

# MARKSCHEME TO EXAMPLE 1 – SOURCEBASED EXERCISE

**1a. What, according to SOURCE 2, was the significance of the Percentage Agreement?** [3 marks]

- Great Britain and the Soviet Union made an agreement about South-Eastern Europe after WWII
- Winston Churchill (UK) and Joseph Stalin (USSR) divided South East Europe into various spheres of influence
- Soviet Union had big influence over Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary
- Britain and her allies had big influence over Greece
- The influence over Yugoslavia should be equal between the Soviet Union and Great Britain + her allies

**At least three of the above claims shall be included in the answer to get full marks on this task**

**1b. What is the message conveyed by SOURCE 3.** [2 marks]

- Britain gives Poland to the Soviet Union (Union Jack as a band on the “butlers” arm and he serves Poland to a man sitting down that has a cap/hat with a star which is a symbol that was used by the Soviet Army)
- Poland, according to the text under the picture was only a starter (first course) for the Soviet Union - in other words, the Soviet Union would receive more parts of Europe
- The previous agreement, the Atlantic Charter does not apply anymore because its different points are crossed out on the paper that is on the table
- The Soviet Union is portrayed in a very negative way - as a rural dirty rough man with a big knife on the platter - no cutlery that one would expect to find in a restaurant
- UK is portrayed as an obedient servant serving the Soviet Union what they want - in this case Poland

**At least two of the above claims shall be included in the answer to get full marks on this task**

**2. With reference to the origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of SOURCE 1?** [6 marks]

**ORIGIN:** *Extract from the biography "Stalin – The First In-depth Biography Based on Explosive New Documents from Russia's Secret Archives" published 1997. Written by Edvard Radzinsky. Edvard Stanislavovich Radzinsky (born in Moscow, Russia on September 23, 1936). He studied in the Moscow Archive Institute and is a trained historian.*

**Who is behind the source:** Edvard Radzinsky – trained historian.

**When was the source written:** It was published 1997

**What kind of source is it:** It's a biography about Stalin

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of a trained historian to write a biography about Stalin based on new material is to enlighten and try to explain a turbulent period in Russia's modern history. To this end, it may also be possible to improve your own career as well as possibly make some money.

**Why was this source written:** To spread knowledge of Stalin; dictator of the Soviet Union between 1928-1953. The title also tells us that we can expect some new knowledge because the author had access to "*Explosive New Documents from Russia's Secret Archives*". To advertise this in the title can also fulfill another purpose - to raise interest and try to get as many as possible to buy the biography...

**For whom was this source written:** A biography about Stalin is primarily aimed at historians, students - all who are particularly interested in Stalin and Russia at this time.

**AUTHENTIC/GENUINE:** Stalin's involvement in the Second World War have been treated by many historians so we do not question the authenticity of this source (in addition, we have clearly stated that we are not "*fooling you*" - i.e. purposely using a false source. This mean that the source is authentic/genuine).

**TIME:** This book is written several years after the time it deals with, which means that the author has access to many various sources – the advantage of hindsight. This is very valuable when you put together a biography. Radzinsky has experienced the Stalin time in Russia as a young person, which may also be an advantage when it comes to the understanding of this time and the understanding of Stalin. However, the source is written long after Stalin's time, which can also be negative. As a historian, the author has read many different sources, which means that he has learned many different ideas about Stalin which might affect the biography.

**DEPENDENT:** The author has used many different sources (it's an obvious fact when we are dealing with a biography written by a historian), which means that he has been influenced by these sources. His title "*Stalin – The First In-depth Biography Based on Explosive New Documents from Russia's Secret Archives*" also indicates that he has access to some primary sources that has not been used before. We do not know anything about these new sources but they will also affect the biography. Because he is a historian, we conclude that he is aware of the impact of these various sources and therefore handles them with the professionalism that we assume a trained historian has.

**TENDENCY:** Radzinsky is a trained historian so we conclude that he tries to be as neutral as possible when he writes and discusses Stalin. However, there is some tendency in the actual title "*Stalin – The First In-depth Biography Based on Explosive New Documents from Russia's Secret Archives*"... The word "explosive" is a value word that departs from the historians' neutrality. Is the word an exaggeration, or is it true that the new documents really add a significant new picture of Stalin and his time? The title is a little bit too sensational and shows a certain tendency.

#### **DISCUSSION – VALUE / LIMITATIONS OF THE SOURCE**

**LIMITATIONS:** Some of the values described above may also imply a limitation. Radzinsky has grown up and trained to become a historian in a communist state with its emphasis on certain political values. This can affect his attempt to be neutral because a totalitarian state usually influences the education system. It is not certain that Radzinsky's special field is modern Russian history. He may have a different field of specialization and therefore does not have any deep knowledge of this area. A biography focuses on a person - not the topic being investigated. Because it was not the focus of the biography, maybe the knowledge and information about this episode is limited ...

**VALUE:** A professional historian must be considered an expert in his field which is valuable. We can expect the subject - Stalin - to be treated in a professional manner. This book is written long after the time it deals, which means that the author has access to many different sources – the value of hindsight. This is very valuable when you put together a biography. The author has gone through new material according to the title which increases the knowledge of Stalin - which is valuable. Radzinsky is Russian, born, raised and educated in Russia, meaning that he probably has deep knowledge of the language and Russian practices, which is another advantage. Radzinsky has experienced the Stalin time in Russia as a young person, which may also be an advantage when it comes to the understanding of this time and the understanding of Stalin.

<p><b>VALUE / LIMITATIONS:</b> What is the value It's a "<i>non-contemporary</i>" "<i>Secondary Source</i>" / Authority – Who is behind the source? / Authenticity – What information is presented? / Objectivity – What is the purpose? / Trend ... / Relevance – When was it written? (or more simply the 5 W's – <b>Who? When? Where? Why? For Whom?</b>)</p>
--

**The answer to this task will vary greatly between different students. What is important is that all parts - the origin, purpose, value and limitations are discussed as well as the various criteria of source criticism are used in the evaluation of the sources...**

**3. "The Western powers gave away Eastern Europe to Stalin in Moscow 1944". Use these sources and your own knowledge to evaluate the validity of this claim.**

[9 points]

When you answer this last task all sources should be used! Note – You should focus on and discuss the claim above – that "*The Western powers gave away Eastern Europe to Stalin in Moscow 1944*"!

**SOURCE 1:** Historian(!) Radzinsky, a non-contemporary secondary source, shows that this was a proposal that started with Churchill scrap of paper and then it was negotiated between the Foreign Ministers of the USSR and the United Kingdom. Ultimately the US was informed. In other words, there is clear evidence of a professional historian that Britain initiated the whole process and then accepted the outcome of the negotiations.

**SOURCE 2:** A two-piece source! The first part is a contemporary primary source that shows Churchill's scrap of paper with the proposal of the division of Eastern Europe into spheres of influence. The text is a non-contemporary secondary source that supports the view that this was an agreement between the USSR and Great Britain, and that it was Churchill who wrote down the proposal on a piece of paper. The text supports the previous text written by Radzinsky that the foreign ministers agreed on the final percentages. The US is not mentioned which means that there should be some comment about the fact that it was only Great Britain that made an agreement with the Soviet Union according to this source.

**SOURCE 3:** It is good to note that this source comes from Germany in 1944... (contemporary source). In this cartoon the Soviet Union is served Poland by Great Britain as a starter. Here it is important that students note that it's Poland that's served on the platter - this country is not mentioned in any of the other sources! In the percent agreement Poland is not mentioned either. So if we look at the statement "*The Western powers gave away Eastern Europe to Stalin in Moscow in 1944*" it's obviously not true/valid when it comes to **SOURCE 3** because Poland was never discussed in Moscow (according to all the other sources)

**OWN KNOWLEDGE:** What was the situation in Eastern part of Europe in 1944 (Red Army offensive – several areas already occupied by the USSR, etc...)? What was the will of the Western world before 1944 (Atlantic Charter 1941; conferences in Casablanca and Cairo)? How did the war progress (and what impact could that have on the agreement in Moscow 1944...)? Etc...

After the students have gone through the various sources and their added "own knowledge" it's very important that they discuss the topic. They should compare and contrast all the sources and their own knowledge. In this discussion it should be clear that:

- *Two sources mention an agreement about influence in southeastern Europe after the WWII*
- *Two sources mentions that it was Great Britain and the Soviet Union who actively negotiated when it came to this agreement and that in both these sources Churchill's initiative is described - it was he who started the negotiation with the "scrap of paper"*
- *One source describes that the United States was only briefed on the agreement after it was done*
- *One source is different from the others - the German source from 1944...*
- *Etc...*

**This is a task which will include an evaluation of all sources in relation to the task (the claim). More able pupils are expected to discuss the source value of the different sources. This is very important when we try to assess what really happened in Moscow in October 1944 ...**