**1. “The Cold War was a result of two conflicting ideologies”. How far do you agree?**

*(You have to define and show the importance of their ideologies in the first part of the essay and argue that the problems were not due to ideological difference, in the second part)*

**Yes, ideology was important:**

* **Explain Marxism Leninism** ( the economy, political life, religion and civil rights ) and its desire to expand into other countries. Religion was seen as the “opium of the masses”. What a communist perceived as the “dictatorship of the proletariat” was seen by Western observers as a ruthless and totalitarian form of government.
* **Explain capitalism, market economy** ( the economy, political life, religion and civil rights ) and the “open door policy” and its desire to expand into other markets.
* **Use examples** illustrating how each side perceived the “other side”. For example: what the Americans thought about Russian policy in **Eastern Europe** and in **Asia**. They were horrified over the fact that political opposition was harassed, land and industries had been nationalised without compensation, etc. You can write a lot here. What did the USSR think about the**Marshall Plan** and the **Truman Doctrine**? Why was it so important to revive Germany? Show how they were coloured by their ideologies.

**No, it was not an ideological conflict:**

* Explain the “Realpolitik school”, which claims that powers may act out of reasons other than ideology but use ideology to disguise their real intentions or simply as a means of getting
* support.
* Even if ideology was important, some historians emphasise the importance of W. W .II. The differences of the ideologies existed before 1939, but why did relations collapse after the war? The war created a unique situation where these two superpowers achieved world domination and powers like Germany and Japan were totally destroyed. This situation led to a contest for power globally.
* It is interesting to notice that the Americans were prepared to support non-democratic regimes like Tito in Yugoslavia, Syngman Rhee in Korea, Batista in Cuba and Diem in Vietnam, whose most important qualifications were that they opposed Moscow. Tito was a communist.
* Stalin’s expansion into Eastern Europe deeply worried the Western powers. But had this expansion anything to do with communist ideology or was it caused by security reasons or a traditional Russian desire to dominate surrounding countries?

**Conclusion:** It is difficult to totally ignore the importance of ideology during the Cold War. But it is also possible to argue that the results of the war in combination with the ideologies played a role. It can also be argued that ideology was of no importance to a politician like Stalin, thereby supporting the Realpolitik school.

***2. “The Cold War was mainly caused by fear and less by aggression”. Do you agree?***

*(In the first part you try to show how fear played an important role. It is a key word in the post revisionist school. In the second part you focus on other reasons, such as aggression.*

**Yes, “fear” was important:**

* The most important point, discussing “fear”, is probably to discuss the importance of nuclear weapons. It led to an arms race that resulted in less security for both sides. Explain the “Security dilemma”.
* It has been argued that Stalin’s policies in Eastern Europe and his need for buffer states were mainly defensive. He *feared* another attack against the USSR through Eastern Europe. His policies in Eastern Europe deeply affected the US. These are arguments used by revisionist historians.
* It has also been argued that the USSR *feared* “dollar imperialism” and consequently had to protect themselves from this new form of imperialism. Economically the US was far stronger than the USSR.
* Fear is also a keyword if you want to understand the Truman Doctrine. If communism was not opposed there could be a domino reaction where countries would fall to communism. After the war, Eastern Europe had been “lost” to communism and there were communist advances in Asia: in China. Korea and Indochina. There are many examples to use where “fear” can be found.

**There were clear signs of aggression**

* Put yourself in the shoes of an orthodox historian. Explain the nature of Marxism Leninism and explain Stalin’s policies in Eastern Europe, Comintern, the coup in Czechoslovakia, the Berlin airlift and problems all over Asia. Some of them resulted in armed conflicts. It can be seen as communist aggression controlled by Moscow.
* A revisionist historian would be able to describe US policies and beliefs as “aggressive”. The US was without doubt the strongest state after the war and had dropped an A-bomb. How did they use this strength? They issued the Truman Doctrine giving themselves the right to intervene anywhere, and the Marshall Plan was an attempt to control weaker states economically and later politically. Again it is possible to give examples from Greece, Taiwan, Korean, Vietnam, etc
* where this aggression was shown.

**Conclusion:** We support a combination, of fear and aggression. We would, however, not go as far as to say that the Cold War was mainly caused by misunderstandings. Support your argument.

***3. How is it possible to explain the emergence of the Cold War by referring to events from the period 1945-50?***

*(This can be approached in several ways. It is a list question and it is possible to go through the question by writing a chronological account. There is a risk that this will become a narrative account which will not score well. We recommend you use the different schools of interpretation again. It will enable you to write a more analytical essay.****It is however very important to support each school by referring to different events****).*

* Describe the “**orthodox view**” and explain Marxism-Leninism from an ideological point of view. Use examples from the period that will strengthen your argument. Possible points to cover: the**Russian policy in Eastern Europe versus commitments made at Yalta**, the policy in Germany where an economic unity was blocked, **the Berlin airlift**, **the coup in Czechoslovakia**, Comintern and developments in **China, Korea and Vietnam**.
* A **revisionist historian** would describe this period by explaining how strong the Americans actually were after the war, both economically and militarily. This strength was used to achieve world domination. It is possible to strengthen this view by referring to the dropping of the **a-bomb**, policies in Germany, the **Truman doctrine** leading to support for Greece and Turkey; and perhaps most importantly, the **Marshall Plan** providing for “**dollar imperialism**” and an “Open Door policy”. US policies in Asia, such as in Korea, and support for the French in Indochina are also possible points to use. The US also misinterpreted Stalin’s foreign policy. They thought that his driving force was an expansionist communist ideology and not national security.
* A **post revisionist historian** would describe the emergence of the Cold War as a result of mutual misunderstandings and fear. The Americans didn’t understand that Stalin’s aims in Eastern Europe were mainly defensive and that he genuinely feared US military and economic strength. Instead they issued the Truman doctrine aiming at world domination. Stalin was probably not fully aware of how his brutal policies in the satellites affected politicians in the West. It is also clear that with so fundamentally different systems combined with the development of weapons of mass destruction, a lot of fear and misunderstandings were inevitable. Both sides must bear responsibility.

**Conclusion:** summarise your main points and emphasise what you think is important. But notice that the question doesn’t explicitly ask you to make your own ‘final judgement’.

***4. To what extent had the policy of containment been successful in Europe and Asia between 1947-50?*** *(Write one part of the essay claiming that it had been successful and a second part showing failures. Note that you must explain the term containment at the beginning of the essay)*

It is always important to define difficult words in the question. “Containment” needs to be defined. **Containment** was the US policy that was adopted by President Truman in his Truman Doctrine in 1947 by which the US attempted to **prevent further Soviet or communist expansion**beyond territories occupied in 1945. No long-term co-operation with the USSR was possible and George Kennan provided the intellectual basis in his Long Telegram from 1946. By supporting the “free world” economically through the Marshall Plan in Europe and economic aid to Japan, the expansion of communism would be prevented.

**Successes:**

* The Marshall Plan led to a substantial economic recovery in Western Europe and it is believable that conditions which bred left wing support were receding as a result of this. The communist parties in both Italy and France lost some of their substantial support in elections in the late 1940s.
* This was probably most obvious in the western part of Germany, which went through a remarkable economic recovery. Germany became a democratic and economically stable country bordering the Eastern Bloc. A pro-western Germany was without any doubt essential for the survival of Western Europe as a part of the “West”. The conservative Christian Democrats and Konrad Adenauer were victorious in free elections.
* The Berlin airlift must be described as a “victory”. The Americans had been able to support 2,5 million Germans and this support had turned the population pro-American.
* The support for Greece and Turkey enabled these two countries to remain within the Western camp. (Both joined NATO in 1951). The communists had been defeated in the civil war in Greece.
* The building up of a strong Western military alliance, NATO, under American leadership, strengthened the West.
* In the late 40s the Americans successfully started to build up Japan as an ally in Asia and a bulwark against communism.**Failures:**
* The US build up of Western Europe was a threat from Stalin’s point of view, and he strengthened his control of the satellites. The Czech coup in 1948 and a purge against “national communists” can partly be seen as a response to the build up in Western Europe and these counter actions were not “successful” from an American point of view.
* The “loss” of China was a major failure. The most populous state in the world turned to communism and signed a Sino-Soviet Friendship Treaty in 1950. The nationalists in China had received economic aid after 1945, yet they lost the Civil War.
* In 1950 the Korean War started. Even if it was too early to assess the final outcome of this conflict in 1950, it was clear that the Americans were facing an expansionist enemy. At the end of 1950 Red China also attacked the UN forces in Korea.
* In Vietnam the French were fighting a difficult war against communist guerrillas who were not easily defeated. The US had now started siding with an unpopular colonial ruler and feared a domino reaction throughout South East Asia.
* **Conclusion:** **Summarise the successes and the failures. It is possible to conclude that containment had been more successful in Europe than in Asia.**

***To what extent was the Korean War a part of the Cold War?***

*(Demonstrate to what extent it was a Cold war conflict and to what extent it was not. It means you have to show both how the Cold War affected the war but also how the Korean War influenced the Cold War).*

**The Korean War was not a Cold War conflict:** *(it is perhaps an unorthodox way of answering the question by starting with the “no” part, but there are fewer “no” arguments compared to the “yes-points”, so let’s start with the smaller part)*

* Two independent states had been set up in 1948 and both were ruled by non-democratic**nationalist leaders**, **Kim Il Sun and Syngman Rhee**. Both wanted to unify the country, by force if necessary. Both claimed authority over the whole country. The division of the country was deeply resented by the population.
* **There were ongoing border disputes both in 1948 and 1949, and several thousand soldiers were killed**. There was growing opposition to Rhee’s rule and communist guerrillas were fighting the regime in the South. It was more the will to unite the country that made Kim ask Stalin for support. There is one school of historians who argue that the origins of the conflict can mainly be found in this **national question**, and less in the Cold War i.e. it was more like a Civil War in the beginning.
* It can be argued that the there were other reasons than Korean reasons that started the conflict (see below). The relations within the communist camp may have had some importance. It might be that Stalin wanted both North Korea and China to be involved in the war because it would tie them to the USSR. It can be seen as an “internal” communist reason.

**The Korean War was a Cold War conflict** *(notice that the question doesn’t explicitly ask for the origins of the conflict. So it is possible to write about the origins and implications from a Cold War perspective)*.

* **The Truman Doctrine, the policy of containment and the NSC-68 report** all indicated that the US must take action. Truman was also under pressure due to the “loss” of China and the Russian A-bomb. The Domino theory also played an important role. The Cold War, it must be argued, pushed the Americans into entering the conflict. The war had far-reaching consequences for US policies by increased support to Japan, Taiwan, the French in Vietnam, Europe and the creation of SEATO. It also led to the rise in US military expenditure from $13 billion to $50 billion per year, in other words an implementation of the NSC-68 report. **The consequences show how this conflict can be seen as a part of the Cold War**.
* The reason for the UN acting against the North was a Soviet boycott as Red China was not accepted in the UN.
* The prospect of a capitalist US-led Korea, was unacceptable to China and it led to their**involvement**. The consequences of diplomatic **isolation** for years and US containment policies in Asia, especially regarding Taiwan, show how the conflict can be related to the Cold War.
* In **Europe** the conflict led to NATO being strengthened.
* To **Stalin** a communist expansion would **strengthen the communist camp** and engulf the Americans in a major conflict if they decided to support the south. It would open up possibilities in other areas. This was probably one reason for Stalin finally supporting Kim. The Korean War led to increased tension and a militarization of the Cold War. The **Red Army** doubled in size between 1948-53 to more than 5 million men. One reason for this was the tension that was created by the Korean War.

**Conclusion:** there may have been other reasons behind the conflict but the Korean War was definitely a part of the Cold War both in its origins and consequences.

***5. How is it possible to explain the emergence of the Cold War by referring to events from the period 1945-50?***

*(This can be approached in several ways. It is a list question and it is possible to go through the question by writing a chronological account. There is a risk that this will become a narrative account which will not score well. We recommend you use the different schools of interpretation again. It will enable you to write a more analytical essay.****It is however very important to support each school by referring to different events****).*

* Describe the “**orthodox view**” and explain Marxism-Leninism from an ideological point of view. Use examples from the period that will strengthen your argument. Possible points to cover: the**Russian policy in Eastern Europe versus commitments made at Yalta**, the policy in Germany where an economic unity was blocked, **the Berlin airlift**, **the coup in Czechoslovakia**, Comintern and developments in **China, Korea and Vietnam**.
* A **revisionist historian** would describe this period by explaining how strong the Americans actually were after the war, both economically and militarily. This strength was used to achieve world domination. It is possible to strengthen this view by referring to the dropping of the **a-bomb**, policies in Germany, the **Truman doctrine** leading to support for Greece and Turkey; and perhaps most importantly, the **Marshall Plan** providing for “**dollar imperialism**” and an “Open Door policy”. US policies in Asia, such as in Korea, and support for the French in Indochina are also possible points to use. The US also misinterpreted Stalin’s foreign policy. They thought that his driving force was an expansionist communist ideology and not national security.
* A **post revisionist historian** would describe the emergence of the Cold War as a result of mutual misunderstandings and fear. The Americans didn’t understand that Stalin’s aims in Eastern Europe were mainly defensive and that he genuinely feared US military and economic strength. Instead they issued the Truman doctrine aiming at world domination. Stalin was probably not fully aware of how his brutal policies in the satellites affected politicians in the West. It is also clear that with so fundamentally different systems combined with the development of weapons of mass destruction, a lot of fear and misunderstandings were inevitable. Both sides must bear responsibility.

**Conclusion:** summarise your main points and emphasise what you think is important. But notice that the question doesn’t explicitly ask you to make your own ‘final judgement’.