention that both Kim Il Sung and Syngman Rhee wanted to reunite the Korean peninsula under their own control so the conflict was, in essence, a civil war.

Finally, some candidates under-achieved because they did not assess the relative contribution of the superpowers to either the outbreak or outcome of the war. Instead they dealt with the involvement of the USA and the USSR completely separately

'Neither the USSR nor the USA gained anything from involvement in the Arab-Israeli Conflict from 1948 to the Camp David Accords.' How far do you agree?

- Following the nationalization of the Suez Canal and the subsequent crisis involving Britain, France and Israel, Soviet influence began to increase through economic and military aid to Egypt and Syria. From 1956, the USSR became the major supplier of military equipment to these states.
- In addition, through its influence in Egypt, Soviet influence developed in Yemen and South Yemen.
- By the 1960s, the USA was the main supporter of Israel and the USSR of Arab States such as Syria and Egypt.
- The Yom Kippur War of 1973 was the high water mark of this aspect of the conflict. The USA and USSR were heavily involved in both the supply of military equipment and in the diplomacy which brought the war to an end.
- However, candidates may state that in the earlier part of the conflict (1948–70) the conflict was more a regional conflict. At that stage, France was Israel's main supporter.
- This issue is illustrated by the Suez Crisis of 1956 where both the USA and the USSR condemned Anglo-French involvement.
- However in 1978–79 under the leadership of US President Carter, Sadat of Egypt and Begin of Israeli signed the Camp David Accords. This brought peace between Egypt and Israel. However, as a result of the Camp David Accords Soviet influence in Egypt diminished significantly.
- The diplomacy was a triumph for the USA and followed on from Kissinger's successful diplomacy at the end of the Yom Kippur War.

Assess the impact of the Cold War between the USA and the USSR upon the Arab-Israeli issue in the period 1956-79.

- Answers are likely to focus on key developments in the Arab-Israeli issue: the Suez crisis, where the Americans and the Soviets were on the same side in wanting to stop the Anglo-French-Israeli collusion to attack Egypt
- the Six Day War 1967 (which changed radically the nature of the Arab-Israeli issue)
- the Yom Kippur War 1973, where the superpowers followed the same, contradictory policy of rearming their client state(s) while also working to end the war
- And the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty (1979) based on the Camp David Accords (1978). There was also a little-known but not insignificant War of Attrition between Israel and Egypt in 1970. The general point about the question is that impact of the Cold War was complex and sometimes contradictory.
- Superpower rivalries made the main issue in the Middle East, the existence of Israel, harder to resolve.
- As the USA tended to side with Israel, so the USSR supported the Arabs, the so-called 'progressive forces'. This support from both superpowers usually involved the provision of the latest military hardware to both sides, which made them less willing to settle, more willing to risk war. This can be seen especially in the period preceding the Yom Kippur war. And once a war was over, the superpower usually rearmed its client state.
- On the other hand, certainly after the Six Day War, the Cold War was in its détente phase, which meant closer co-operation between the superpowers. Thus, paradoxically, they also worked side by side, if not always together, to try and improve Arab-Israeli relations. This happened with the Yom Kippur war.
- And relations with so-called 'client' states were never as simple as the image might suggest, as shown by the occasionally dramatic shift in Soviet-Egyptian relations.

To what extent did the reasons for, and nature of, American and Soviet intervention in the Middle East between 1956 and 1982, differ?

To achieve higher marks candidates are expected to address both aspects of the question. With reference to reasons:

- The USA initially wanted to prevent conflict in the region but increasingly became the backer of Israel, finally attempting to gain allies in the Arab world from 1970s, in particular Egypt and Jordan.
- USSR intervention was initially due to an attempt to increase influence in the Middle East by exploiting the Arab-Israeli conflict.
- In terms of the USA from 1956 to 1982, US policy was directed at preserving the state of Israel. Initially this was done diplomatically, as in the Suez Crisis but more significantly in ending the Yom Kippur War of 1973.
- The height of US diplomatic involvement came with the Camp David Accords of 1978 where US President Carter brokered a deal between Begin of Israel and Sadat of Egypt which led to end of war between these two states and the Israeli evacuation of Sinai.
- Also, from 1973, the USA replaced France as the main supplier of military equipment, in particular, military aircraft.
- Soviet involvement involved supplying economic aid to Arab states, in particular, providing expertise to Egypt in the building of the Aswan High Dam.
- However, the main form of Soviet involvement was the provision of military equipment and advice to Arab states increasingly throughout the period.

'Too little, too late.' Consider this view of US intervention in Vietnam

- 'too late', candidates may state that by 1963 the South Vietnamese state was on the verge of collapse. All that US intervention achieved was to delay the inevitable until 1975.
- The period of the French War and the 1954–63 periods allowed communist forces to consolidate themselves not only in North and South Vietnam but also Laos.
- In support of the view 'too little', candidates may state that US strategy was to fight a 'limited war' which did not utilize US military power effectively. Operation Rolling Thunder did not attack targets in Hanoi and Haiphong.
- It was not until the Linebacker raids of 1972 that full force of B52 raids on the North began to have a major effect on North Vietnam.
- Also the gradual build up of troops from 1965 to 1968 merely contained Viet Cong and NVA military activity – it didn't defeat it.
- To counter the argument candidates may state that the US followed the wrong military/diplomatic strategy; misunderstood the nature of the Vietnamese Civil War; failed to force the ARVN government to make necessary reforms to win 'hearts and minds' of the population.

Assess the relative contributions of America and the Soviet Union to the outcome of the Vietnam War

- Many candidates will provide a narrative of the war from start to finish. Better answers will focus on the outcome of the war in 1975, on the unification of Vietnam, north and south, following the withdrawal of US military forces. Almost certainly, answers will be imbalanced, the role of the USA receiving much greater coverage.
- Contributions are best considered under two main headings, military and political(including diplomacy), as follows:
- Military: US: Mistaken strategies, for both land and air war, bombing North Vietnam and extending war to Cambodia and Laos, followed by ineffective policy of Vietnamisation.
- USSR: Indirect military role, providing equipment, e.g. tanks.
- Political: US: Paris peace process and 'triangular diplomacy' under Nixon.
- USSR: Pressure on North Vietnam to come to the negotiating table.
- The context of détente as developed by Nixon and Kissinger is important understanding/explaining the outcome of the Vietnam War in the early and mid-1970s

'The outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962 was a victory for both the USA and USSR.' How far do you agree?

- Candidates will be expected to study the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. In support of the view that it was a victory for the USA candidates may mention that JFK was able to get Soviet missiles removed from Cuba, which was the main cause of the Crisis.
- JFK received considerable praise by the world's media at the time as being the victor in forcing the USSR to climb down.
- To counter this view the USSR were able to get US agreement to remove Jupiter missiles from Turkey and to receive an assurance from the USA that they would not invade Cuba.
- As a result the USSR removed a major threat to its own security and ensured the survival of a socialist country in Latin America.
- Crisis began a period of détente with the Partial Test Ban Treaty and the creation of the Molink between the Kremlin and the White House.

'The Cuban Missile Crisis was the inevitable result of US policy towards the Cuban Revolution.' How far do you agree?

- The Cuban Revolution of 1959 was initially welcomed by the USA
- But Castro's nationalisation of US enterprises resulted in CIA plans to topple him which culminated in the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961. Ill-fated attempts to remove Castro by force, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, along with the imposition of economic sanctions, forced Cuba to seek assistance from the USSR.
- It could be argued that American overreaction created the problem by turning Castro from a nationalistic freedom fighter into a staunch supporter of communism.
- However, in order to maintain balance, it was necessary to show that this alone would not have led to the missile crisis. The best responses provided an explanation of Soviet geopolitical motives in installing missiles on the island and Castro's own motives in seeking Soviet assistance and pledging himself and his country to communism.

Who was most responsible for causing the Cuban Crisis in 1962 – Castro, Kennedy or Khrushchev?

Candidates will be expected to display knowledge and understanding of the Cuban Crisis of 1962, and to deploy this in order to produce a reasoned argument as to who was most responsible.

Arguments which might be used could include

- **Castro:**
 - replaced a corrupt and inefficient American-backed regime
 - essentially a Liberal-Nationalist rather than a Communist
 - nationalized US-owned estates and factories
 - made economic agreements with USSR (e.g. sugar)
 - following Bay of Pigs and continued threats from USA, declared himself a Marxist and asked the USSR for military assistance
 - presence of a communist regime in the western hemisphere led to a major escalation of the Cold War
- **Kennedy:**
 - concerned that Cuba had become a communist state so close to USA
 - Eisenhower had endorsed Batista's corrupt and inefficient government, now Kennedy endorsed the Bay of Pigs fiasco
 - sank Cuban merchant ships
 - US troops instructed to carry out invasion exercises
 - when it became clear that USSR had placed missiles on Cuba, military advisers encouraged Kennedy to carry out air strikes
 - Kennedy was more cautious and turned to a blockade instead
 - historians split over Kennedy's actions – many have praised him for his cautious but effective approach; others have criticized him for not calling Khrushchev's bluff and taking stronger action
- **Khrushchev**
 - gave economic and, subsequently, military aid to Cuba

- installed missiles on Cuba
- clear threat to major US cities
- possible explanations of his motives could include the desire to gain the initiative in the nuclear arms race, retaliation for US missiles in Turkey, testing the new and inexperienced US president, gesture of solidarity with a fellow communist regime, bargaining tool regarding Berlin
- backed down first when he ordered Soviet ships to return
- US missiles removed from Turkey (but this had already been agreed anyway)
- Khrushchev heavily criticized in USSR

‘Khrushchev simply wanted to help protect a new and vulnerable Communist state’.
How valid is this explanation of Soviet policy towards Cuba in the period from 1960 to 1963?

The focus of the question is on the motives of Khrushchev in secretly installing intermediate nuclear missiles on Cuba in 1962. Candidates must analyze Khrushchev’s political, diplomatic, strategic and economic motives.

- The answer rests between an essentially defensive move in response to US aggression such as the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961 or an aggressive move towards the USA.
- The answer may link both: a defensive move misinterpreted by the USA as aggressive. Analyzing Soviet motives should go beyond merely installing missiles.
- It could also include aggressive moves towards Castro's Cuba by the USA from the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. The Bay of Pigs,
- the trade embargo from January 1962 and
- CIA attempts on Castro's life in Operation Mongoose.
- Khrushchev could be seen defending Cuba against imperialist America.
- A second context for the question could be the wider Cold War. Installation of missiles would give the USSR a stronger position in the global Cold War.
- Khrushchev could have miscalculated JFK's response because of the Berlin Wall crisis of 1961.
- A third context could be the Monroe Doctrine where USA saw all the Americas as within its sphere of influence

CRISIS OF COMMUNISM AND THE END OF COLD WAR

Paper 3

How far was the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 responsible for the collapse of the USSR in 1991?

Some candidates still see Eastern Europe as part of the USSR. They will often write about Poland and Ukraine and the Baltic states all in the same sentence. It is important that they know which came within the borders of the USSR and which did not. Eastern Europe was part of the (informal) Soviet empire but that is not the same as the USSR itself

- The causal relationship might be one of examples: the success of Eastern European dissidents in 1988-9 further encouraged fellow dissidents in the USSR, especially in the all-important Baltic states. They looked to Poland, East Germany and Czechoslovakia in 1988-89 and were encouraged to take their own independence.
- The failure of will of the communist governments of Eastern Europe further demoralized the communist leadership of the USSR.
- An additional factor might be the impact of large-scale Soviet troop withdrawals from Eastern Europe, which helped create further social and political problems in the USSR. The problem of accommodating returning soldiers put army-civilian relations under strain
- Some saw as a retreat without a defeat further weakened the authority and power of the army leadership. However, 1989 alone does not explain 1991.
- Other factors needed mentioning. They include: the rapidly deteriorating state of the Soviet economy
- the growing division within the CPSU leadership, as symbolized by the open rivalry between Gorbachev and Yeltsin. Eastern Europe could not have alone achieved independence if it hadn't been for Yeltsin, who by 1989-90 was working to subvert the existence of the USSR
- The incompetence of the old guard within the CPSU, as shown by the attempted coup of August 1991
- finally – and perhaps most importantly – the limitations of Gorbachev and the failure of his reforms
- Also Gorbachev abandoned the Brezhnev Doctrine which allowed peaceful revolution in Czechoslovakia and East Germany (glue which held eastern Europe that is the army was now removed)

To what extent did the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 make the collapse of the USSR unavoidable?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the collapse of the USSR, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the relative significance of the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe.

- In support of the view that the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe made the collapse of the USSR inevitable, candidates may mention:
 - the speed with which changes occurred throughout Eastern Europe following the success of Solidarity in Poland in 1988
 - communist governments were quickly removed in Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania
 - nationalist uprisings soon followed within the Soviet Union itself (e.g. Nagorno Karabatch, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia)
- However, it could be argued that events in Eastern Europe were a symptom rather than a cause of the collapse of the USSR:
 - Gorbachev's abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine meant that uprisings went unchallenged
 - his glasnost and perestroika reforms failed to solve the massive economic problems facing the USSR and encouraged nationalism and anti-communist sentiments internally
 - Candidates may counter this argument with reference to the long term ills of the Soviet economy. By the accession of Gorbachev matters had become so dire that his policies had little effect
 - external pressures from the USA (with SDI etc) added to the insurmountable problems facing the USSR

Which did more to cause the collapse of Soviet communism by 1991, developments inside or outside the USSR?

Developments inside the USSR include both

- short term causes, such as the policies of glasnost and perestroika and their consequences, and
- long term causes, such as the ambitious expansion of Soviet military power and the failure of Khrushchevism as a cause of decline which preceded collapse but the case must be argued

Developments outside the USSR include

- the collapse of Eastern Europe in 1989
- Various policies of the USA in particular, such as Reagan's plans for Star Wars.
- Another, often forgotten, is the slump in oil prices in the 1980s, which meant that the USSR, a major oil producer, had even less hard currency with which to fund its external commitments and internal reforms.
- Candidates also often blur the whole two years from 1989 to 1991, assuming that the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the USSR was one combined process. In fact, it is possible to argue that the end of communism in Eastern Europe was a significant cause of the end of Soviet communism in that the former showed how easily the communist system could fall, how communism had become intellectually and morally bankrupt. A more practical consequence of 1989 was that Soviet troops had to be brought home, which imposed even greater strains on an already disintegrating system. The USSR was on its last legs. It would have collapsed at some time in the 1990s. What candidates need to explain is why it collapsed sooner rather than later?

How far do you agree that the growth of nationalism within the USSR was the main cause of its collapse by 1991?

- Solidarity movement in Poland, the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia
- Fall of the Berlin Wall
- The rise of nationalism particularly in the Baltic States, Ukraine and the Caucasus. The decision of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to declare independence from the USSR had a catalytic effect on the rest of the USSR.
- Candidates may mention that by 1991 the Central Asia republics of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tadjikistan and Kirghizia had all declared autonomy from Moscow.
- Nationalism also explains why autonomous areas within the RSFSR, such as Tartarstan and Bashkirstan also sought independence. By August 1991, the USSR had virtually disintegrated along nationalist lines.
- However, candidates should also cite other factors such as the impact of the collapse of communist rule in Eastern Europe in 1989,
- the economic failures of the Soviet system
- The impact of the attempted Communist coup against Gorbachev. The immediate cause of the sudden collapse of the USSR in late 1991 was the refusal of several Union- Republics, including Russia, to accept a new federal treaty. Rather than do so, they decided to declare their independence. This path to independence was established by the Transcaucasian and Baltic Union- Republics, which broke away from CPSU control and then from the USSR in 1989-91. The attempted coup of August 1991, the exact details of which remain obscure, greatly accelerated the process

How important was the West in the collapse of the USSR by 1991?

Note that the question asks about the West and not just the USA. And 'collapse' can be gradual, if finally quick.

- Thus it is possible to include Willi Brandt's Ostpolitik of the 1970s because the consequent thaw in East-West relations undermined Soviet predominance in Eastern Europe, which in turn compounded its economic problems.
- However, the main focus will be on the role of the USA and especially on the policies of President Reagan – though Bush Senior also merits consideration. Reagan policy had two distinct elements: initially hard-line (until c1983) and then more conciliatory. During the 1st stage, the cost of matching the USA in both conventional and nuclear armaments was cited as an important cause of the Soviet Union's collapse
- The second stage encouraged (and was encouraged by) a similar approach by Gorbachev.
- Bush Senior's role was to intensify the co-operation with Gorbachev. Some argue that in 1989-91 Gorbachev gave more attention to relations with the West than he did to his domestic situation, which in part explained his fall and the Soviet Union's collapse.
- The disparity of lifestyles and wealth which were picked up via TV and radio in East Germany or by radio across the Soviet Bloc were given as examples of this phenomenon
- Most candidates will give more time to the Soviet causes of the Soviet collapse: the deteriorating economy, CPSU division and disarray (e.g. the role of Yeltsin) and the growth of the nationalities problem.
- The better answers must link their analysis to the collapse of the USSR in 1991; too often they write about perestroika and glasnost as if these policies are a sufficient explanation for the disintegration of the USSR

Explain the effects of the collapse of the USSR in the period 1985-1991 upon the foreign policy of the USA.

- Two aspects of the collapse affected US policy towards the USSR. One was the 'new thinking' that Gorbachev revealed in Soviet foreign policy in the late 1980's, as he unilaterally cut Soviet defenses and pushed hard for a new relationship with the USA.
- The second was the rapid disintegration of the USSR; especially in the period 1989-1991. Both developments required a response from the USA and enabled US initiatives in other areas, such as the Middle East.
- The US government of Reagan was right wing and thus is usually seen as cautious in its response to the initiatives of Gorbachev and Shevardnadze. (There are some historians who argue that Reagan began the policy of rapprochement in early 1984, following nuclear war scares in late 1983.) However summits at Geneva (1985) and Reykjavik (1986) established new relationships, thus resulting in the INF treaty (1987), a significant breakthrough.
- Reagan's successor, Bush Senior, was initially suspicious of Gorbachev but the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 caused him to accept the need to match Soviet concessions. The Malta summit (1989) led to two arms reduction treaties, CFE in 1990 and START 1 in 1991.
- In 1990 the two sides agreed to the reunification of Germany. The USA had eventually co-operated with the USSR in ending the Cold War. The new relationship greatly helped the USA building an international coalition to resist Iraqi aggression against Kuwait in 1990-1.
- In his response to the disintegration of the USSR, Bush was cautious. He did not provide Gorbachev with the massive financial aid he requested, mainly because Gorbachev was not dismantling the command economy quickly enough.
- Events unfolded rapidly in 1991, which meant that the USA could do little but watch, even though its response to the attempted coup of August was not as dismissive as it might have been.

How far was Ronald Reagan responsible for the end of the Cold War?

- Candidates will be expected to assess Reagan's role. They may state that his conventional arms buildup helped create major economic problems for the USSR to sustain its part of the arms race.
- Reagan also moved Pershing II and Cruise missiles into Europe in 1983 to make clear to the Soviet leadership that the USA was determined to contain and confront communism.
- Also Reagan's SDI created a new dimension to the arms race which the USSR could not match.
- The USSR was trying to find a way to end the arms race and the Cold War conflict that went with it (e.g. Afghanistan). One of the results was to force the Soviet economy into further difficulty, creating the need for Gorbachev to end the nuclear and conventional arms race in order to save the Soviet economy from collapse.
- Reagan's determination to hold out for major weapon concessions.
- However, later on Reagan was willing to work with Gorbachev to reduce nuclear weapons and ease Cold War tension.
- However, candidates may cite other factors such as the role of Gorbachev, George Herbert Bush and the declining quality of the Soviet economy.
- The most effective responses were able to show how the various factors which led to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the ending of the Cold War were inter-connected. This helped to explain why Gorbachev felt it necessary to carry out reforms, by explaining them in the context of a stagnating Soviet economy made worse by Reagan's stepping-up of the arms race and his determination to hold out for major weapon concessions

How far do you agree that the Sino-Soviet conflict was a consequence of the struggle between the two countries for leadership of the Communist world?

- The conflict began in 1960 when the USSR and China publicly fell out over various matters, one of which was a dispute about who could better claim to lead the Marxist world.
- The USSR based its claim on being the first Communist state, China on its adaptation of Marxism to the rural reality of Third World states.
- Policy differences, based in part on ideological differences, widened the rift. The USSR criticized the Great Leap Forward while China criticized peaceful coexistence with the West.
- Personal rivalries between Mao Zedong and Khrushchev only made matters worse. There was also a history of difficult relations between the CPSY and the CCP which stretched back to the 1920s.
- Finally, these adjacent great powers quarreled over (ill-defined) borders and resources.

How seriously did the Sino-Soviet conflict weaken the Communist bloc?

- The conflict became public knowledge in the West in 1960, when China criticized the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence at a Communist conference in Moscow.
- During the 1960s the split continued to widen until in 1969 clashes occurred between Soviet and Chinese troops. However, there had been tensions between the party leaderships of the two states since the 1920s and certainly since 1945, when Stalin had supported Chiang Kai-shek rather than the CCP.
- The rift between the two leading Communist states certainly weakened the unity of the Communist bloc. It did so in several ways. It enabled Kissinger and Nixon in 1969-73 to play one power off against the other and gain concessions from both, in terms of either arms control or trade.
- It diverted scarce military resources to defending their borders against each other.
- Finally, it enabled some minor communist states to break away from Soviet control, as in the case of Albania and Rumania.
- The rift also undermined the Soviet claim to be the only true interpreter of the Marxist faith. To many Third World communist leaders, China provided an attractive alternative model of a Marxist-Leninist state.

How seriously the communist bloc was weakened is much harder to assess. By 1989-91 the bloc had disintegrated and disappeared, leaving China as virtually the sole remaining communist state. That collapse was probably more a result of the weaknesses of the Soviet model of communism rather than of divisions within the bloc.

The other limitation of many answers was that they concentrated on explaining how the bloc was weakened rather than how seriously it was weakened. The difference is slight but significant. A full assessment of how seriously the bloc was divided requires some analysis of the nature of the bloc in the first place. It might have been the case that communism was less unified than might be suggested by the term 'bloc' and therefore the conflict did not result in a serious rift.

Assess the view that the success of China and the failure of the USSR to survive the crisis of the 1980's was due to the quality of political leadership?

Candidates have the opportunity to discuss the crises facing the world's largest communist states in the 1980's.

- In China the crisis was sparked by the impact of new, liberal economic policies which transformed the Chinese economy rapidly and led to demands for major political reform in 1988–89, culminating in the Tiananmen Square demonstrations and massacre.
- In the USSR the crisis developed because of the stagnation of the Soviet economy and attempts to reverse decline through the policies of glasnost and perestroika.
- Candidates may mention that Deng Xiao Ping showed resolute leadership through economic reforms which were bringing greater economic prosperity and in using the PLA to effectively crush political opposition in 1989. Clever and resolute leadership enabled Deng to maintain control of both the communist party and the army, which he was prepared to use in order to crush political opposition.
- Gorbachev, in contrast, failed to reverse the Soviet economic decline and failed to show resolute leadership in face of demands for political reform in Eastern Europe and the USSR in 1989–1991. He was also unable to maintain control of the Communist Party
- The best responses were able to demonstrate that the quality of political leadership was not the only factor which led to such different outcomes, stressing that Gorbachev also had to contend with problems such as nationalism, a major commitment in Afghanistan and the huge financial outlays necessitated by the nuclear arms race.

Why did Deng Xiaoping survive the 'crisis of communism' whilst Mikhail Gorbachev did not?

Candidates will be expected to show knowledge and understanding of the crises facing the world's largest communist states in the 1980s and to deploy this in order to compare and contrast what took place in China and USSR in order to reach a conclusion regarding the validity of the hypothesis. Relevant content could include:

- **Deng Xiaoping in China:**
 - The China crisis was mainly political
 - facing major socio-economic problems post-Mao–
 - developed 'Market Socialism' –
 - economic reforms, joining of IMF and WB, output increased–
 - A few protestors continued to call for the so-called 'Fifth Modernization' of democratic rights, first advocated at the time of the Democracy Wall in 1978. Initially he gave greater freedom – e.g. in religion, literature, the arts, Democracy Wall–
 - Further demonstrations followed in 1985-6 and then again in 1989, following the death of the liberal Communist leader Hu Yao-bang
 - clamped down when there were demands for greater political reform–
 - managed to maintain a balancing act between rival factions within CCP–
 - maintained control of the army–
 - able to survive Tiananmen Square by maintaining hard line and resolute leadership

- **Gorbachev in USSR:–**
 - The Soviet crisis was initially economic and soon political as well
 - tried to bring in economic and political reforms at same time–
 - economic reforms largely failed–
 - Aims and results of glasnost and perestroika– Too many, Gorbachev's domestic policies made a bad situation worse. His policies did not redress the economic decline of the USSR
 - gave greater freedoms – e.g. release of dissidents, greater freedom of press and media
 - greater democracy meant that CP lost its privileged position–
 - unable to control rival factions within CP–
 - Did not address problems in Eastern Europe in a resolute way – Sinatra Doctrine. This abandoned the Brezhnev Doctrine which sanctioned Soviet military intervention in Eastern Europe if the satellite governments of that region were threatened. As a result, the Sinatra Doctrine was an important factor in explaining the collapse of Soviet style regimes across central and eastern Europe in 1989
 - The Doctrine also fuelled the backlash to Gorbachev's policies by conservatives such as Ligachev. The August Coup of 1991, which led to the end of the USSR, was an attempt to reverse Gorbachev's reforming policies

Similarities

- both faced major social, economic and political problems and were willing to reform in order to address them
- If there is an event in the USSR specific to 1989 which can be offered alongside Tiananmen Square as a significant stage in the crisis, it is probably the 'Baltic Way' of 23 August 1989. On the 50th anniversary of the secret Nazi-Soviet agreement that the USSR should occupy the Baltic states, several million Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians protested against Soviet occupation by forming a human chain which stretched for 400 miles, linking their three capitals. This marked an important stage in nationalist resistance to Soviet rule.)

Differences

- Gorbachev tried to reform economic and political structures; Deng did the former, but restored total control over the latter after giving some initial political reforms
- The USSR was burdened with its east European empire and with the burden of a cold war arms race. China had neither.

'Deng Xiaoping's reforms created more problems than they solved in China.' How far do you agree?

This question offers candidates the opportunity to assess the impact of Deng's reforms.

- The economic reforms brought to an end the command economy of the Mao era. It involved creation of SEZ (Special Economic Zones) and TVEs (Town/village enterprises).
- Collectivization of agriculture came to an end.
- On the positive side, by 1991, China had begun a process of rapid industrialisation which increased economic wealth for China.
- However, it also causes mass migration to cities and led to inequalities in economic development between east and west China.
- Process also involved major increase in pollution.
- A major impact was the growth of opposition to communist rule, culminating in the Tiananmen Demonstrations of 1989

'Deng Xiaoping's move towards market socialism was both the cause of the crisis of Chinese communism and the reason why it survived.' How far do you agree?

Candidates will be expected to show knowledge and understanding of Deng Xiaoping's approach to the problems facing China, and to deploy this to show the effects of his reforms on the Chinese Communist Party and to test the validity of the hypothesis.

Content which might be used to show how 'market socialism' led to the crisis could include:

- reversal of changes made during Cultural Revolution – wanted a prosperous modern state
- Economic reforms – joined IBM and WB and accepted foreign loans, profit-sharing schemes etc. initial success, but then inflation grew etc.
- greater social freedoms – e.g. greater religious freedom, greater freedom for intellectuals in literature and the arts, Democracy Wall
- these changes led to demands for more radical reform – e.g. the right to criticize the government, representation for non-communist parties, freedom to travel abroad, abolition of communes
- reforms upset the traditional, conservative members of CCP
- student demonstrations in 1986 supporting Deng's 'four modernizations' but demanding greater democracy
- Many people, including Gorbachev, felt that it was impossible to have economic reform without political reform.
- Tiananmen Square 1989 – demanding political reform

Content which might be used to show how 'market socialism' helped CCP survive could include:

- Deng maintained control of CCP by balancing the various factions within it – e.g. replacement of the reformer Hu Yao Bang with Zhao Zi Yang, who was an economic reformer but not interested in political reform – after Tiananmen Square, Deng supported hard-liner Li Peng
- CCP retained support of the army which was used to disperse demonstrations
- international criticism, but Deng was convinced that one-party control was needed to supervise the transition to a 'socialist market economy'
- Gorbachev's experiences in USSR might seem to confirm that Deng was right
- counter arguments might suggest that CCP would have faced a crisis with or without Deng's 'market socialist' policies and that the CCP would have survived because of its hard line approach and control of the army

Which of the various policies followed by the Chinese governments in the 1980s was the most responsible for the crisis of Chinese communism which occurred in 1989?

- The crisis of Chinese communism in the late 1980s was the challenge to the authority of the Communist leadership. This challenge, essentially political, took the form of demonstrations, mainly in Beijing, which culminated in the massacre of Tiananmen Square in 1989 and demonstrations in various Chinese cities in the following few days.
- The protests came about following the death in April 1989 of Hu Yaobang, the former Communist party leader who had been dismissed for being too liberal. The Chinese authorities made several misjudgments in dealing with what was initially a relatively small scale protest as they debated whether to conciliate or to crush: firstly, they labeled the demonstration as 'turmoil', seemingly insignificant, but it meant that the protestors had to stay to avoid facing punishment; secondly, two weeks later they announced but could not enforce martial law.
- Two weeks after that, faced with growing and continuing protests, the authoritarians persuaded Deng Xiao-ping, the key figure, of the need to restore order and the tanks went in. For more details, see *The Tiananmen Papers* by Andrew Nathan and Perry Link (2001).
- These short term events took place because China was undergoing major social and economic change, mainly as a result of the 'four modernizations' introduced by Deng since 1978. These reforms resulted in inflation, economic insecurity and more obvious corruption. Without these developments, the crisis of the summer of 1989 would not have occurred as it did.
- Most of the 'pro-democracy' protestors were middle class students, wanting limited political liberalization. The authorities became more alarmed when working class groups started to join the protests.
- Thus the focus of the question is on the relative importance of, on one side, the immediate decisions taken by the party leadership in the summer of 1989 and, on the other, the longer term policies followed by the CCP

How far do you agree that 'the crisis of Chinese communism in the 1980s seriously threatened the authority of the Chinese Communist Party'?

- The crisis of Chinese communism reached its climax with the Tiananmen Square demonstrations and massacre in June 1989. The crisis began in the 1970s, as the Communist leadership liberalized, if not completely, the agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy.
- By the mid-1980s, the leadership was divided over whether it should liberalize Chinese politics as well. Therefore, the crisis of communism had two aspects: in the country and within the leadership.
- The death of the liberal (and sacked) CCP leader Hu Yaobang, in early 1989 brought the two crises together, with large-scale demonstrations in Beijing. Demonstrations were crushed by the government.

How serious were the twin crises? The crisis in the country had grown in support since May 1989. It gained support in at least 132 cities. These demonstrations were crushed by the army. The final phase was the Tiananmen massacre in June 1989.

NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

Paper 3

Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963) is a treaty prohibiting all test detonations of nuclear weapons except underground. It was developed both to slow the arms race (nuclear testing was, at the time, necessary for continued nuclear weapon advancements), and to stop the excessive release of nuclear fallout into the planet's atmosphere.

The **Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1968)**, is a landmark international treaty whose objective is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament. Opened for signature in 1968, the Treaty entered into force in 1970

SALT I (1972) froze the number of strategic ballistic missile launchers at existing levels, and provided for the addition of new submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) launchers only after the same number of older intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and SLBM launchers had been dismantled.

The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM Treaty 1972) was a treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems used in defending areas against missile-delivered nuclear weapons.

SALT II (1979) was the first nuclear arms treaty which assumed real reductions in strategic forces to 2,250 of all categories of delivery vehicles on both sides. SALT II helped the U.S. to discourage the Soviets from arming their third generation ICBMs of SS-17, SS-19 and SS-18 types with many more Multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs). The SALT II Treaty banned new missile programs (a new missile defined as one with any key parameter 5% better than in currently deployed missiles), so both sides were forced to limit their new strategic missile types develop.

The Geneva Summit of 1985 was a Cold War-era meeting. The two leaders met for the first time to hold talks on international diplomatic relations and the arms race. They talked outside for about two hours on the Strategic Defense Initiative, but both stood firm. Gorbachev accepted Reagan's invitation to the United States in a year, and Reagan was invited to do the same in 1987. On the second day, Reagan went after human rights, saying that he did not want to tell Gorbachev how to run his country, but that he should ease up on emigration restrictions. Gorbachev claimed that the Soviets were comparable to the United States and quoted some feminist extremists. They did agree on a joint statement.

The Reykjavik Summit (1986) was a summit meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev. In 1986 Reagan had proposed banning all ballistic missiles, but wanted to continue research on the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) that could potentially be shared with the Soviets. Yet Soviet suspicion of SDI continued, At Reykjavik, Reagan sought to include discussion of human rights, emigration of Soviet Jews and dissidents, and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. However, Gorbachev sought to limit the talks solely to arms control. The Soviets also proposed to eliminate 50% of all strategic arms, including ICBMs, and agreed not to include British or French weapons in the count. All this was proposed in exchange for an American pledge not to implement strategic defences for the next ten years, in accordance with SALT I. But the talks failed.

The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) is a 1987 agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. The treaty eliminated nuclear and conventional ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with intermediate ranges, defined as between 500-5,500 km (300-3,400 miles).

The Malta Summit (1989) comprised a meeting between U.S. President George H. W. Bush and U.S.S.R. leader Mikhail Gorbachev, taking place between, just a few weeks after the fall of the Berlin Wall. It was their second meeting following a meeting that included then President Ronald Reagan, in New York in December 1988. During the summit, Bush and Gorbachev would declare an end to the Cold War, although whether it was truly such is a matter of debate.

The original Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) (1990) was negotiated and concluded during the last years of the Cold War and established comprehensive limits on key categories of conventional military equipment in Europe (from the Atlantic to the Urals) and mandated the destruction of excess weaponry. The treaty proposed equal limits for the two "groups of states-parties", the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact.

START 1 (1991) (bush and Gorbachev). The treaty barred its signatories from deploying more than 6,000 nuclear warheads atop a total of 1,600 ICBMs, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and bombers.

START II (1993) (for **Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty**). It was signed by United States President George H. Bush and Russian President Boris Yeltsin on 3 January 1993. It banned the use of multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs) on intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).

Analyze the reasons why the nuclear arms race between the superpowers ended in the 1980s.

- One school of thought would focus on the individuals involved: either Gorbachev or Reagan or both.
- Some might include the opponents of nuclear weapons, people who had demonstrated, especially in the early 1980s, against further escalation of nuclear weapons, but there is little evidence to link them with arms reductions at the end of the decade.
- Another approach would be to consider the various practical factors that ended the nuclear arms race, for example the Strategic Defense Initiative, more usually called Star Wars. The two key treaties, INF (1987) and START 1 (1991) were more consequences of decisions to end the arms race rather than their causes.
- One school of thought would argue that Gorbachev and Shevardnadze, with their 'new thinking', made the running at meetings such as Reykjavik in 1986. This particular meeting, though seen as a failure at the time, was a significant turning point. Both sides became convinced that the other was serious about disarmament and thus a degree of trust was established.
- Another, less well-known, school argues that Reagan made the first moves to renew detente as early as the start of 1984, in part because he came to fear the risk of an accidental nuclear war. He was also in the stronger position, mainly because increased defense expenditure, especially on Star Wars. Some, especially on the American right, argue that the USA used its superior economic and research resources to force the USSR to give up the nuclear arms race.
- Whatever the exact combination of reasons, the USA became willing to halt the nuclear arms race. Gorbachev wanted to do so because the Soviet economy was in a state and he also wanted to end the danger of a nuclear war.

Compare and contrast the SALT treaties and the START treaties as means of controlling nuclear weapons.

- There were two SALT treaties, SALT I (1972) and SALT II (1979), the latter never being ratified by the US Senate. However future US governments did observe SALT II as long as the USSR did so.
- There have been two START treaties, START I (1991) and START II (1993), the latter not yet being ratified by the Russia Duma. Both SALT treaties halted the nuclear arms race by limiting the number of strategic missiles; however they did not limit the number of warheads each missile could carry.
- The USSR continued to increase its nuclear warheads. (The USA's fell.)
- Both START treaties reduced the number of strategic nuclear weapons held by the two superpowers, START I by 50% for the USSR and 35% for the USA and START II to a maximum of 3500 by 2007.
- However a full answer to the question requires assessing the various treaties 'as means of controlling nuclear weapons'. Further definitions are needed: to control just the number of weapons held by the two superpowers? To control the use of nuclear weapons? To control the danger of nuclear war? To control the spread of nuclear weapons?
- Once these various dimensions are identified, then the value of the various treaties can more accurately be assessed. ((START II and the implementation of START I fall outside the dates of the syllabus; however both treaties are mentioned in the specification)).

How successful were attempts to control the nuclear arms race between the superpowers in the period from 1960 to 1980?

The treaties on which all answers will be based are:

- Partial Test Ban Treaty 1963
- Non-Proliferation Treaty 1968
- SALT I 1971 (and SALT II 1979, which though never ratified, was acted on)
- ABM Treaty 1972 of the nuclear arms, vertical (between the superpowers) and horizontal (including other great powers), the second is not strictly relevant.
 - The key treaties are those signed in the 1970's. Neither SALT nor the ABM Treaty stopped the nuclear arms race. They did not really slow it down. There was no limit on the number of missiles either power could build.
 - However, the treaties did control the race in that they brought to it a degree of order which had not existed before.
 - The technological innovations of Multiple Independently targeted Return Vehicles (MIRVs) and ABMs made it possible that one side might gain a significant advantage and thus launch a surprise attack on the other. SALT and ABM prevented this, ensured that both remained vulnerable, and thus embedded the doctrine of mutually assured destruction.

Discuss the view that in the period 1950 to 1980, the nuclear arms race did more to stabilize the Cold War than to destabilise it

- Candidates could mention that by the late 1950s the concept of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) did much to stabilize the Cold War. The development of two vast nuclear arsenals meant that the USA and USSR could not confront each other directly in a military conflict.
- However, the nuclear arms race could be seen as destabilizing with developments such as Antiballistic missile systems (ABMS) which threatened to undermine MAD and, thus, increase tension between the two Super Powers.
- However, many candidates may cite the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962 as offering the best example of the destabilizing effect of nuclear weapons.
- Or on the contrary Cuban Crisis led to a period of détente as Mutually Assured Destruction dawned upon US and USSR
- Candidates may also mention that the nuclear arms race forced both Super Powers into fighting surrogate wars (e.g. Vietnam, Angola etc) which had a destabilizing effect.

'From 1968 to 1988 attempts to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons were more successful than attempts to reduce them.' How far do you agree?

- Candidates have the opportunity to assess the success of non-proliferation following the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty of 1968.
- Candidates may mention that neither China nor France would sign the treaty.
- Also by 1989 India, South Africa and Israel had joined the nuclear club with Pakistan developing nuclear capability.
- Compared to this the attempts to reduce nuclear weapons had mixed results. The growth of intermediate forces increased with the deployment of Pershing II and Cruise missiles by the USA and SS20s by the USSR.
- However, the SALT I and SALT II treaties limited ABM systems. Finally, the INF Treaty of 1988 showed that reduction was ultimately more successful than non-proliferation.

'Attempts to control the development of nuclear weapons between 1949 and 1980 were largely ineffective.' How far do you agree?

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that, despite various attempts to impose controls, there was a constant build up of nuclear weapons by both the USA and the USSR, whilst other countries also developed nuclear capability (e.g. UK, France, China). Evidence might include:

- USSR's development of atomic bomb 1949, which led the USA to vastly increase its own expenditure on arms (Massive Retaliation)
- development of hydrogen bombs (USA 1952, USSR 1953)
- USSR's development of ICBM, with USA quickly following suit
- later development of SLBMs, ABMs and MIRV
- failings of various treaties – e.g. Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963), banning of nuclear tests in space (1967), Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968), SALT Treaties of the 1970s

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that these treaties did have some positive effects e.g.:

- very few states (e.g. India, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea) are non-signatories of the NNPT
- Iran (a signatory) has made progress on its nuclear programme
- SALT Treaties did impose limits on certain types of weapons and could be seen as a vital precursor to subsequent, and more effective, treaties (e.g. START)
- greater effectiveness of attempts to control nuclear weapons during periods of detente (e.g. 1970s)

Which did more to control the growth of nuclear weapons – the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 or the SALT Treaties of the 1970s?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of attempts to control the growth of nuclear weapons in the 1960s and 1970s, and to deploy this in order to engage in comparative analysis in order to evaluate the impact of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the SALT Treaties respectively.

➤ **The Non-Proliferation Treaty:**

- aimed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons outside those countries already in possession of them
- nuclear states would assist non-nuclear states in the development of civilian nuclear power and agreed to make their best efforts to agree on measures of nuclear disarmament
- largely effective, but France refused to sign the Treaty, and by 1991 both Israel and South Africa had developed nuclear weapons, whilst India and Pakistan were developing capacity for them
- (more recently, North Korea has withdrawn from the Treaty and Iran (a signatory) has made progress on its nuclear programme)

➤ **SALT Treaties:**

- limited the development of ABMs
- did not halt the nuclear arms race (e.g. USSR – SS20; USA – Pershing II and Cruise)
- SALT II never ratified by USA because of USSR's involvement in Afghanistan
- since USA and USSR had the largest nuclear weapon arsenals, SALT Treaties did limit the number of nuclear weapons more than NPT
- SALT Treaties can be seen as a vital precursor of subsequent START talk

Who or what was responsible for the acceleration of the nuclear arms race in the 1950s and 1960s?

- **'Who' can include the leadership, both political and military, of the USA and the USSR.**
 - For the Americans, Truman, Eisenhower, Dulles and Lemay (head of Strategic Air Command) are the leading players.
 - For the USSR, Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev would seem to be the key figures.

- **'What' might include military doctrines such as**
 - massive retaliation (Eisenhower & Dulles from 1954) and policy statements such as NSC-68.
 - It could also include technological developments such as the development of long range bombers in the 1950's
 - ICBMs towards the end of 1950's. These meant that all areas of USSR and USA were now under threat
 - SLBMs (submarine launched ballistic missiles) in the early 1960's. These missiles were very difficult to detect as time period for their detection was very small as they could be launched near the coast
 - The development of MIRV's in the early 1970's. A multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicle (MIRV) warhead is a collection of separate warhead. It provides greater target damage for a given missile payload and reduces the effectiveness of an anti-ballistic missile system that relies on intercepting individual. They were considered destabilizing because they tended to put a premium on striking first
 - It could also be argued that events often helped accelerate the nuclear arms race, the Korean War and the Cuban missile crisis being the most obvious examples.
 - Finally, psychological factors played their part; mutual suspicion and mistrust caused both sides to accelerate arms production to close imagined bomber and missile gaps. For example in the late 1950s, the USA (mistakenly) saw the Soviets overtaking them and actually pulling ahead, thereby causing a 'missile gap'. Thus the USA (a) rapidly expanded its ICBMs and (b) changed its nuclear warfare strategy to 'assured destruction' (MAD) in a second strike

Thus there should be plenty of opportunities for well prepared candidates to use their knowledge, understanding and analytical skills. Reward above all an ability to place relevant factors into some kind of hierarchy of importance.

How and why did the USA's nuclear deterrence strategies develop between 1954 and 1967?

Candidates will be expected to show knowledge and understanding of the USA's nuclear deterrence strategies, and to deploy this to show how and why they changed in the period from 1954 to 1967.

Relevant content could include:

- **Massive Retaliation (1954):**
 - Massive retaliation was the response of the new Eisenhower administration to (a) the lessons of the Korean War and (b) the increasing number and types of nuclear weapons. Containment was essentially a reactive policy, one which gave *the* initiative to the communists. It meant that the USA could not use its superiority in nuclear weapons. Dulles, the Secretary of State felt it necessary to threaten the USSR and China with the possibility of an all-out attack by American nuclear forces. This was the only way of effectively containing Communism. It was also cheaper than maintaining huge conventional forces.
 - USSR developed atom bomb, so USA developed hydrogen bomb in 1952 – USSR achieved this in 1953
 - USA remained ahead in number of weapons, but USSR took lead in 1957 with development of ICBMs – USA followed suit with Atlas
 - USA developed shorter range Jupiter missiles with launching sites in Europe and Turkey
 - USSR launched sputnik in 1958; USA followed suit

- **Mutually Assured Destruction (1964):**
 - response of the new Kennedy administration to the expansion of both US and Soviet strategic nuclear weapons in the late 1950s and early 1960s
 - It refined the strategy of deterrence by saying that the destruction of the USSR would occur, should it launch a nuclear attack on the USA. It was a strategy aimed at preventing nuclear war rather than fighting one
 - Cuban crisis revealed the full extent of the danger of nuclear war
 - Nuclear weapons now seen as creating stability due to balance of power
 - Nuclear Test Ban Treaty 1963
 - USA developed SLBMs in the 1960's (Polaris and Poseidon)
 - USSR developed their own stockpile of ICBMs and SLBMs – wanted to pressure USA into limiting arms build-up
 - USA had less to spend on nuclear weapons (e.g. cost of Vietnam War) – USSR catching up with USA's stockpile
 - The doctrine later became labeled as mutually assured destruction (MAD) because the USA accepted the idea of some kind of nuclear parity with the USSR

- **Flexible Response (agreed by NATO 1967):**
 - originally developed under Kennedy
 - need for conventional weapons
 - Allies in NATO were very suspicious of US nuclear strategy and on two counts. One was the problem of extended deterrence: would America be willing to risk the destruction of the USA in order to defend Western Europe against a Soviet attack? The other was the possibility that an all-out nuclear war would result in the immediate destruction of Europe. Eventually, in 1967, at the height of the Vietnam war, the USA persuaded its NATO allies of the benefits of flexible response (of which MAD was a part). The allies

never accepted the implications of such a strategy, namely the need to expand their conventional forces. Thus it was some five years before they reluctantly approved flexible response.

- Massive retaliation left the U.S. with only two choices: defeat on the ground or the resort to the use of nuclear weapons. Flexible response as coming between massive retaliation and assured destruction. The strategy was an attempt by the incoming Kennedy administration to provide an alternative to the 'overkill' of massive retaliation. It involved the use of 'conventional' as well as nuclear forces. The theory was that once a political crisis became a military conflict, the American response to Soviet military moves would be proportionate

Direct defense: In case of a conventional Soviet attack (meaning non-nuclear or this would be considered a first strike) initial efforts would be to try and stop the Soviet advance with conventional weapons. This meant that the foreseen Soviet attack on West-Germany would be tried to be forced to a halt by NATO's European forces, Allied Command Europe.

Deliberate Escalation: This phase was entered when conventional NATO forces were succumbing under the Soviet attack. This was actually expected as intelligence indicated Soviet divisions outnumbered NATO divisions by far. In this phase NATO forces would switch to a limited use of nuclear weapons, such as recently developed tactical nuclear weapons (like nuclear artillery).

General Nuclear Response: This was the last phase or stage which more or less corresponded to the mutual assured destruction scenario, meaning the total nuclear attack on the Communist world. If the Soviets had not already done so, this would make them switch to all-out attack as well.

Analyze the impact of the nuclear arms race on the Cold War during the period 1950-1980.

- The superpowers raced each other perhaps only from the later 1950s, when the USA (mistakenly) saw the Soviets overtaking them and actually pulling ahead, thereby causing a 'missile gap'. Thus the USA (a) rapidly expanded its ICBMs and (b) changed its nuclear warfare strategy to 'assured destruction' (MAD) in a second strike.
- For MAD to be effective, neither side had to have a surprise advantage. Thus some kind of limits on weapons was needed. Hence the controls on nuclear testing and weapons proliferation in the 1960s and on the expansion of nuclear weapons, SALT I and II and the ABM treaty, all in the 1970s.
- To use the analogy of a race, in the 1970s the superpowers agreed to slow the race to a virtual stop. New weapons technologies continued to be developed, causing a second-level crisis in the late 1970s and the USSR installed intermediate range SS20s in Eastern Europe. In December 1979 NATO decided to install Cruise missiles, a few weeks before the USSR invaded Afghanistan.
- In the 1960s and most of the 1970s, both sides accepted limitations mainly because of their experience of the one surprise of nuclear arms, the deployment of Soviet missiles to Cuba in 1962. The crisis which followed showed how close the risk of a nuclear conflict was.
- This crisis could be used to distinguish between the short term and long term effects of the arms race; in the short term, it made the Cold War much more dangerous, thereafter it brought about the relaxation of tension known as détente.

'That so few states had nuclear weapons in 1991 is evidence of the success of the nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty of 1968.' Discuss.

- By 1991, the states with nuclear weapons were the declared nuclear powers, the Big 5, and the undeclared, South Africa, Israel and India. (South Africa scrapped its weapons in 1993-4.) Iraq, Iran and North Korea were trying to build their own nuclear weapons.
- By 1991 India, Pakistan and Israel, along with France and China had not signed the NNPT. (France and China did so the following year.)
- Virtually all other sovereign states had signed the treaty.
- The NNPT distinguished between nuclear and non-nuclear states. All non-nuclear states (NNS) were to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only and would be subject to full inspection by the IAEA in order to ensure observance.
- Three nuclear powers –USA, UK, and USSR – agreed to use the UN to protect NNS against the threat of nuclear attack.
- The nuclear powers also accepted that they would scrap their nuclear weapons; the ultimate aim of the NPT is a world free from nuclear weapons.
- More recently, North Korea has withdrawn from the Treaty and Iran (a signatory) has made progress on its nuclear programme
- It could be argued that bilateral treaties such as START are moves towards this goal, if belated and limited.

'By the 1980s the USSR was losing the nuclear arms race.' How did this affect the Cold War?

- By 1970s the USSR spent between 15% and 20% of GDP on defense. This compares to approx 6% of GDP spent by the USA.
- From the accession of President Reagan anew arms race began, started by the USA. The SDI and the deployment of Cruise and Pershing II missiles in west Europe increased Soviet military buildup.
- Even with the INF Treaty of 1987 the USSR couldn't match US spending. The failure of the USSR to compete with US military spending on nuclear weapons and their delivery systems was a major factor in forcing Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, to get arms control agreements in Geneva and Iceland.
- This eventually led to the INF treaty of 1987 and subsequent treaties on limiting nuclear weapons between the two superpowers. The failure of the USSR to compete in the nuclear arms race was a major factor in bringing the Cold War to an end.
- Candidates, however, could also mention the increasing difficulties the USSR had in controlling Eastern Europe and failure of reforms of Gorbachev

How successful were international efforts in the period 1963 to 1991 to control nuclear weapons?

Candidates can refer to both arms control and arms limitation.

- **In 1963 the Partial Test Ban Treaty** established limitations on the testing of nuclear weapons. However, it did not include France and China, who acquired nuclear weapons during the 1960s.
- **In 1968 the Non-Proliferation Treaty** attempted to control the increase in nuclear weapons. France and China did not sign and by 1991 other states had acquired nuclear weapons such as Israel, India and South Africa. Also by 1991 Pakistan was developing a nuclear capability. Iraq, Iran and North Korea were trying to build their own nuclear weapons. By 1991 India, Pakistan and Israel, along with France and China had not signed the NNPT. (France and China did so the following year.) Virtually all other sovereign states had signed the treaty.
- The NNPT distinguished between nuclear and non-nuclear states. All non-nuclear states (NNS) were to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only and would be subject to full inspection by the IAEA in order to ensure observance.
- Three nuclear powers –USA, UK, and USSR – agreed to use the UN to protect NNS against the threat of nuclear attack.
- The nuclear powers also accepted that they would scrap their nuclear weapons; the ultimate aim of the NPT is a world free from nuclear weapons.
- More recently, North Korea has withdrawn from the Treaty and Iran (a signatory) has made progress on its nuclear programme
- Thus, non proliferation was only partially successful.

- In terms of arms control the **SALT I and SALT II** treaties of the 1970s limited the development of ABM systems.
- However, **Reagan's SDI programme of 1980s** increased tension between the superpowers and led to increase in the USSR's nuclear arsenal.
- However, the **START talk of the 1980s and the INF Treaty** marked first real attempt to reduce nuclear weapons held by superpowers

Assess the impact of the nuclear arms race on the development of the Cold War from 1949 to 1989.

This question offers candidates the opportunity to assess the role of nuclear weapons in the development of the Cold war.

- The nuclear arms race led to the development of massive retaliation 1954, MAD (mutually assured destruction) 1964 and flexible response 1967.
- It also prevented the two superpowers from direct military confrontation, except for Cuba in October 1962.
- It also forced the two superpowers to develop ways of limiting the possibility of a nuclear war: the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty of 1968; SALT1 and 2, START1 and 2 and the ABM treaty.
- As a result of the nuclear 'stand-off' between the two superpowers, they became involved in proxy wars in areas such as Vietnam, Angola and the Horn of Africa.
- This also led to the development of naval and air bases across the globe by both superpowers, leading to superpower involvement in Africa and Asia.