This document contains a selection of past paper questions that are relevant to the new syllabus – you should complete some from every section as part of your revision. Remember to review the syllabus carefully; you will have only two questions to choose from and therefore need to be well prepared in all aspects.

The questions in red do not have mark scheme comments available (new parts of the syllabus).

Once you have planned (see website for Dead Fish Frame) or written each essay you can scroll to the bottom of the document to see the comments from the IB marks scheme.
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| **PAST PAPER QUESTIONS** |
| **1. RIVALRY MISTRUST AND ACCORD**  ***a) The Breakdown of the Grand Alliance (i.e. Origins of Cold War):***  1. “Post-war enmity was the product of longer term ideological differences.” To what extent do you agree with this statement on the origins of the Cold War up to 1949?  2. Evaluate the importance of each of the following in the breakdown of East–West relations, 1945–1949: the Potsdam Conference; the sovietization of Eastern and Central Europe; the Marshall Plan.  3. “The Potsdam Conference marked the end of the wartime alliance and laid the foundations for post-war hostility.” With reference to the period up to 1949, to what extent do you agree with this statement?  4. Examine the reasons for, and the impact in Europe of, the formation of NATO.  5. To what extent did decisions about post-war Germany contribute to the breakdown of East–West relations between 1945 and 1949?  6. “Stalin and Truman were equally responsible for the outbreak of the Cold War”. To what extent do you agree? |
| ***b) The US, USSR and China -Superpower relations 1947-79: Containment, Peaceful Co-existence; Sino-Soviet and Sino-US relations; Détente.***  7. For what reasons, and with what results, did Sino–Soviet relations deteriorate after 1953?  8. Analyse the reasons for, and results of, the adoption and expansion of the doctrine of containment up to 1962.  9. Analyse the reasons for, and the impact of, changes in US–Chinese relations in the 1970s.  10. Assess the achievements and limitations of détente between 1969 and 1979.  11. To what extent was there a ‘thaw’ in relations between 1953-1960? |
| ***c) Confrontation and Reconciliation: Reasons for the end of the Cold War 1980-1991; ideological challenges and dissent; arms race; economic problems:***  12. “The Cold War came to an end due to the hard-line approach of Ronald Reagan’s policies in the early 1980s.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?  13. “The Cold War came to an end due the policies of Glasnost and Perestroika”. To what extent do you agree with this statement? |
| **2. LEADERS AND NATIONS**  ***a) The Impact of two Leaders (each from a different region) on the Course and Development of the Cold War***  6. “Stalin and Truman were equally responsible for the outbreak of the Cold War”. To what extent do you agree?  14. Compare and contrast the role of two Cold War leaders in the heightening of tensions during the Cold War. |
| ***b) The Impact of the Cold War on two Nations (excluding the US & USSR)***  15. With reference to two states (excluding the United States and the USSR), examine the economic impact of the Cold War.  16. Compare and contrast the impact of the Cold War on two different states (excluding the USA and USSR)  17. “The Cold War transformed the lives of ordinary people”. With reference to one country (excluding the USA and the USSR), analyse this statement. |
| **3. COLD WAR CRISES**  **a) Cold War Crises Case Studies: Detailed Case Studies of any two Cold War Crises from different regions**  18. Compare and contrast the reasons for, and results of, two Cold War Crises.  19. “Brinkmanship was an effective deterrent to escalation.” With reference to two examples, assess the validity of this statement. |

\**The Mark Schemes are all covered by the statement* ***“Do not expect candidates to discuss all or most aspects of the mark scheme. There is also a vast range of other materials that could be included and this should be rewarded equally”.*** *Some of the mark scheme comments­­­­­ are also frustratingly brief.*

|  |
| --- |
| **MARK SCHEMES** |
| **1. “Post-war enmity was the product of longer term ideological differences.” To what extent do you agree with this statement on the origins of the Cold War up to 1949?**  The differences in ideology of the protagonists in the Cold War could be defined/explained at the outset: the belief systems associated with the East and West represented by the USSR and the USA. Without clear identification and awareness of what constituted “differences” answers are unlikely to prove effective. Candidates may refer to the issues of political pluralism (or lack thereof), economic organization, the question of what constituted civil liberties, etc.  The division between the capitalist/democratic and the socialist worldview which was evident during the years following the Second World War existed earlier – though the intensity of struggle and confrontation was less marked. Candidates are required to examine when and why enmity, resulting in the Cold War, originated.  Some candidates may trace the enmity back to 1917 and the Bolshevik Revolution which produced a state whose ideology was antithetical to that of Western nations, noting the levels of mutual suspicion which characterized the relationship from then up until the Second World War where mutual suspicion was replaced by a “marriage of convenience” to defeat a greater enemy. Apart from ideology, candidates may argue that it was the power vacuum established by the defeat of Germany which led to what became known as the Cold War. The vacuum produced, and the prospect of rewards in economic and strategic terms, could be seen as setting the scene for confrontation. The issues of changing attitudes due to leadership change in 1945, mutual fear in the new atomic age, and the search for security could all be examined.  Regurgitation of historiography: that is summarizing of historians’ interpretations (Traditionalist/Revisionist/Post Revisionist views, etc) is not what is required. Such views should be used to supplement historical detail, not to replace it. |
| **2. Evaluate the importance of each of the following in the breakdown of East–West relations, 1945–1949: the Potsdam Conference; the sovietization of Eastern and Central Europe; the Marshall Plan.**  The invitation to “evaluate” invites candidates to comment upon the relative importance of the given issues and candidates who do so should be rewarded.  Often candidates provide “template”, learned responses which outline the origins of the Cold War from 1917 and then launch into descriptions of schools of historiographical interpretation. This is not the focus of the task.  Accurate details of each of the issues are important as the basis for successful consideration of the importance/significance of the issues/factors.  Potsdam occurred in July/August 1945 – after the unconditional surrender of Germany, but before the end of the war against Japan. It followed on from the earlier Yalta Conference of February 1945. Issues raised at Yalta were to prove contentious at the Potsdam meeting. The question of what to do with Germany (politically and economically), the growing antagonism over arrangements for Poland – and indeed conflicting interpretations of the Declaration on Liberated Europe – led to mutual suspicion, especially with the new line up of leaders at Potsdam. News of the successful testing of the atomic weapon arguably led Truman to take a more uncompromising stance than his presidential predecessor. The failure of US leaders to collaborate with the USSR in the development of such a weapon and the manner in which its existence was revealed at Potsdam has led to claims that the Soviet Union saw such a weapon (and its subsequent use against Japan) as a veiled threat. Relations at Potsdam marked a deterioration in the relationship among members of the Grand Alliance, whose raison d’être had been called into question after Germany’s defeat.  The sovietisation of Central and Eastern Europe from 1945 onwards (specific examples of such states should be included) led to claims and counter-claims by both East and West. Whether the “liberation” of these states was followed by a deliberate policy of Soviet expansionism in order to fulfil an ideological goal on the part of Moscow – or whether the motive behind such expansion was defensive in nature could be examined. The assumptions behind the “Long Telegram” of Kennan, the significance of the Riga Axioms, the reality of the claims made by Churchill in his “Iron Curtain” speech (as compared to the rhetoric) etc. could be considered.  The Marshall Plan, mooted in June 1947, was one “half of the walnut” of Containment espoused by Truman. Candidates could examine the reasons for the credits provided by the US and comment upon the overt purpose stated by Marshall, how the Plan was perceived by Moscow and the results of the Plan for Western Europe as well as the Soviet reaction (politically and economically: Cominform, Comecon etc.).  Candidates should show knowledge of the issues/factors and apply such knowledge to evaluate their role in the breakdown of East–West relations. |
| **3. “The Potsdam Conference marked the end of the wartime alliance and laid the foundations for post-war hostility.” With reference to the period up to 1949, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**  Candidates are expected to address the causes of the Cold War in their answers to this question. Events up to the Potsdam Conference should be well known and it is likely that mention will be made of the introduction of Truman and Attlee (less on Attlee perhaps) to the peacemaking process as well as their relationship with Stalin. The structure of the question invites candidates to argue in favour and/or against the statement.  In agreement with the statement, candidates may argue that ideological differences were fundamental obstacles to continued cooperation once the common enemy was defeated. It may be that some candidates will go back to the 1917 revolution to support this analysis. This is acceptable as long as the focus remains firmly on the question. Candidates may also argue that Truman had a different approach from Roosevelt, which meant that US–Soviet relations were likely to worsen. Evidence for this may include Truman’s meeting with Molotov in April 1945 as well as Truman’s mention of a “new weapon” to Stalin at Potsdam. Also, disagreements over the future development of war-ravaged Germany could be mentioned, including the discussions over reparations and how these contributed to post-war tension.  Against the statement, it could be argued that by the meeting at Potsdam there was already an understanding among the Big Three that post-war Europe would be restructured along the lines of “spheres of influence”, as indicated by discussions at Teheran and Yalta. It was already clear that Stalin wanted new borders for the USSR and Poland, and the Moscow Conference of 1944 had touched upon “spheres of influence” throughout Eastern and Central Europe. The USSR had also agreed to join the United Nations and was planning to enter the war against Japan. The Allied Control Council was in place and Germany divided into zones of occupation. In this way, it could be argued that there was broad agreement on significant issues. Candidates may then go on to propose that it was not until 1946, or after, that relations worsened, and this argument could be supported by an analysis of the Long Telegram, Iron Curtain Speech, Truman Doctrine, COMECON, Berlin Blockade, etc.  Do not expect all of the above but do expect good factual supporting evidence. Historiography should complement rather than dominate the answer. |
| **4. Examine the reasons for, and the impact in Europe of, the formation of NATO.**  Candidates should demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the question and effectively deploy knowledge of the key issues raised by the question. There should be a detailed consideration of the rationale for the formation of NATO as well as an analysis of the consequences of its formation on Europe.  This should not be an essay on the origins of the Cold War.  The short term circumstances in which NATO was formed are likely to be well known and should be addressed. They include: the alliance was an extension of the Brussels Defence Pact (1947); it was formed in the aftermath of the Berlin Blockade and the establishment of the West German state; member nations included the major powers and other smaller nations such as Portugal, Denmark and Norway; a joint NATO military command was formed and the founding treaty stated that an attack on one member was an attack on all NATO members. West Germany joined in 1954 and it could be argued that it formed part of the policy of Containment.  The NATO alliance was very clearly a defensive alliance; however it was also a very public confirmation to Europe that in the longer term the US would not revert to isolationism (the Marshall Plan had been temporary). It had the effect of reassuring various nations (for example the French were reassured that a rearmed West German state would not be a threat). In the short term NATO contributed to the notion of a unified Europe. Economic benefits also resulted from the alliance: trade between member nations increased; it stimulated economic recovery (for example the alliance led to orders for West German machine tools). It also helped to maintain the influence of the US on European affairs. As such, although the alliance was primarily a defensive one, it was also a means to maintain and extend US influence in Europe.  The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to use. |
| **5. To what extent did decisions about post-war Germany contribute to the breakdown of East–West relations between 1945 and 1949?**  With regard to decisions made about post-war Germany, candidates may begin with those discussed and finalized at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Following on from 1945, reference may be made to the following: the policies outlined in Secretary Byrnes’s speech at Stuttgart; the mutual support of the US and Chancellor Adenauer making reunification less likely; the pillaging of their zone by the USSR; the friction caused by the failure to support agreements on the exchange of food and goods; the Marshall Plan and its impact on currency reform; the breakdown of the Allied Control Council; the Berlin Blockade; the establishment of the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany) and the GDR (German Democratic Republic).  Candidates may consider the following as reasons why such decisions affected East–West relations: post-war Germany had to be occupied and governed, at least temporarily, as the call for “unconditional surrender” had removed all vestiges of the Nazi regime. Furthermore, Germany’s geopolitical importance meant that all of the Allied Powers wanted to have influence over its post-war developments. The US and Britain rapidly came to support the economic revival of Germany whilst the USSR was concerned about the revival of Germany as a military power, as, indeed, was France. Both countries, but especially the USSR, were also concerned about security and feared another invasion. There was a growing divergence of views about the future of Germany and suspicion was reflected in the pragmatic union of British and American zones into Bizonia and the adoption of the Truman Doctrine by the US and, later the Marshall Plan.  Along with the Marshall Plan (ERP or European Recovery Program), came the need for a stable currency and, with France now on board, the emergence of Trizonia. The adoption of the Deutschmark in the West was a major reason for the Berlin Blockade. Re-unification was now unlikely to happen and candidates may discuss Stalin’s argument that the Yalta agreement had been ignored by the US that moved ahead with plans for the establishment of the FRG, rather than the reunited, but neutral, Germany favoured by Stalin.  “To what extent” invites candidates to consider other factors that may have contributed to the breakdown of East–West relations. These may include: ideology; mutual fear over expansion of influence; issues of security; the nuclear arms race etc.  The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to use. |
| **6. “Stalin and Truman were equally responsible for the outbreak of the Cold War”. To what extent do you agree?**  Candidates should demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the question and effectively deploy knowledge of the key issue raised by the question. They should critically assess the merits (or otherwise) of the given statement and provide a well-supported and consistent argument about whether or not Stalin and Truman were equally responsible for the emergence of the Cold War.  In their responses some candidates may consider longer term tensions dating back to 1917. They may refer to the establishment of Comintern; the Riga Axioms; Soviet support for the Republic in the Spanish Civil War; wartime tensions over the delay in the opening of the Second Front; and Soviet actions in liberated nations.  The immediate causes of tension were events in Germany between 1945 and 1949; tensions over reparations; the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan; the establishment of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers’ Parties (Cominform) and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON); the Sovietization of Eastern Europe; the formation of Bizonia and Trizonia; and the Berlin Blockade.  The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and no set answer is required. |
| **7. For what reasons, and with what results, did Sino–Soviet relations deteriorate after 1953?**  March 1953 marked the death of Stalin and the beginnings of a process of succession dispute and destalinisation within the USSR which is often considered to be significant in the deterioration of relations between Moscow and Beijing. In order to comment effectively on the “deterioration” candidates need to show awareness of the nature of the relationship prior to 1953. For some candidates this could entail examination of relations between Stalin and Mao/Chinese Communist Party (CCP) even before the establishment of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) in 1949. For others a possible starting point may be the period 1949/50 and the Sino–Soviet Treaty and what its  territorial, military and economic details reveal about the “partnership” which existed at that point.  The relationship from 1950–1953, at least on the surface suggested a partnership (albeit a junior partnership in the case of the PRC as far as Moscow was concerned) and candidates could refer to the $300 million loan by Moscow; solidarity in relation to support for North Korea in the Korean War; Soviet help in China’s First Five Year plan (1950–1953); the provision of training for Chinese workers in the USSR; etc.  From 1953 ideological differences which had in the past provided grounds for suspicion (Stalin’s criticism of Mao’s “peasant heresy” for example) were noted in: the breakdown of relations over Khrushchev’s “secret speech” with its attack on the cult of Stalin and advocacy of “peaceful coexistence”; the withdrawal of Soviet aid from China and Moscow’s criticism of the Great Leap Forward; the failure of Khrushchev to provide help in the construction of atomic bomb technology; Moscow’s failure to support China in the Sino–Indian dispute in 1962; China’s perception of Soviet weakness in defence of socialism at the time of the Missile Crisis in Cuba. Candidates may go further chronologically to cover tensions in the late 1960s over the use of the Brezhnev Doctrine.  The results of the deteriorating relationship could include: border clashes; Soviet anxiety due to improving Sino–Soviet relations; the contribution of Soviet withdrawal of aid to the failure of Chinese economic policies; the pursuit of rival policies by both Moscow and Beijing in Africa/Asia); the Cold War impact; the beginnings of US–USSR détente.  N.B. No end point is given in the question so allow candidates to explain/justify the end point they select. Do not expect all of the above but expect a balance of well-evidenced reasons and results for higher marks. |
| **8. Analyse the reasons for, and results of, the adoption and expansion of the doctrine of containment up to 1962.**  Candidates may begin with the introduction of the policy of containment in 1947 with the Truman Doctrine (and then added to by the Marshall aid programme) which was originally meant for the European theatre. The situation in Europe 1945–1947 that stimulated the United States’ involvement in this particular sphere would be relevant, as would an examination of the rationale (overt and covert) for the adoption of such a policy. The question does not require a narration of crises up to 1962 but rather the judicious selection of historical knowledge to allow for critical assessment of why the original doctrine was subsequently adopted on a global basis – for example Korea 1950–1953 and, by 1962, Cuba.  The task also requires consideration of the results of containment and these may include: military expansion; the growth of tension; the escalation of the arms race; the establishment of alliances; etc.  If only reasons or results are analysed then limit to a maximum of 8 marks. |
| **9. Analyse the reasons for, and the impact of, changes in US–Chinese relations in the 1970s.**  Candidates must address both reasons for, and the impact of, changed US–Chinese relations.  US reasons  American motives for improved relations: the need for help from China in ending the Vietnam War;  fear of growing Soviet nuclear capability; concerns about Soviet ambitions in Africa and Asia; the  need for a strategy to encourage the Soviets to reduce tensions and enter the détente process (a US–  China relationship would frighten the Soviets and force them to negotiate arms control agreements);  changing US views on Taiwan that reduced American hostility to China; Nixon and Kissinger were  practitioners of Realpolitk and prepared to overlook ideological differences in the interests of the  US.  China’s reasons  Chinese reasons for changing its relationship with the US were based on: its growing fear of the  USSR, following the outbreak of armed conflict between the two powers in 1969; China’s  weakness after the Cultural Revolution and its need for economic support, as well as a possible  alliance; its belief that the USSR was considered a much greater enemy than the US; Mao’s  impression that he could negotiate with Nixon.  Results for the US  The US began to trade with China and the Nixon visit, in 1972, signalled a new era. The US also  accepted the “one-China” policy as a goal for the future and received some assistance in ending the  Vietnam War. Improved relations with China also allowed the US to put pressure on the Soviet  Union to enter into negotiations on a variety of issues. Domestically, the China trip increased the  popularity of Nixon and contributed to his re-election in 1972. Cold War tensions were also  reduced for the US as China was now no longer considered an enemy or threat, as it had been  previously. The United States gained the potential for a strategic advantage against the USSR and  the opportunity to profit from the sale of arms etc to China. Diplomatic relations with China were  resumed in 1979.  Results for China  The results for China included: increased security in her disputes with the USSR as it would be  inclined to be more conciliatory towards a China that was longer isolated internationally;  a resolution of the Taiwan issue became a possibility; China could look forward to improvements in  her economy through trade with and investment from the US; China joined the United Nations and  took its seat on the Security Council.  General results  This was a revolution in the Cold War that made it a three sided game and the USSR would be at a  serious disadvantage if the US and China cooperated. US policy towards China encouraged the  USSR to enter into détente, to begin the disarmament process and to assist the US with their exit  from Vietnam. The US initiative also complicated Soviet foreign policy and weakened their position overall.  If only reasons or impact is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [8 marks]. |
| **10. Assess the achievements and limitations of détente between 1969 and 1979.**  By the early 1970s the superpowers were prepared to accept the compromises necessary to secure agreements on issues of mutual concern. Treaties such as SALT I (1972) and the Helsinki  Agreements (1975) can be seen as the central achievements of détente. The difficulties in their  implementation can be perceived as limitations. Achievements of détente include the improvement of relations between the USA and the USSR and the USA and China. Some of the limitations were:  that detente did not reduce tensions in all areas of international relations; and conflicts within the developing world continued and even intensified. This situation was to produce renewed suspicion and mistrust that led to the collapse of détente after 1979. |
| **11. To what extent was there a thaw in relations 1950-60?** This is not an IB past question. Go to lesson c) How did change in leadership affect the Cold War up to 1960? / your notes for review. Scroll down below.http://www.tippers-town.com/1-rivalry-mistrust-accord.html |
| **12. “The Cold War came to an end due to the hard-line approach of Ronald Reagan’s policies in the early 1980s.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**  Candidates may agree or disagree with this view but, in either case, Reagan’s policies shouldbe addressed.  Supporters of this view can credit Reagan’s hard-line approach as providing the pressure that caused the Soviet Empire to collapse. Among these policies were: support for anti-communist groups such as those in Afghanistan, Angola, and Nicaragua; also a program of unprecedented arms production, including SDI. Unable to match the increased defence spending of the USA, the USSR moved to end to the arms race and the Cold War. Candidates that disagree with the quotation may mention the economic problems in the USSR not connected to arms production, the quagmire of the Soviet Afghan War, the reforming policies of Gorbachev that led to the implosion of the USSR. |
| **13. “The Cold War came to end due the policies of Glasnost and Perestroika”. To what extent do you agree with this statement?**  This is not an IB past question  BUT… refer to the question above…think about it… |
| **14. Compare and Contrast the role of two Cold War leaders in the heightening of tension during the Cold War.**  This is not an IB past question  **Refer to:**  <http://www.tippers-town.com/2-cold-war-leaders-and-nations.html>*(last lesson)* |
| **15. With reference to two states, each chosen from a different region (excluding the United States and the USSR), examine the economic impact of the Cold War.**  There is no specific date set in this task and candidates are free to choose whether they wish to  focus on examples which are limited to a particular chronological period, for example Germany  1945–1949, Japan and the period of economic recovery attributable largely to the Korean War, or  cover a longer period in the answer – for example the impact on China since 1949, Cuba since  1959, etc.  Economic impact could be dealt with by examining: the links between the economies of the chosen states and the superpowers; the structure of the economic system inside the state as a reflection of ideological beliefs (for example private ownership versus public ownership); control of the means of production and how the economy functions – free enterprise as opposed to command economy etc.  Candidates could also consider specific economic policies undertaken by states whether it be the  changing nature of Cuban trading and foreign investment and aid before and after 1959, or the  consequences of economic packages such as that offered by the Marshall Plan in the late 1940s  and 1950s.  The responses regardless of the relevant examples selected must have specific evidence to support the claims being made. Generalized accounts cannot score well. |
| **16. Compare and contrast the impact of the Cold War on two different states (excluding the USA and USSR)**  This is not an IB question.  Lesson materials:  http://www.tippers-town.com/2-cold-war-leaders-and-nations.html |
| **17. “The Cold War transformed lives in many countries”. With reference to one country (excluding the USA and the USSR), analyse this statement.**  This is not an IB question.  Lesson materials:  http://www.tippers-town.com/2-cold-war-leaders-and-nations.html |
| **18. Compare and contrast the reasons for, and results of, two Cold War Crises.**  This is not an IB question.  Lesson materials:  **http://www.tippers-town.com/3-cold-war-crises.html** |
| **19. “Brinkmanship was an effective deterrent to escalation.” With reference to two examples,**  **assess the validity of this statement.**  Candidates should approach this question by defining the term “brinkmanship” and by applying it  to the selected examples.  Secretary of State Dulles defined the policy of brinkmanship as “the ability to get to the verge  without getting into the war”. The concept implies pursuing negotiations or diplomatic exchange to the brink of war in order to force the opposition to make concessions. Events that demonstrate ‘brinkmanship’ prior to Dulles statement are perfectly valid to be considered (e.g. Berlin Airlift). Note, brinkmanship was pursued by both sides.  Brinkmanship prevented escalation of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, where the US and the  USSR were pushed to the “brink” of a nuclear war until Soviet leader Khrushchev finally  compromised with the US. Another example could be …  but credit any valid examples. |