

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/72

Paper 5k (Special Subject: Winston Churchill, 1914–1946),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result, not all answers fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Question 1 (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

Question 1 (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the band. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected or, especially at the lower end of the band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear, there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated, but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, while investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

- 1 (a) **How far does Document D corroborate the view of Munich in 1938 expressed in Document A?** [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

A and D agree that Munich was a surrender, but A goes further and sees it as a 'total and unmitigated defeat'. Both refer to the loss of the Czech forces – 'the fine army of ancient Bohemia' in A is echoed by the reference to the 'fine Czech army in D' which amplifies this by reference to the Skoda works. However, Churchill in A finds the surrender unendurable, while D sees that it gave Britain advantages and any other policy would not have been possible given the state of Empire and domestic public opinion – something that Churchill ignores. D sees that from a military point of view, the sort of opposition to Hitler implied in A could have been justified. This point is corroborated by Churchill's reference to the German need for 30 divisions to conquer the Czechs – something that would have given Britain an advantage. The nature of the evidence is very different. Churchill is predicting the effects of Munich, while Ismay is writing from hindsight. His view is very coloured by his military knowledge. Churchill in this speech is not concerned with military options, but with national disgrace and the loss of a valuable ally, and the danger of British policy being dominated by Germany. He is speaking as a minority opinion in the heat of the moment after years in the wilderness, warning about German threats. The emotional tone, therefore is understandable. Ismay has had time to reflect on the events and weigh the arguments, so offers a more detached and balanced view based on the military knowledge he had at the time. He can look at public opinion, but Churchill did not want to refer to the enthusiasm by the public, for fear of weakening the strong and unpopular view he was presenting.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Government was right not to have confidence in Churchill's judgement on the conduct of foreign policy in 1938?**

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A to E). [20]

Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently, with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

The debate is whether Churchill's criticisms of appeasement and the Munich settlement had any real substance. His view in A was that there had been a total and unmitigated defeat, that Czechoslovakia would be taken over entirely, that Britain had lost the advantage of a powerful Czech army, and that Britain was in danger of being dependent on Germany and losing its independence in foreign policy. The view that British foreign policy had neglected honour and duty is offered, and the thrust is that diplomacy has neglected to gain sufficient support from like-minded enemies of dictatorship.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

The counter view is that there was no real alternative. B argues that France had no real will to defend Czechoslovakia, the Czechs could not have resisted and Russia had military weaknesses. This might have been expected from a Conservative MP in the euphoria of relief that war had not come in 1938, but it is also supported by Ismay. Despite his wholehearted support for Churchill in the war, in his memoirs this general doubts whether war would have been possible given the lack of unity at home and within the Empire (Commonwealth). However, he offers the Churchillian view some support in purely military terms, agreeing with him about the loss of the Czech army and munitions works, though in more prosaic terms than Churchill's 'fine army of Ancient Bohemia'. In a sense, Wise's speech confirms Ismay's view about the lack of unity for war compared with, say, the sombre but more united view in the Commons in September 1939. Churchill's appeals to the League of Nations Union in December 1938 seems to have a rather desperate and unrealistic air about it – could anyone really see the League of Nations as significant by this time? Also, Churchill makes no mention of Russia, therefore who were the democracies that he is urging a common front with? France, as was seen in 1930, had little will to resist and the USA was firmly isolationist. This is certainly consonant with the critical view in E. The point is made that it was questionable whether the rather diffuse collection of states referred to in the passage would actually collaborate and whether the threat of anti-German alliance might have driven Hitler to war anyway, much in the same way, perhaps, that 'encirclement' had alienated Germany before 1914. It is easy as both the contemporary B and the historian E do to ridicule the idea of a Grand Alliance and a democratic front against Hitler – Churchill had not shown himself at all eager to defend democracy in Spain, he had been sympathetic to Mussolini and had himself run down British forces in the 1920s, so his stance in 1938 might be seen as inconsistent and unrealistic. However, what was the alternative? Appeasing the dictators had not worked, the time 'bought' by appeasement in 1938, as Ismay said, was more to the advantage to Hitler in military terms than to Britain, and Poland was a much less strong military ally in the east than Czechoslovakia. In the end, Hitler was defeated by an alliance and history has tended to see Munich as ignominious.

2. 'Churchill's record in government from 1918 to 1929 was characterised more by failure than success.' Discuss. [30]
Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

In 1917, Churchill became Minister of Munitions in the Lloyd George coalition and in January 1919, Secretary of State for War and Secretary of State for Air. He was a vigorous minister and he was successful in preventing further unrest by reorganising demobilisation. He advocated a war of intervention in Russia and was virulently opposed to Bolshevism. He also supported arms reduction on the basis that a future war was a distant prospect and introduced the Ten Year Rule. He took a leading role in advocating first of all a harsh line against unrest in Ireland and then in negotiating the peace treaty. In 1921, he became Colonial Secretary and suppressed unrest in Iraq. In 1924, he became Chancellor of the Exchequer and responsible for the return to the Gold Standard in 1925. He took an active part in the government's reaction to the General Strike, editing the British gazette and urging the deployment of troops to safeguard food supplies. Though he supported the restrictions on General Strikes in the trade union legislation of 1927, he tried to negotiate better terms for the miners' return to work and was critical of the owners and their spokesmen. His financial policies as Chancellor were seen by most of his party to be practical and successful in the late 1920s.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

There should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them.

Churchill's energy and vigour have to be set against some lack of judgement. The sound work done in the later stages of the War and his handling of the demobilisation of a large army did not preclude a major error of judgement over Russia. The Whites were unreliable as allies and the practicalities of waging a major war in Russia without the support of the majority of the British people or his cabinet colleagues were too much. His vigorously pressing economies, including the reduction in the armed forces, has led to much criticism, but may have been inevitable in the circumstances of the time. His relationship toward Ireland shows the same mixture of truculence and reliance on force, together with a willingness to negotiate and form warm relationships, that characterises much of his career. Churchill has been much criticised for over-reacting to the General Strike; the issue of press freedom exercised him and he saw the constitution to be in danger. This may be set against a calmer and more conciliatory policy in its aftermath and some solid financial expertise in the late 1920s.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

3 How important were Churchill's views on India in explaining why 1929-38 became his 'wilderness years'? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Churchill took a strong line against the modest constitutional reforms that were being discussed in the wake of the Congress agitation of the 1920s. He aligned himself with the quite extreme views of the India Defence League and was at odds with the cross-part consensus that had emerged about India. It seemed that he was being guided by an outdated view of India coloured by his experiences as a young man on the North West Frontier, rather than a modern post-war view supported by Baldwin and the main stream of the Conservative party. However, this was not the only issue that was separating him from the party in the 1930s. Though he had been a competent Chancellor in the 1920s, the economic downturn had led to a retreat from the Gold Standard that he had restored in 1925 and his judgement was being seen as faulty. His style seemed outdated in an age when there was coalition rather than confrontation and a more conversational speaking style. A long career had left its share of bitterness. Churchill had been an abrasive critic of the Conservatives before the War and had come back to them, therefore was not entirely trusted. His previous allies in politics, for instance Lloyd George and FE Smith, had dropped away and a new generation found his personality and political style old-fashioned. From 1933, his warnings about German resurgence and the danger of air power did not meet with much sympathy in a country opposed to war and by politicians whose main concern was the economy and retrenchment. For the author of the Ten Year Rule to criticise rearmament was inconsistent. For a well-documented admirer of Mussolini to criticise the German dictatorship seemed inconsistent. The support for King Edward VIII was seen as ill-judged and the hostile reception that Churchill got in the Commons when he spoke about this was one of his worst political moments. The India Act of 1935 passed easily and the opponents were seen simply as reactionaries.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. There should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them.

In many ways, India summed up the problems that many in the party found with Churchill. The matter was discussed in the extreme terms of the crusade against Bolshevik or the General Strike, rather than in rational terms. The rhetoric and the views seemed to be more Edwardian than modern and his allies were mainly out of touch former officers or civil servants, rather than the middle classes that the Conservatives represented or the newly enfranchised working class men and women whose votes they needed. With Empire turning into Commonwealth, with the strains of policing India at a time when defence was being reduced and when there was a need for economy in spending, a hard-line approach to concession to Congress was seen as impractical. The attacks on the government alienated Baldwin who had promoted Churchill above his abilities in 1924 and offered good chances to his growing rank of enemies. Once the India issue had divided him from his party, Churchill's other preoccupations seemed further evidence of someone with outdated attitudes and needless anxieties, so it could be seen as the key to his isolation, but it could also be seen as a symptom of his lack of sympathy with modern trends.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

- 4** **'When he was in office, he appeased Stalin too much; when he was in opposition he needlessly antagonised him.'** How justified is this criticism of Churchill's policies towards Stalin and the USSR in the years 1944–46? **[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

By 1944, with the Red Army advancing into Eastern Europe and with the considerable expansion of Russian power, Churchill was anxious about the post-War world. Stalin's failure to assist the Warsaw Rising in 1944 may have been an indication of the fate of post-War Poland. Roosevelt did not share Churchill's anxieties and Churchill had become increasingly isolated in the wartime conferences of the Big Three. The US feared that Britain would wish to restore her Empire and that Churchill had an unrealistic hatred of Communism dating back to the war of Intervention. Churchill was caught between the practical demands to sustain the Grand Alliance, to ensure that Germany was defeated and that Stalin would join in the war against Japan, and the fears that Russia would dominate Europe and in particular rule Poland in whose name the British had entered the War in the first place. The Poles in London had been recognised as Poland's government in exile, but Churchill could not afford a breach with Stalin over post-War Poland and they were forced to accept a massive territorial change to the country. At Yalta, there was little Churchill could do to prevent Poland being sacrificed and little to prevent Russian domination of Eastern Europe. The return of Russian prisoners to almost certain imprisonment and death remains one of the most controversial concessions to Stalin. The debate in the Commons on Yalta in February 1945 produced Conservative criticisms uncomfortably close to Churchill's own criticisms of Munich in 1938 – that a dictator had been appeased. Realistically, there was no way

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	72

to enforce the promise of elections in areas occupied by Russia and the brutal onslaught on Japanese territory by Stalin was simply for expansion and plunder. After May 1945, Churchill was much freer to express his concerns about growing Soviet power.

The death of Roosevelt in April 1945 and the accession of Truman had produced a change in US attitudes and the threat from Stalin would fall on more receptive ears. The speech in Fulton, Missouri, was one of the defining moments of the Cold War and used a phrase – ‘The Iron Curtain’ – which was profoundly influential. However, it could be argued that it assumed a greater ideological intention on Stalin’s part than was actually the truth and that Churchill was over-simplifying the situation, ignoring the genuine defence needs of the USSR and the support for radical change in Eastern Europe.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. There should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them.

The judgement can be supported by Churchill’s acceptance, albeit reluctantly, of Stalin’s post War ambitions. The so called percentages agreement seems rather cynical and brutal and envisages a division of Europe without regard to the wishes of its inhabitants that goes further than Munich. The acceptance of Stalin’s plans for Poland and the bullying of the London Poles to agree with them might support the view that appeasement was in full swing. However, this could be seen as merely accepting reality. In practice, there was little that Churchill could do and joint opposition to the USSR by the USA and Britain was not a practical proposition. Churchill himself was concerned about the policies. The swing to open and aggressive criticism in March 1946 is understandable, but is also open to criticism for the following reasons: Stalin had kept his word in Greece; Yugoslavia was not under Russian control; his arguments that the USSR did have genuine defence concerns was reasonable; there was some local support for change in areas of Eastern Europe which had been under right wing dictatorship; and, the degree of control was not always the ‘iron curtain’ that Churchill suggested. However, Stalin had not interpreted the promises at Yalta in the spirit that they had been made, as shown by the brutal repression and imposition of Communist regimes.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.