

A level History Coursework marking training – Module 4

Script B

Coursework authentication sheet

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History

Assignment title:

Historians have disagreed about the origins of the Cold War.
What is your view about the origins of the Cold War?

Have you received advice on the title from the Assignment guidance service?

☒ Y ☐ N

Centre name:

Centre number:

Candidate name:

Candidate number:

Word Count: 3,567

State the examined options that are being taken (delete as appropriate):

Paper 1: ~~The Crusades c1095-1204~~

~~Britain 1625-1701: conflict, revolution and settlement~~

USSR 1917-91: from Lenin to Yeltsin

Paper 2: ~~England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154-1189~~

~~France in Revolution, 1774-1799~~

Mao's China, 1949-76

Paper 3: ~~Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII, 1399-1509~~

Germany 1871-1990: united, divided and reunited

Mark
awarded

Comments

Bullet point 1: range of material, citations and understanding of the issue

Bullet point 2: judgement and integration of contextual knowledge

Bullet point 3: analysis of views and explanation of differences

Bullet point 4: criteria for judgement

Bullet point 5: knowledge and organisation

Summary

There are several different interpretations that explain why the Cold War began. The historians that I have researched have all got differing viewpoints as to why the Cold War began. Hobsbawm believed that the Cold War occurred due to Western/US greed and he argued that the USSR was a country that wanted to rebuild and wanted to make relations with the US and he mentions that the USSR had asked the US for aid but the US had refused and had introduced policies such as the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine that would obviously irritate the USSR. I should also mention that Hobsbawm had Marxist ties so he could be subject to bias. Another historian I researched was Gaddis, and he puts the blame on Stalin and claimed that without him that 'a cold war was unavoidable.' He also implies that Stalin was key to the Cold War being as hostile as it was and that without him, things wouldn't have gotten as frosty as they did. I should mention that Gaddis has US military ties so could be subject to bias. The third historian that I researched was Paterson and he implied that the redistribution of power was key to the origins of the Cold War. For example, countries like the USSR and the US wanted to be the number one world superpower while the UK and France just wanted to rebuild. He has US ties and may be subject to bias. However, I felt that it was a well written account relating to the origins of the Cold War from a refreshing, fairly unbiased point of view. My personal view is that the redistribution of power and the US's policies such as the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan made things really hostile and both the USSR and the US both wanted to be the dominant superpower of the world so I believe that it was inevitable that they would clash.

Context +
basis of
view
Hobsbawm

LT

Possibly? -
How?

vi
perspective
v2 of H
outlines
views
v3
J
+ R
Judgement

Hobsbawm.

with
reading.

Eric Hobsbawm was born on 9 June 1917 in Alexandria, Egypt. He was a British historian of the rise of industrial capitalism, socialism and nationalism. A life-long Marxist, his socio-political beliefs influenced the viewpoint of his work. His early childhood was spent in Vienna, Austria and Berlin, Germany. Although the family lived in German-speaking countries, he grew up speaking English as his first language.¹ Hobsbawm attended King's College, Cambridge², from 1936, where he joined the Communist Party "in the form of the university's Socialist Club." He took a course in History in which he received first-class honours. He received a doctorate (PhD) in History from Cambridge University. During the Second World War, he served in the Royal Engineers and the Army Educational Corps. He was prevented from serving overseas after he attracted the attention of the security services by using the newspaper he edited during his army training to argue for the opening up of a Second Front, which was a demand made by the Communist Party of Great Britain at the time. He applied to return to Cambridge as a research student, and was released from the military in 1946. The MI5 opened a personal file on Hobsbawm in 1942 and their monitoring of his activities which was to affect the progress of his career for many years³. In 1945, he applied to the BBC for a full-time post making educational broadcasts to help servicemen adjust to civilian life after a long period in the forces and was considered "a most suitable candidate". The appointment was swiftly vetoed by the MI5 who believed Hobsbawm was unlikely "to lose any opportunity he may get to disseminate propaganda and obtain recruits for the Communist party".⁴ In Eric Hobsbawm's - "Age of Extremes The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991", there is a theme that's constant throughout and that is the implication that the US were power hungry. A quote that connotes this is 'Confrontation would probably have developed without ideology'.⁴ He also implied that the Cold War was 'based on a Western belief.' From just these two quotations alone it is clear that he is very critical of the US and the way they used to/do operate. He also stated "For it is now evident, and was reasonably probable even in 1945-47 that the USSR was neither expansionist...". This implies that the US wanted to use the perceived threat of the USSR going to take over more land than they were permitted to control due to the agreements at the summits as an excuse to be distant and frosty towards them. In reality, the USSR did actually from 1945 and 1949 create a Russian empire in Eastern Europe. This empire included Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and East Germany, which all had a Communist government.⁵ So, in this case the threat of Soviet expansionism was real but Hobsbawm might have been right in the US trying to find problems with the USSR due to their ideological beliefs. However, as mentioned above he was a member of the Communist Party and was a Marxist so he could have been subject to bias.

Basis/Explanation
of view

Detailed
biography

Good opportunity to link this to Hobsbawm's interpretation

Extract!

Hobsbawm.

Context

view
view
Some
analysis/
K contribution
→ J

Another theme that is present in Eric Hobsbawm's - "Age of Extremes The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991" is the theme of the USSR being a rebuilding country that had been ruined by war and the US was bitter with the USSR for not being a capitalist republic. This is connoted by the quote "On any rational assessment, the USSR presented no immediate danger to anyone..... It emerged from war in ruins". This implies that the USSR was a

Ext:
Hobsbawm.

¹<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/jan/17/eric-hobsbawm-mi5-communism-stalin-historian-private-papers>

² The Economist, 6 October 2012, p. 108.

³ <https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v37/n07/frances-stonor-saunders/stuck-on-the-flypaper>

⁴ Eric Hobsbawm - Age of Extremes The Short Twentieth Century

⁵ <https://schoolhistory.org.uk/topics/world-history/cold-war-1945-1972/soviet-satellite-states/>

country looking to rebuild and that the USSR at this stage had been devastated by the war. Officially, 98,000 collective farms had been ransacked and ruined, with the loss of 137,000 tractors, 49,000 combine harvesters, 7 million horses, 17 million cattle, 20 million pigs, 27 million sheep; 25% of all capital equipment had been destroyed in 35,000 plants and factories; 6 million buildings, including 40,000 hospitals, in 70,666 villages and 4,710 towns (40% of urban housing) were destroyed, leaving 25 million homeless; about 40% of railway tracks had been destroyed; officially 7.5 million servicemen died, plus 6 million civilians, but perhaps 20 million in all died. In 1945, mining and metallurgy were at 40% of the 1940 levels, electric power was down to 52%, and steel 45%; food production was 60% of the 1940 level. After Poland, the USSR had been the hardest hit by the war. Reconstruction was impeded by a major labor shortage due to the enormous number of Soviet casualties in the war (between 20 and 30 million). Moreover, 1946 was the driest year since 1891, and the harvest was poor. Another quote that connotes that the USSR wanted to rebuild quickly is "It needed all the economic aid it could get and therefore had no short-term interest in antagonising the only power that could give it, the USA." Indeed, the USSR did want to seek financial help from the USA. However, the USA and USSR were unable to agree on the terms of a US loan to aid reconstruction, and this was a contributing factor in the rapid escalation of the Cold War.⁶ This left the USSR little choice but to side with Eastern Bloc countries and create Comecon in order to help rebuild and reach the goal that Stalin set out in 1945 of being the leading industrial power by 1960. This is a very convincing point by Hobsawm and History is on his side as the USSR did indeed want to rebuild but the US refused to aid them which escalated the Cold War. *Judgment USA ✓ 9 Reason*

In conclusion, Hobsawm makes good points such as mentioning that the USSR were a country that wanted to rebuild and that they were a country that wanted to develop relations with the US as they were a country that could have helped out massively financially but it was the US themselves who rejected these advances and there was a clear bitterness towards the USSR by the US due to their ideological differences. However, Hobsawm was a Marxist who had alliances to the Communist Party so his viewpoints have a bit of bias against the US and capitalist powers.

John Lewis Gaddis was born in Texas, in 1941. He attended the University of Texas, receiving his BA in 1963, MA in 1965, and PhD in 1968. Gaddis then taught briefly at Indiana University and then Ohio University in 1969. At Ohio, he founded and directed the Contemporary History Institute, and was named a distinguished professor in 1983. In the 1975-77 academic years, Gaddis was a Visiting Professor of Strategy at the Naval War College. In the 1992-93 academic year, he was the Harmsworth Visiting Professor of American History at Oxford. He has also held visiting positions at US institutions such as Princeton University. In 1997, he moved to Yale University to become the Lovett Professor of Military and Naval History. He sits on the advisory committee of the Wilson Center's Cold War International History Project, which he helped establish in 1991.⁷ The information above implies that he has a bias in favour of the US as he worked at the Naval War College, taught at American universities and was part of the 'Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations'. From information alone, I reckon that he is very patriotic which will probably affect his viewpoint on the Origins of the Cold War. *Possibly?*

In Gaddis' 'We Now Know' there is a constant theme and that is the implication of Stalin being key to the Cold War. A quote that supports the fact that he is implying that Stalin was key to the Cold War is "that as long as Stalin was running the Soviet Union a cold war was unavoidable."⁸ *Extract: Gaddis.* This implies that Stalin was crucial in terms of the Cold War coming into fruition and that with him at the helm of the Soviet Union, it was inevitable that such a conflict would occur. Another quote that implies that Stalin was key in the terms of the Cold War coming into fruition is "The Soviet leader waged cold wars on all these fronts". This again implies that Stalin was key to the Cold War being as hostile as it was and that without him, things wouldn't have gotten as frosty as they did. In Gaddis' defence, Stalin was known for his paranoia and he feared a Western attack of his country was looming which may have caused him to mistrust Truman and the US and made relations difficult. However, ideological differences and actions from both parties, particularly the US, may have made relations even more difficult. For example, the introduction of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan would have completely irritated Stalin and the aims from those policies was to suppress Communism in the Eastern Bloc and they offered countries aid in the fight to contain communism. These policies probably wouldn't have taken place under Roosevelt and Roosevelt would have probably taken a more calm approach with the USSR and Stalin and would have been more willing to build relations with the USSR and on top of that the USSR

⁶

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Five-year_plans_of_the_Soviet_Union#Fourth_and_fifth_plans,_1945%E2%80%931955

⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Lewis_Gaddis

⁸ Gaddis' 'We Now Know'

Hobsbawm
support
Gaddis.

wanted economic aid from the US but Truman's government refused to help the USSR. As Eric Hobsbawm put it "It needed all the economic aid it could get and therefore had no short-term interest in antagonising the only power that could give it, the USA."⁹ The USA and USSR were unable to agree on the terms of a US loan to aid reconstruction, and this was a contributing factor in the rapid escalation of the Cold War. Stalin's paranoia probably did make relations difficult but time after time the USSR wanted to work with the US and wanted to build a relationship with them but the US kept on refusing and introduced policies such as the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid which they knew would irritate Stalin and the reason that Gaddis has the viewpoint he has is due to his US patriotism and nationalism so he is subject to bias. He is blatantly ignoring facts in his write up and there is no mention of policies that would incriminate Truman and the US government. On top of all of this he has military ties.

why?
when?
how?
evidence?
→ J
(substantiate)

Gaddis.

In Gaddis' "We Now Know", he makes the point that without Stalin, the Cold War wouldn't have gone on for as long as it did due to his great influence. This is connoted by the quote "Nor did Stalin's influence diminish as quickly as that of most dictators after their deaths." This implies that Stalin had a great influence in the USSR after his death and there's a lot that supports this. Gaddis also connotes this through the quote "He built a system sufficiently durable to survive not only his own demise but his successors' fitful and half-hearted efforts at de-Stalinization." For example, after Stalin's death was announced, massive mourning crowds filled Moscow's streets, while his embalmed body was placed alongside Lenin in the Red Square mausoleum. He was still greatly honoured shortly after his death. In February of 1956 his successor, Nikita Khrushchev, addressed a "secret session" of the 20th Party Congress, where he spent three hours denouncing Stalin, thus beginning the process known as de-Stalinization¹⁰. However, despite this the Soviet state that he had built survived for another forty years. The Cold War went on, Eastern Europe remained under heavy influence from the USSR. The gulags still operated, and the tight grip of the state in Eastern Europe was not relaxed. Indeed, Khrushchev's successor, Leonid Brezhnev, actually made an effort to restore Stalin's reputation, to cover up the few crimes that Khrushchev had exposed, and to return him to a place of honor among Soviet heroes. It was not until the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Cold War, and the final crack-up of the Soviet Union in 1991-92 that the world was allowed access to the record of Stalin's crimes and even that information remains incomplete, so careful were Stalin's contemporaries to hide his corruption.¹¹

under
evidence/
context

Not entirely
relevant to the
origins of the
Cold War.

Not entirely
relevant.

In conclusion, Gaddis makes some valid points about the influence that Stalin had. For example, even after de-Stalinization his influence was ever-present as he stated. Examples include the gulag system and the satellite states being greatly under Soviet control. He was still viewed in a positive light by many Russians and he still had many allies working for him in the Soviet political hierarchy such as Brezhnev who sought out to fix Stalin's reputation and implied that he was a Soviet hero and even covered up dark secrets about Stalin and his regime. However, there was clear bias in his work and he came across as a very patriotic American and therefore would do anything in his power to make the US look more favourable than the USSR.

Paterson

Thomas Graham Paterson was born in 1941 in Oregon. He received his Bachelor's degree from the University of New Hampshire in 1963, and his Masters and Doctoral degrees from the University of California at Berkeley in 1964 and 1968, respectively. Paterson is known primarily for his contributions to Cold War history with an emphasis on United States-Cuba relations, as well as the study of United States foreign relations in general.¹² This information above connotes that he has US ties and may be subject to bias. why?

Background

J.

Thomas Paterson in 'Inevitable conflict: The Unstable International System' suggests that an unstable international environment was a reason for the Cold War coming into fruition. A quote that connotes this is 'What one government sees as defence, another labels "offence".¹³ This quote implies that certain actions are seen differently by different governments. For example, the US committed the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki which the US would have claimed to be "defence". However, many see this event to be a disgraceful event and it would be interpreted by others to be an act of "offence". Another quote that implies that this is his point of view is "Higher degrees of conflict are reached when the international system undergoes significant change... such as in the case of WW2." History supports this as the USSR and US had differing viewpoints and had changed leaders. For example, Stalin got on better with Churchill and Roosevelt than he did with Atlee and

Extracurricular:
Paterson.

+K

Extracurricular
Paterson

⁹ Eric Hobsbawm's - "Age of Extremes The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991"

¹⁰ <https://www.sparknotes.com/biography/stalin/section11/>

¹¹ <https://www.sparknotes.com/biography/stalin/section11/>

¹² <https://snaccooperative.org/view/27611358>

¹³ 'Inevitable conflict: The Unstable International System' - Thomas Paterson

especially Truman. Also, policies such as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan which came into fruition through the US were rejected by the USSR which led to Europe being split up. However, both superpowers had different ideologies, so conflict was inevitable but I do not believe that they would have escalated as far as they did if it wasn't for governmental changes and different interpretations of specific events such as the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings and the Berlin Blockade. The US believed they were in the right when it came to the Hiroshima bombings as they believed the atomic bomb to be a symbol that connoted power. While other nations just saw these bombings as unnecessary tyranny. Same goes with the Berlin Blockade, as the Western powers introduced Deutschmark in 1948 without informing the USSR, which the USSR didn't take kindly to which led to the culmination of the Berlin Blockade. Paterson makes valid points relating to the unstable international system being a key reason for the origins of the Cold War. However, the leaders and governments themselves made ill-advised choices which especially affected Europe.

In Thomas Paterson's 'Inevitable conflict: The Unstable International System', there is an implication that the redistribution of power was key to the origins of the Cold War. A quote that connotes this is 'The defeat of Germany, Italy and Japan left power vacuums.' This is true as the Allies had to split up reparations in a way that would suit all parties, which was a hard task. On top of this all of the parties involved had different motives. For example, the UK was no longer the superpower it once was in the past as it had lost its empire and many colonies due to their greed. An example of this would be the Anglo-Afghan Wars in which the British were beaten in even though Afghanistan lacked the resources and the power that the UK had and a quote from Dost Muhammad Khan signifies this 'I have been struck by the magnitude of your resources, your ships, your arsenals, but what I cannot understand is why the rulers of so vast and flourishing an empire should have gone across the Indus to deprive me of my poor and barren country.'¹⁴ Greed such as this had cost the British massively and on top of that WW2 didn't help either and they were struggling financially. France also suffered massively from the war as they suffered massive losses and didn't have much respect from the international world. However, the USSR and US were looking to be world superpowers after WW2 which led to an ideological power battle between the two nations. A quote from Paterson that implies this is 'Two different ideologies with quite different ideologies emerged from the rubble of WW2 to claim high rank'. There is a lot to support as Truman and Stalin butted heads massively and the US refused to give the USSR aid as they didn't want to help their ideological rival and both nations had lofty goals. For example, Stalin detailed the USSR's ambitious goals through the Five Year Plans and the US had made statements of intent to beat the USSR as the number one world superpower and to suppress communism through policies such as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Paterson makes some good points relating to the fact that all the nations in the reparation payments had different mindsets, suffered from different issues and had differing goals. History is in his favour as they all clashed and were in different situations. For example, the US was looking to be the number one world superpower, while France just wanted to rebuild and garner respect from the international community. However, terms were discussed at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences and agreements were made.

Good opportunity to link back to the question
In conclusion, Paterson makes good points relating to the splitting of reparations and the unstable international system being key reasons to the origins of the Cold War and he gives good examples when it comes to the USSR and US fighting to be the number one superpower and the differing situations of all the Allied nations. However, I think the point relating to the unstable international environment was fairly weak compared to the other point that Paterson had made as the nations themselves made ill-advised decisions that increased friction in the international hemisphere. But all in all it was a well written account relating to origins of the Cold War from a refreshing, fairly unbiased point of view.

In conclusion, I believe that Hobsbawm despite his Marxist ties makes some really good points and gives examples and reasoning to back up his points. The same cannot be said about Gaddis who made his bias very clear throughout his piece and didn't include any reasoning or any examples to back up his points. I support Hobsbawm's viewpoint the most out of the three that I viewed as he made the most convincing argument out of the three in my opinion. Although I believe that Paterson made some good points and wrote a good account when it came to the origins of the Cold War but lacked the convincing nature of Hobsbawm.

¹⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Anglo-Afghan_War

Teacher 1

L4 -	BP 1 Range of material relevant to the enquiry identified and deployed with precision. Demonstrates understanding of issues + most relevant aspects of the debate discussed. Treatment of some aspects lack depth.
L4 -	BP2 Evidence from reading used with discrimination to sustain a judgement. Selection lacks balance in places. Contextual issues of some issues integrated in the discussion
L4 -	BP3 Analyses views in chosen works and differences between them. Demonstrates some understanding of the of the basis of the authors arguments
L4 -	BP 4 Valid criteria established by which arguments in works can be judged and applied – some evaluations only partly substantiated
L4 -	BP 5 Knowledge demonstrates understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry + meets most demands. Answer is concise and generally well organised
26/40	Summary Qualities of L4 displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects

Teacher 2

Agree, low level 4

BP1 – L3

BP2 – L4

BP3 – L4

BP4 – L4/3

BP5 – L3

Resource Record

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History				
Centre names: [REDACTED]				
Candidate name: [REDACTED]				
Resources used The three works chosen for the assignment must be asterisked	Page / web reference	Student comments	Student date(s) when accessed	Teacher initials and date checked
Erik Hobsbawm - Age of Extremes The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991	230-237	'Based on a Western belief' 'Confrontation would probably have developed without ideology'	12/7/21	
Gaddis - 'We Now Know'	242-245	'The Cold War went on much longer than it might have had nuclear weapons never been invented. If both had not emerged victorious from WW2, the South East would have been on all these fronts.' 'Stalin's centrality to the cold war becomes quite clear.'	15/7/21	LP 8/9/21
Paterson - 'The origins of the Cold War.'	72-86	'What one government sees as a defense, another labels "offense".'		
The Guardian		Useful for Hobsbawm context	Sept/21	
The Economist		Useful for Hobsbawm context	Sept/21	

Wikipedia		Gaddafi + Soviet Union info		
Spark Notes		Stalin info		LP. 17/12/21