



Pearson

# INTERNATIONAL ADVANCED LEVEL HISTORY

## Unit 4 WHI04

International Study with Historical Interpretations

**Exemplars with examiner commentaries**  
**Section A**

## **International Advanced Level History**

### **UNIT 4 INTERNATIONAL STUDY WITH HISTORICAL INTERPRETATIONS Exemplars with examiner commentaries**

The exemplars that follow were selected to show key features of the generic markschemes and what distinguishes the qualities of one level from another. The examples are taken from different options in the unit.

In addition, the [Paper-specific principal examiner reports](#) also contain examples.

The Unit 4 WHI04 examination contains two sections:

**Section A** – Historical Interpretations – assesses both AO3 (20 marks) and AO1 (5 marks)

**Section B** – International Study – assesses AO1 (25 marks)

#### **Section A exemplification**

In Section A the question relates to the Historical Interpretation enquiry defined in Key Topic 1 of the Unit Option being studied. The debate under discussion is that created by the viewpoint and focus of the question not the overall question posed by the Key Topic.

The task requires students to analyse two extracts selected from historical writings to reach a judgment about how far they agree with a view reflected in one extract in the light of the counter-evidence in the other and of their own knowledge of the controversy. This is reflected in the descriptors used in the level of response mark scheme.

The level of response mark scheme identifies progression in three separate elements or traits across 5 levels:

Strand 1 – interpretation and analysis of extracts

Strand 2 – deployment of knowledge of issues related to the debate

Strand 3 – evaluation of and judgement about the interpretation.

It is important to note that the view given in the question should clearly be discussed in relation to the content of the extracts and candidate knowledge of the issue under consideration.

## Example 1

This is a high Level 5 response answering WHI04 1D Q1.

**Question 1: How far do you agree with the view that China's entry into the Korean War was triggered by US forces invading North Korea in October 1950?**

Explain your answer using [Extracts 1 and 2](#) and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(25)

The justification for China's entry into the Korean War is <sup>constantly</sup> ~~often~~ disputed. <sup>As seen</sup> ~~Further~~ in Bragan's interpretation some schools of thought ~~trace it to~~ <sup>the</sup> U.S' exchange in war aims ~~and~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~invasion of Korea~~ which drew China into the war for reasons of self defence and loyalty. Alternatively, Frank's interpretation alludes to the already preparedness of China for eventual involvement as early as U.S troops were in Korea. Overall, it can be assumed China had multiple reasons for entry largely owing to self defence but also pressures from the USSR, North Korean loyalty and domestic affairs in China which <sup>reveals</sup> ~~makes~~ the newly formed Communist nation both had interests of self defence and opportunism - consolidating the already preexisting need to join the war ~~and~~ instead of "triggering a

Bragan's interpretation highlights the way China repeatedly warned U.S of ~~that~~ the consequence of the invasion of North Korea of

evident within "indicated plainly". This is justified by the knowledge that Mao repeatedly warned Truman of that if ~~the~~ U.S./UN/ROK forces were to be used on the Chinese border they would subsequently be forced to retaliate ~~as~~ <sup>This</sup> as the interpretation clearly states was a ~~matter~~ <sup>matter</sup> of the fear of U.S. imperialism evident within "self-confident aggressor". ~~Similarly, Frank might~~ Thus, China became fearful of U.S. expansion only when U.S. war aims <sup>only</sup> began to <sup>change</sup> from containment to roll back. <sup>How ever,</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>this suggestion the Korean invasion was a trigger.</sup>

Frank is more convincing in suggesting that China was always prepared evident within "He ordered the PLA to begin troop deployments". This is supported by the evidence that Mao ~~sent~~ offered Kim troops in early 1950 yet Kim declined. Thus, it is more justified to suggest that the crossing of the ~~the~~ 38<sup>th</sup> parallel did not create the ~~desire~~ <sup>the need</sup> for Chinese involvement, but consolidated it, as a response from an accumulation of factors and American actions.

Another reason to suggest that China's entry into the Korean war was

not "triggered" by U.S. invasion of North Korea which both extracts allude to is China's self defense interest. Brogan highlights that China was fearful they had to face "~~Chinese~~ <sup>U.S.</sup> initiative elsewhere". China who had just wanted after years of war war had interests to prevent U.S. military ~~momentum~~ <sup>activity in China</sup> ~~activity~~ <sup>after military momentum that</sup> gave the U.S. the confidence to advance into North Korea in the first place after the Inchon Landing.

Similarly, Frank highlights China's fear <sup>that the U.S. may</sup> "sweep up to the Chinese border".

It is clear that China was "triggered" by the possibility to involve in the war before their entry into North Korea, and the invasion merely consolidated <sup>China's</sup> ~~North~~ ~~Korean~~ fears. ~~and~~ This gave Mao who was having difficulty gaining consent from the Politburo to <sup>a reason to become involved</sup> become involved in the war. ~~and~~ What further consolidated the need for self defense was the remobilization of Japan who bordered China's industrial heartland of Manchuria. Thus, after World War II and the Sino-Japanese war for China to have overlooked the newly formed alliance of Japan and U.S. is

as not a significant ~~not a threat would have~~ threat would have been highly unlikely. Then, the crossing of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel did not in fact "trigger" the entry of the war as Frank's interpretation implies but consolidates the security necessity of doing so.

~~And~~ China also would have been triggered to enter the Korean war as a part of <sup>the</sup> loyalty ~~not only~~ <sup>and</sup> to the greater Communist movement - ~~but also~~ to repay <sup>Korea</sup> for the support they received during the Chinese war. <sup>These are attitudes which would have predated the crossing of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel</sup> Although, Brogan seems to overlook Chinese entry as "not simply" a problem of "losing face" it is a vital reason. ~~Frank's~~ Frank's interpretation alludes to this by ~~the~~ the fact it was one step in a "process with much deeper roots" potentially commenting on the great cold war environment. It is known that Mao was greatly influenced by the USSR to send assistance to Korea and the USSR provided both Chinese forces and Korean <sup>supplies</sup> forces to fight with. Thus, it must be recognized that once the U.S. entered the war it technically became "internationalized" and this <sup>made</sup> ~~placed~~ Korea ~~an~~ conflict apart of the great cold war climate in which

NSC-68 <sup>divided</sup> ~~potent~~ the World as Communist and Capitalist. Frank's interpretation alludes to "military readiness in August 1950" and he further supports the idea that in this context attack from the West on Communism was <sup>a threat</sup> ~~not~~ to the strength of the ~~but~~ rise of Communism both in Asia and in Europe. Thus, the crossing of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel into North Korea did not "trigger" China's entry but consolidated the need to protect <sup>North</sup> Korea as a member of the greater "Communist Monolithic Bloc". On behalf of the USSR, and for Chinese ideological protection

<sup>Moreover</sup> ~~Additionally~~, it can be recognized that the security threats posed by the USA also predated the crossing of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel and this expansion of war consolidated fears and the necessity to enter rather than created them.

Although Brogan's interpretation suggests that the U.S. invasion of North Korea was "intolerable" other actions by the U.S. particularly by MacArthur demonstrated the necessity to enter the war. This refers back to the "deep roots" which Frank alludes to. After the North Korean crossing of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel Truman responded by sending the 7<sup>th</sup> fleet

to the Taiwan <sup>strait</sup> ~~states~~ and MacArthur publicly  
praised Jiang Jieshi. This ~~demonstrated~~ <sup>was</sup> suggested  
to China a renegeation with the Chinese  
civil war and allies such as Britain also  
criticised this policy as provocative. This serves  
to further give credit to Frank's interpretation  
who alludes to China's military preparedness  
which predated the Crossing of the 38<sup>th</sup>  
parallel. Thus, although as Brogan's interpretation  
suggests that the U.S advance into Korea <sup>Not</sup>  
demonstrated potential issues for China,  
these were already fears that China was  
aware of and thus the U.S advance did not  
"trigger" Chinese entry but consolidated its  
necessity.

Furthermore, it must be recognised that China's  
entry into the war was also potentially an  
example of opportunism for the newly formed  
Communist state. Brogan's interpretation highlights  
the role China thought it could play: "the  
moment to avert a Third World War"

This demonstrates the way China was also  
seeking to gain prestige by challenging the  
west. This is a prospect which the crossing  
by UN/US/ROK forces opened up but not  
something which ~~was~~ <sup>would</sup> have been overlooked.

By this time as well China and USSR were already facing tensions due to the ideological conflicts surrounding the interpretation of Marx and the USSR were worried North Korea would turn to ~~China~~ <sup>Mao</sup> instead of Stalin for Communist influence. Moreover, China after experiencing years of war and turmoil perhaps saw the Korean war as a method to unify the country and some historians go as far to say it allowed Mao to consolidate his oppressive regime. Thus, this further supports Frank's interpretation that China did not overlook the U.S. threat in the Korean war and were only triggered off and advance but in fact suggests that the crossing and operation on the Chinese borders gave Mao a justification and reasoning to present China on the "world stage" and gain prestige as both a protector of communism and a force able to halt the U.S. Subsequently, this is what did happen, the world was impressed by China's ability to halt the U.S. in their attempts at roll back. Thus, Hagan's interpretation is limited in the sense it does not acknowledge the political climate or ulterior motives of the world powers of the time. Thus, once again the U.S. invasion of North Korea did not

"Ingrate" China's involvement but justified the entry as a part of a great political opportunity to gain prestige and consolidate power.

In conclusion, although Brogan is justified in the respect it acknowledges the evidence which highlights China's supposed unwillingness to enter the war unless North Korea was threatened however facts to recognize to great cold war climate which made Chinese entry inevitable and moreover the opportunity in Korea war provided in this respect Frank is more convincing in the way he acknowledges Chinese awareness of U.S. actions and the security threats predated the North Korea invasion. Moreover, Brogan although not explicitly does suggest it was an accumulation of actions not only one which consolidated China's need to enter the way. Overall, Chinese entry into the war was not triggered by the invasion of North Korea, but considerably in the sense it affirmed security threats, the need to protect Communism and of course demonstrated an opportunity to reinsert itself onto the world stage.

## **Examiner commentary**

This response demonstrates a sustained evaluative argument in relation to the view stated in the question throughout. The interpretations are considered with confidence and knowledge of the historical context is integrated. There is an explicit understanding of the nature of historical debate. There is sustained discussion of the interpretations in relation to the key words in the stated view focusing particularly on whether China's entry was 'triggered' by an event or was caused by more long-term factors.

The opening paragraph refers directly to both interpretations and shows an awareness of the debate created by the differing viewpoints. The debate is outlined and the argument introduced – that China's entry into the Korean War can be explained more by longer term influences than by US invasion of North Korea in October 1950.

Evaluation is sustained throughout the response.

The second paragraph interprets each Extract with confidence, using the language and evidence included to highlight key issues being raised, and integrates this with knowledge of the historical context to suggest that Extract 2 is more convincing.

The third paragraph demonstrates an ability to use the interpretations with discrimination; to further the argument against the view stated in the question the response illustrates key issues that both interpretations raise.

The fourth paragraph introduces a different aspect of the debate not directly addressed in the Extracts – the international context in which the Korean War was fought. However, this is not introduced using 'stand alone' knowledge but by integrating contextual knowledge with a discussion of what is not mentioned in Extract 1 and alluded to in Extract 2.

Each further paragraph follows a similar pattern with the content of the Extracts and the historical context being used to determine the extent to which each interpretation can be justified. Knowledge is precisely selected and appropriately deployed.

The concluding paragraph brings together the different elements of the debate discussed in the main body of the response. It reaches a fully substantiated judgement on the views given in both Extracts while arguing against the view stated in the question.

Overall it meets Level 5 for all three strands of the mark scheme, allowing the award of High level five.

## Example 2

This is a mid-Level 4 response answering WHI04 1C Q1.

**How far do you agree with the view that the Cold War policies of the USA, in the years 1945–53, were motivated by an ideological mission to defend 'liberty against the forces of darkness' (Extract 1, line 3)?**

**Explain your answer using [Extracts 1 and 2](#) and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.**

The USA claimed that its ~~foreign~~ policies in the years 1945–53 were motivated by an ideological mission to defend "liberty against forces of darkness. Nonetheless, as ~~some~~ <sup>extract</sup> 2 points out, the USA had economic interests as well, which were protected by the Cold War policies of the USA. Hence, while ~~some~~ extract 1 advocates that USA's foreign policy aimed at defending liberty, extract 2 alleges that the American objective was the spread of capitalism. It can be argued that both ideological as well as <sup>econo-</sup>mic motives contributed to the formation of the American Cold War policies.

Extract 1 is a secondary source as it is an extract from the book "The Story of American Freedom" written by E. Foner and published in 1998. Extract 1 supports the view that the Ameri-<sup>can</sup> ~~can~~ Foreign policy was motivated by an ideological mission to defend "liberty against the forces of darkness". ~~So~~ This idea was illustrated by the Truman Doctrine (1947) as well as the Marshall Plan (1947). They both aimed to prevent the spread of communism by offering military as well as economic aid to ~~the~~ <sup>in</sup> war-torn countries.

Moreover, the view that the USSR is pursuing expansionist policies <sup>and hence the USA had to defend "liberty"</sup> was enhanced by Stalin's actions, and other events, such as "the Berlin Blockade, a Communist government in China, the establishment of NATO and the Korean War". After the Berlin Blockade (1948-49) the USA, regarding the blockade as an attempt to undermine the ~~the~~ American hold over West Berlin, formed the NATO alliance (1949). Furthermore, the communist takeover of China (1949) after the Chinese civil war as well as the fact that North Korea was under communist regime made the Americans believe that democracy and liberty, as perceived in the West according to the principles of Williamsonian democracy, was under attack by the USSR.

As cited in the source, the policies <sup>and the rhetoric</sup> intensified through the years. In the Truman Doctrine (1947), ~~the~~ the American President Truman adopted a policy of containment towards communism, while ~~in~~ in the Korean war (1950-53) with the establishment of the "NSC 68" document the USA changed its policy to one of rolling back communism, thus adopting a more aggressive stance towards it.

The NSC-68 document presented the world in bipolar terms since, as cited in the extract, it "described the Cold War as a conflict between 'the idea of freedom and the idea of slavery under the grim control of <sup>the</sup> Kremlin'". This view had been adopted by the majority of the Western world during the Cold War and since ~~according to~~ <sup>the</sup> orthodox historians <sup>such as</sup> Schlesinger <sup>who advocate that</sup>, the Cold War was a conflict between two competing ideologies: capitalism and ~~communism~~ <sup>communism</sup> as Truman outlined in extract 1 "between those who love

freedom and those who wanted to lead the world back into slavery and darkness." This was due to the fact that their attitudes and \*

~~Extract~~ Extract

~~Extract~~ 2 is a secondary source as well since it is

an extract from the book "American Capitalism's Expansion" written by J and G Colka and published in 1999. Contrary to extract

1, extract 2 advocates that the Cold War policies of the United States were moulded by its economic interests "to sustain and

to reform world capitalism". The ~~author~~ <sup>author</sup> points out that the USA "emerged from the war... goals" hence it refutes the

view presented in extract 1 that the Truman Doctrine was designed to protect liberty. In addition, the author highlights the ~~point~~ <sup>fact that</sup>

"United States' aim was to ~~go~~ <sup>restructure</sup> ... everywhere". This could be a reference to the Marshall Plan (1947).

However, their motives, according to the source were not as humanitarian as extract 1

claims, since the Marshall Plan aided devastated European economies because the USA was afraid that ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> economic crisis in Europe would

harm the USA, due to the fact that Europe was a major importer of American goods.

~~The~~ Extract 2 adopts a very ~~harsh~~ <sup>critical</sup> view towards American policies since it alleges that its aim was not to "containment of communism", which is advocated in extract 1, but instead

"the extension and expansion of American capitalism according to its new economic power and needs". This view has been adopted by

~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> revisionist school of historians, in which Colka belongs to, ~~the~~

Since revisionists were disillusioned with the Cold War due to the Vietnam War. ~~the~~

The two extracts presents two different points of view regarding the American Cold War policies. While ~~extract~~ <sup>extract</sup> 1 illustrates the ~~perspective~~ <sup>perspective</sup> of the orthodox school of historians, ~~extract~~ extract 2 illustrates the perspective of the revisionist school of historians. ~~Extract~~ Extract 1 supports the view that American policy was motivated by its willingness to defend liberty and democracy by the expansionist ~~tendencies~~ <sup>tendencies</sup> of Stalin, whilst extract 2 alleges that American motives were far from ideological since USA's aim was to spread capitalism and hence increase its strength.

In conclusion, extract 1 and 2 present two different perspectives on the ~~Cold~~ <sup>Cold</sup> War policies of the USA in 1945-53. Extract 1 claims that USA is "defending liberty against the forces of darkness" ~~and~~ thus its motives are ideological, while extract 2 points out that American motives were ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> moulded by its economic interests to spread capitalism. All in all, ~~both~~ <sup>it can be argued that</sup> it was a combination of ideological and economic motives that ultimately formed the American Cold War policies.

\* actions were moulded by the events of the Cold War and the surrounding atmosphere ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> tension, since the west perceived Stalin's spread ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> Eastern Europe and the imposition of communist governments there, <sup>which violated the agreements of the Yalta Conference (1945)</sup> as an attempt ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> spread communism rather ~~than~~ <sup>than</sup> a way to defend the USA from a future attack, as revisionist historian Williams ~~claims~~ <sup>claims</sup>.

## Examiner commentary

This response demonstrates a clear understanding of the extracts and analyses the issues of interpretation raised within them. The viewpoints are identified in the introduction and through reference to relevant points in the extract throughout the response.

The evidence from Extract 1 is used to support the view in the question and the evidence from Extract 2 identified as supporting an economic argument for US motivation. The extracts are compared rather than the differences just being shown. The analysis of Extract 1 suggests some Level 5 qualities, e.g. the reference to the USSR's pursuit of expansionist policies requiring the USA to defend 'liberty', but Extract 2 is not approached with the same level of confidence. Strand 1, therefore, exhibits high Level 4 qualities.

Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore relevant aspects of the debate particularly in relation to Extract 1. Contextual knowledge is used to explore the viewpoint in Extract 1, e.g. with reference to Berlin, China and Korea, but there are some aspects of expansion of detail rather than integration of knowledge and the deployment of knowledge with regard to Extract 2 is relevant but lacks depth. Strand 2, therefore, exhibits Level 4 qualities, but not strongly.

An overall line of argument is suggested in the opening paragraph, i.e. that US policies in the Cold War were motivated by a combination of the two viewpoints outlined in the Extracts.

However, although the response does demonstrate understanding that the issues raised in the Extracts are matters of interpretation and the evidence provided in the extracts is discussed, there is no clear process of coming to an overall judgement. The main paragraphs outline the viewpoints and compare them but criteria for judging motivation are not clearly established and the final judgement is based on the limited substantiation that both viewpoints can be corroborated and so together explain US motivation. Strand 3, therefore, definitely meets the qualities of Level 3 with some aspects of Level 4 present.

It is worth noting that there is no need for the candidate to state that the Extracts are secondary sources as this is not a requirement of the AO3 skill being assessed; it is the view provided by the extract that is being analysed and not its author or origin. Evaluation of the Extracts using provenance criteria more associated with AO2 assessment will not be credited and prevent candidates from using the time available effectively.

Overall the response demonstrates understanding of both viewpoints but Extract 1 is more confidently dealt with than Extract 2. There is an awareness that the issues are matters of interpretation but the response becomes a repetitive comparison towards the end and lacks a substantiated overall judgement. The response meets all of the criteria for Level 3 with Level 4 qualities clearly shown in Strand 1 and Strand 2, and partially in strand 3, so overall this leads to a 'best-fit' judgment of mid-Level 4.

### **Example 3**

This is a mid-Level 3 response answering WHI04 1B Q1.

**How far do you agree with the view that the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 was a result of the alliance system developed by the great powers?**

**Explain your answer using [Extracts 1 and 2](#) and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.**

~~Source~~ Extract 1 origin is from B E Schmitt. The title of his book is "The Origins of the First World War" and was published 40 years later after the First World War ended.

This could add weight to the source as B E Schmitt is less involved emotionally with the war as he wrote his book 50 years after. It could be argued that his view was more balanced than other historians who wrote during the first world war and were more emotionally involved.

B E Schmitt's nature is that he argues that in the earlier years 1870 "peace was maintained by the combination of alliances and armaments". This is true as countries such as Germany had an alliance with Italy and France had an alliance with

Russia this gave them confidence as they knew if they would be attacked these countries would come and help them. This ultimately ~~led~~ led that no countries would attack each other in the earlier years as everybody was kind of afraid of each other. However this did not ~~mean~~ <sup>mean</sup> that they ~~did~~ did not want to go to war. AS Franz Duke Ferdinand was killed in Sarajevo from Gabriel Princip member of the Black Hand, Austria-Hungary argued that Serbia planned this assassination and issued that Serbia ~~should~~ need to pay for this action. Austria-Hungary felt that their "status quo" like Schmitt is talking about was being put down and their solution was an ultimatum.

Even though Austria-Hungary had ~~Austria-Hungary had~~ more military and weaponry than Serbia, they knew that Serbia ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> an agreement with Russia, therefore they asked Germany for their help.

~~As~~ Germany sent Austria-Hungary a "blank cheque", which stated that they will give their unconditional support to Austria-Hungary no matter what they will do.

This gave Austria-Hungary the confidence to send Serbia an harsh ultimatum and therefore like B E Schmitt refers "upset their status quo". ~~As~~ Serbia gets the ultimatum ~~and~~ <sup>they</sup> wanted ~~firstly~~ to accept all terms. ~~But as the~~ However ~~Russians~~ ~~to~~ then the Russians came into play and said they will support Serbia. ~~and that~~ This gave the Serbian more confidence and they rejected 2 points of the ultimatum.

The ~~source~~ <sup>Extract</sup> mentions "Austria-Hungary and Germany insisted a military solution" this shows that Germany and Austria-Hungary did want to go to war as they had their alliance system which made them more confident and arrogant. Germany wanted more land for their own this was called

"Erfüllungs politik" therefore they supported Austria-Hungary to send that ultimatum and later to ~~declare~~ go to war with Austria-Hungary against the allies.

Russia, France and Britain did not have such an <sup>desire to</sup> ~~want~~ to go to war. <sup>However on the other</sup> ~~however~~ they <sup>side they were also</sup> ~~were also~~ too proud to let Germany and Austria-Hungary take Serbia's military. Therefore Russia tried to warn Germany and Austria-Hungary if they will attack Serbia they will be mobilising. Germany pushed Austria-H. to go to war before the Russians mobilised as Russia had such good weaponry but as soon as Russia started to mobilise "no military command was willing to allow a rival to get a head start and mobilising first". This shows that the alliance system gave the powers more confidence and courage to start a war, as they knew ~~if~~ that the great powers such as Russia and Germany will be backing them up.

~~It~~ Germany would B E Schmitt <sup>(purpose in writing)</sup> pointed ~~extremely~~ good out that if ~~the~~ Austria-H. would not have get support from Germany they might not sent such an harsh agreement to Serbia and Serbia <sup>if Russia</sup> might ~~would~~ not have supported Serbia they might have accepted all the ~~main~~ points from the Ultimatum therefore the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 was a result of the alliance system.

However B E Schmitt also mentions that the arms race with the countries had during that time resulted in a lot of tension among the countries and that the "beginning to mobilise, its action made military men everywhere nervous". This indicates that also other factors such as the arms race between the big powers contributed to the outbreak of war. As powers started a naval race for example Britain against Germany other countries started also to produce more and more

and therefore within that they increased tensions among each other.

Extract 2 origin is from A J P Taylor his book is called "The struggle for mastery in Europe 1898-1918" published in 1959. ~~AJP~~ Taylor did publish his book like Schmitt in the later years. Taylor is focusing

Taylor argues that it would be wrong to say that the European war was inevitable. As he mentions "no war is inevitable until it breaks out".

Taylor moreover mentions the nature of the alliances is precarious. As an example he refers to Italy.

Italy first ~~said~~ ~~it~~ had an pact with Germany and promised them support. This changed ~~then~~ very fast as Italy wanted to negotiate a Mediterranean agreement with France and Britain. Italy was only interested in its self interest.

Italy saw it's benefit in the Mediterranean sea. ~~As there the whole trading~~  
~~was~~ The Mediterranean sea was the trading empire and countries such as Britain made their money out of trading. Britain did not want to enter war as it wanted to ~~stay~~<sup>keep</sup> in it's trading empire. Therefore, ~~it~~<sup>Britain</sup> constantly tried to make agreements and negotiate for it's self interest. Taylor's nature is to point out that one of the reasons why war broke out was that every country was only interested for its own benefits.

They made pacts and secret agreements to ensure their own safety. ~~and if~~ If the agreement did not suited them anymore they made new pacts and changed sides. ~~as most~~ Italy is a good example.

In addition, Taylor points also out in the end of his source that "France had an agreement with Germany and the British, however ~~at~~ in the end the alliance looked completely different.

Britain France and Russia sided together and Italy joined in the end for their benefit to get Tyrol, Trieste and the other countries they wanted.

~~Both sources can be~~

Extract 1 and 2 show some different approaches of why the first world war broke out. Extract 1 focuses more on the alliance system than Extract 2. Extract 1 purpose is that the alliance system was primarily responsible for the outbreak of war with the alliances which the great powers made. However it argues also correctly that the arms race and the mobilisation of the countries played an important role. Extract 2 purpose is that the secret agreements and the countries self interest played an important role in the outbreak of the war, however his point is leading to the same as Schmitt that the alliances

~~and the~~ were the reason for the outbreak of war. As ~~is~~<sup>when</sup> countries negotiate with each other ~~this is a sign of alliance~~ and make secret agreements it is a sign of building an alliance together.

Therefore, I agree ~~more~~<sup>add more</sup> ~~with~~ weight to source 1 as it outlines more the origins of the outbreak of the first world war, which was ~~largely to an~~ to an large extent due to the alliance system.

## Examiner commentary

This response is useful in demonstrating both the key features of a Level 3 response and a common area of weakness in responses at Level 3 and below – the use of AO2 skills and language in an AO3 question type. The response attempts to both discuss the extracts as interpretations (which is required) and to evaluate the extracts as source of evidence (which is not required).

The references to origin, nature, purpose and weight are either irrelevant or not used accurately. The introductory paragraphs to the consideration of each extract attempt to evaluate the origin of the extract. For the AO3 assessment, the candidate is being asked to analyse the content of the extracts rather than to address historiography or the reliability of the author. These paragraphs on origin are irrelevant and so not rewardable within the mark scheme. The use of AO2 language such as nature, purpose and weight within the response are misapplied and highlight that this approach is not useful for AO3 responses. However, elements of this material are rewardable as it is clear that the candidate is actually considering the content of the extract when using these terms and is demonstrating understanding and providing some analysis.

The rewardable material demonstrates the key features of a Level 3 response. In dealing with each extract the response selects some of the key points of interpretation. In the consideration of Extract 1 understanding with some analysis is clearly demonstrated and the reference to the arms race does hint at some Level 4 analysis of issues. Extract 2 is weaker in this respect with key points being selected but some not being explained. Each extract is considered separately and the differences between them indicated in a separate paragraph. Strand 1 meets the qualities of Level 3.

For Strand 2, the response clearly meets Level 3 with regard to Extract 1. Knowledge of the issues related to the role of the alliance system is included which is both linked to and used to expand views given in the extracts. However, knowledge is less securely deployed with regard to Extract 2. Strand 2 meets the qualities of Level 3, but not strongly.

The structure of the response has led to Extract 1 being given more consideration than Extract 2 with the discussion of the extracts in relation to the other and the judgement coming briefly at the end. However, discussion of the views in the extract is attempted both in each separate section and when considering them together. The candidate is attempting to address the key points in relation to the viewpoint expressed in the question. Attempts are also made to establish criteria for judgement. It is suggested that Extract 1 suggests that alliance system was not the only contributory factor and that Extract 2 has elements which may also support the viewpoint in the question. However, the judgement is given with very limited substantiation. Strand 3 meets the qualities of Level 3, but not strongly.

Overall, the response deals more effectively with Extract 1 than Extract 2 but understanding and some analysis are demonstrated, and knowledge of issues related to the debate is included. The structure of the response led to a limited opportunity for a discussion of the viewpoints in relation to each other and for coming to a substantiated judgement.

There were elements of the response that were not relevant to AO3, but the rewardable material met the Level 3 descriptors in all three strands with Strand 2 and 3 being slightly weaker, leading to a mid-Level 3 mark.

### **Example four**

This is a mid-Level 2 response answering WHI04 1C Q1.

**How far do you agree with the view that the Cold War policies of the USA, in the years 1945–53, were motivated by an ideological mission to defend 'liberty against the forces of darkness' (Extract 1, line 3)?**

**Explain your answer using [Extracts 1 and 2](#) and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.**

The Cold War policies of the Truman era, directly after World War II, was punctuated by an immense <sup>suspicion</sup> ~~hostility~~ for and wariness towards the USSR, which inevitably took of a ~~s~~ situation of tense diplomatic situation called the cold war. But, what were the motives behind American foreign policy during 1945-53?

Both Extract one and two blame the policies on the economic and political ideological differences between the USA and USSR. According to Extract one, the Truman Doctrine 'created the language' to which most Americans viewed the cold war, a battle between ideologies. Between capitalism that was liberty and eternal good and communism which was eternal darkness and oppression. It also brings <sup>up</sup> ~~the~~ the creation of Communist China and Korean War and the NSC-68 document in passing and catalogue it as a build up to allow 'the US a global crusade against Communism'. Instead of it's actual impact which ranges further than just a continuation of the rhetoric. Extract one also treats the paranoia <sup>created</sup> ~~and~~ by ideological differences as a rhetoric or propaganda used to

rile the Americans up against Communism.

Since the establishment of the USSR in 1917, and the 5 year long civil war that raged within Russia <sup>with</sup> ~~and~~ aid from ~~a~~ capitalist countries against the Soviet state, the USSR had been invaded twice from Poland and craved security against invasion by claiming Eastern European states as buffer zones. This was misinterpreted by Truman and Atlee for imperialism, and caused tension to rise between them due to being unable to grasp the <sup>USSR's</sup> need for safety, as neither Britain nor the USA had suffered as much losses during the wars as the USSR had.

The ideological differences between the USA and USSR is summarily explained in extract two, although extract two is more liable to bias, and only manages to bring in its policies towards communism very late. Woodrow Wilson's enthusiasm to spread capitalism through a free-market policy was ~~an~~ integral to his 14-points in 1918, though the direct application of that was to be carried out ~~after~~ after the Second World War, driven by the power vacuum created due to a decimated Europe, according to the source. However, it is more likely that it was the misunderstanding towards the before said USSR's buffer zones which was misinterpreted as ~~capitalism~~ <sup>imperialism</sup>.

China's revolution and the Korean war only cemented this misunderstanding even though USSR was most likely more concerned about their own survival than bringing about a world revolution. Stalin, the leader of the

USSR had claimed power through the idea of revolution in a single state rather than World revolution.

This misunderstanding of intentions and ideological contrast led to the Truman Doctrine and Marshall plan, that insisted on rooting out poverty and getting Europe's economy back together in order to stop communism. Through the spread of capitalism and created 'post-war economic miracles' as in West Germany and Japan.

Another reason for the strong anti-communist rhetoric and spread of capitalism may root from Truman himself. Vice President Truman was not allowed to intervene in foreign policy during Roosevelt's presidency, and as such lacked experience in dealing with the USSR. In order to get some sort of high ground and establish himself Truman adopted an anti-communist narrative. He was also more influenced by McCarthyism and anti-communist feelings in the USA than Roosevelt was; and thus may have been swept up by his own narrative.

In conclusion, there was more to the policies pursued by the USA during the cold war besides acute ideological, economic and political differences. The misinterpretation of USSR's buffer zones as well as Truman's inexperience fueled the policies as much as the <sup>integral</sup> difference. Both sources explain this well, but leave out <sup>details and</sup> a more objective analysis in Extract 2, which was heavily biased.

## Examiner commentary

This response is useful in demonstrating some of the key features of a Level 2 response. Here the candidate response is using the extracts and their own knowledge to address the motivations behind the Cold War policies of the USA in the years 1945-53, but not explicitly in relation to the viewpoint outlined in the question.

The response also attempts to use AO2 skills to answer this AO3-focused question (as in the 1B level three example above). This is a general commentary on the extracts rather than an attempt to use the extracts to discuss the debate created by the question. Although reference to Extract 1, line 3 is made in the second paragraph, there is little indication that this is the viewpoint which should be under discussion. Within the overall response there is an acknowledgement of the ideological and economic motivations suggested by the extracts and so there is some understanding of the debate.

The response does attempt to analyse the extracts in relation to motivation behind US foreign policy but not the specific debate outline in the question. It is a commentary on what they say rather than analysing them in relation to the given viewpoint. As a result the best descriptor fit is Level 2 – demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. Strand 1 meets the qualities of Level 2.

As the focus of the response is not specifically directed to the viewpoint in the question then deployment of knowledge is not being used to explore relevant aspects of the debate. However, knowledge is being used to link or expand some views given in the extract rather than just being added to the information. Strand 2 is borderline Level 2-3.

The judgement made in the response is not in relation to the viewpoint outlined in the question but it does refer to the ideological and economic motivations outlined in the extracts and so the best fit here would be Level 1 – judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence. If some acknowledgement of ideological motivations had not been present, then Strand 3 would have been below baseline with no reward. Strand 3 meets the qualities of L1.

Overall, this response acknowledges the focus of the question but does not consider the viewpoint given in the question. Such responses are not able to develop the debate suggested by the question and the extracts and so are likely to meet the qualities of Level 2 for Strand 1 and 2 and may not be able to rewarded for Strand 3.

Here, Level 1 has been achieved in all Strands and the relative strengths of Strands 1 and 2 move the mark to a mid-Level 2.

## Example five

In clarifying the qualities required for high-level performance, it will be helpful to consider this response in relation to the high Level 5 response below to the same question:

To a certain extent, I agree with the view that the Cold War policies of the USA were motivated by the ideological mission to defend liberty against communism in the years 1945-53. Extract 7 supports this view by highlighting the policies of the Truman Doctrine, which led to the USA's greater involvement in world affairs. On the other hand, Extract 2 emphasizes the importance of working to spread capitalism in order to increase the USA's power, something which can be ~~also~~ further interpreted in the 1947 Marshall Plan. This is also seen in the Korean War ~~and~~ ~~Extract 1 mentioned~~ and the leadership rivalry between Truman and Stalin.

On one hand, I agree with the view that USA's policies were mainly fuelled by the wish to defend 'liberty against the forces of darkness'. Extract 7 defends this view by stating the importance of the 1947 Truman Doctrine which guided the 'spirit of American foreign policy'. The USSR is portrayed as an empire who's aim was 'slavery for all the world'. The USA, which had been threatened by communism since the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution felt responsible for saving freedom. Truman's resilience is conveyed by his separation between those who 'love freedom' and those who want 'slavery and darkness'. This idea had already ~~is further seen in the~~ been seen in the 1946 Long Telegram from Moscow,

where George Kennan warned the US government of Russia's plans to spread communism. This view, which dominated American Cold War policies for much of the Cold War, evidently motivated the ideological mission to defend liberty against communism.

On the other hand, Extract 2 emphasises the importance of building an effective business market to spread world capitalism. The 'new strength' following the Second World War fuelled the USA's ambitions to increase their economic supremacy and 'reform world capitalism'. This interpretation by Kettle was shared by the USSR in the years 1945-53. The 1947 Marshall Aid was portrayed by the USA, to be a generous act of heroism, in order to prevent the economic crisis in Europe from declining even further. They gave \$17 billion in total to 16 countries in West Europe, excluding all satellite states of the Soviet Union. This reflects Extract 2's view that 'trade' and 'peace' were the true motivations behind the USA's policies, as they wanted to make sure that they upheld European trade partners. Peace was also regarded to be the breeding grounds for communism by the US government, so the Marshall Aid was imposed to ensure the sustainability of capitalism. This interpretation is also supported by America's reluctance to force Germany to pay costly reparations during the 1945 Potsdam conference, something which the USSR condemned to be 'Dollar Imperialism'.

However, the aggression of Soviet expansionism in the years 1945-53 reflect Extract 1's portrayal of the USSR as 'slavery under the grim control of the Kremlin'. The speed at which Stalin managed to take control of the neighbouring states after the Second World War alarmed the West. By 1947,

every Eastern European state, except Czechoslovakia was under communist control. Stalin also managed to stamp out all opposition by expelling, exiling, or even executing those who tried to go against his regime, something which would have made the USA lean towards the view that the USSR was a 'force of darkness'. There was particular outrage after Stalin had promised to uphold free elections at the 1945 Yalta conference, along with his refusal to allow the original Polish government to replace the Red Army after the war. Extract 1 also mentions the Berlin blockade 1948-49, which portrayed Soviet aggression in opposing the intervention of Western capitalism. The USA was forced to fly up to 3000 tonnes of consumer goods every 24 hours to West Berlin, in order to prevent the people from starving. This illustrates the USSR as a 'force of darkness' which the USA had no choice but to fight against in order to maintain liberty.

On the other hand, the Berlin Blockade, although aggressive, had been triggered by the combined forces of West Germany. The Western allies had joined their territories together to create a 'Trizonia' state, something which Stalin saw as a threat. Their introduction of the new currency, Deutsche Marks, presents an example of the USA's aim to 'restructure' the world to gain profit, as conveyed in Extract 2, suggesting that the USA had provoked the USSR into the blockade, undermining the view that the USA's Cold War policies were motivated by the wish to protect freedom. This can also be seen in the Korean War 1950, as America's war policies shifted from containing communism to 'rolling-back' communism. In October 1950, Truman ordered ~~the~~ General MacArthur and the 260,000 UN troops to capture Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea. The initial involvement of the USA in the war had been triggered by communist forces invading South Korea, suggesting the policy of 'defending liberty'. However, when

Truman decided to go further and invade North Korea, this portrays the policy of obtaining 'world capitalism' as stated in Extract 2. The Soviet expansion which America had condemned as 'forces of darkness' were now being mirrored by the USA's 'extension and expansion of American capitalism'. Thus, ideological mission can not be identified to be the USA's motivation to defend those fighting communist forces.

In conclusion, the USA did regard the USSR as evil and it's Cold War policies were motivated by the defence of 'liberty against the forces of darkness'. <sup>Extract 1 shows</sup> how the Truman Doctrine portrays the defensive policies which dominated the USA in the years 1945-53, supported by aggressive Soviet expansionism following the Second World War. The Long Telegram further proves this interpretation to have been adopted by Truman's government along with their heroic act in face of Stalin's Berlin blockade. However, these portrayals could also be masking the true motivation behind the USA's Cold War policies as mentioned in Extract 2. Their interference in Europe with the Marshall Aid and the wish to uphold the sustainability of their trading partners, proves that the USA's policies may have been motivated by ~~the~~ world capitalism and gaining profit. The triggering of the Berlin Blockade, along with the change of policies to 'rolling-back' communism in the Korean War, supports this interpretation of Extract 2. Thus, both Extract 1 and Extract 2, along with supporting evidence, ~~also~~ implies that America's Cold War policies were motivated by defending liberty and economic gain, in the years 1945-53.

### Examiner commentary

This response addresses the viewpoint in the question and relates it to the extracts from the beginning. It interprets the extracts with confidence and analyses the issues raised by considering the claims made and evidence given in the extract. Knowledge of the historical context is integrated with the analysis to present a sustained argument and to reach a substantiated judgement on the views given in each extract. All 3 Strands meet the qualities within Level 5, allowing the award of a high level five mark.

## Generic level descriptions for section A

### Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

---

#### Section A

**Target: A01 (5 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**A03 (20 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.  Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.  Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.  Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.  A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgment are left implicit.
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.  Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.  Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.  Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge.  Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.

	<p>Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</p> <p>A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p>
--	--