

Visit
FREETESTPAPER.com
for more papers



Website: freetestpaper.com



[Facebook.com/freetestpaper](https://www.facebook.com/freetestpaper)



[Twitter.com/freetestpaper](https://www.twitter.com/freetestpaper)

NAME:	()	CLASS:
-------	-----	--------



YISHUN TOWN SECONDARY SCHOOL

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS II 2015 SEC 4 EXPRESS / SEC 5 NORMAL ACADEMIC COMBINED HUMANITIES HISTORY ELECTIVE (2204/03)

DATE : 28 August 2015

DAY : Friday

DURATION : 1 Hr 40 Mins

MARKS: 50

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Writing paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your class, index number and name in the spaces provided on the work you hand in.
Write in dark blue or black ink on both sides of the paper.
Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid/tape.

Section A

You must answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **one** question.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the head of each section.

Setter(s): Mrs Lynn Ong

Vetted by: Mr Ng Wei Kwang

This question paper consists of 6 printed pages.

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

Study the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions

You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources you were told to use. In answering the questions you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

1 (a) Study Source A.

Was the composer of the song a supporter of Stalin's collectivisation programme? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

These two sources differ in their views about collectivisation. Does that mean one of them is wrong? Explain your answer. [6]

(c) Study Source D.

How useful is Source D in showing the impact of Stalin's collectivisation programme on Soviet Union? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Source E.

Can you trust Source E? Explain your answer. [5]

(e) Study **all** Sources.

'Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Did Stalin's collectivisation programme succeed in moving the country forward?

Source A: *An extract from a popular Russian song in the 1930s.*

Stalin stands on a coffin
gnawing meat from a cat's bones.
Well, Soviet cows are such disgusting creatures.
How the collective farm had become prosperous?
There used to be thirty-three farms
and now there are five.
We fulfilled the Five-Year Plan
and are eating well.
We ate all the horses
and now are chasing the dogs.
O commune, O commune,
you seized everything
all in the Soviet cause.

Source B: *A report by a British correspondent in March 1932.*

I walked alone through the villages and twelve collective farms. Everywhere was the cry "There is no bread; we are dying." In a train, a Communist denied to me that there was a famine. I flung into the spittoon* a crust of bread I had been eating from my own supply. The peasant, my fellow passenger, fished it out and ravenously ate it. I threw orange peel into the spittoon*. The peasant again grabbed it and devoured it. The Communist then kept silent.

* *Spittoon: A bowl-shaped, usually metal vessel, often with a funnel-shaped cover, into which tobacco chewers periodically spit.*

Source E: *An account of Stalin's policies published in 1996 from an American Human Rights website.*

By mid-1932, nearly 75 percent of the farms in the Ukraine had been forcibly collectivised. The collective farms, despite their inefficiencies, did grow more food than the tiny, privately-owned holdings had done. On Stalin's order, foodstuffs to be shipped out to the Soviet Union were drastically increased in 1933, until there was simply no food remaining to feed the people of the Ukraine. Much of the abundant wheat crop harvested that year was sold internationally to generate cash to aid Stalin's Five Year Plan for the modernisation of the Soviet Union and also to help finance his massive military build-up. If the wheat had remained in the Ukraine, it was estimated to have been enough to feed all of the people there for up to two years. Progress of Soviet Union was evident but it was at a huge cost.

4E/5N History 2015 Prelim II Suggested Answers

(a)	Study Source A. Was the composer of the song a supporter of Stalin's collectivisation programme? Explain your answer Target: Inference	[5m]
L1	Misinterpretation of source / description of source E.g. The composer is a supporter of Stalin's collectivisation programme because people are "eating well" E.g. Source A says that the commune seized everything in the Soviet cause	1
L2	No, with valid interpretation of source content E.g. The person who wrote this song was not a supporter of Stalin's collectivisation programme as Source A tells me that the programme had made people's lives very difficult. The quote "gnawing meat from a cat's bones... now chasing the dogs" tell me that the collectivisation programme had resulted in food shortage such that the Soviet people had to eat animals like dogs and cats.	2-3
L3	No, Detect tone with valid interpretation I think the person who wrote this song was not a supporter of Stalin's collectivisation programme. The tone used to describe the programme is very critical and mocking, as seen by the quote "Stalin stands on a coffin gnawing meat from a cat's bones" which portrays Stalin and the conditions within the Soviet Union in a very negative manner. If the author was a supporter of Stalin's collectivisation programme, he would not be mocking Stalin or his policies.	4
L4	L2/L3 + contextual knowledge Award 4m for L2 + contextual knowledge Award 5m for L3 + contextual knowledge E.g. The person who wrote this song was not a supporter of Stalin's collectivisation programme as Source A tells me that the programme had made people's lives very difficult. The quote "gnawing meat from a cat's bones... now chasing the dogs" tell me that the collectivisation programme had resulted in food shortage such that the Soviet people had to eat animals like dogs and cats. This is supported by my contextual knowledge as I know that as part of the collectivisation programme, properties of people such as their horses were seized and killed. In addition, I know collectivisation led to famine which led to the deaths of many	4-5

(b)	Study Sources B and C. These two sources differ in their views about collectivisation. Does that mean one of them is wrong? Explain your answer.	[6]
L1	They are different, so one must be wrong OR Identifies differences, no explanation Source B stated that there was not enough food whereas Source C stated that the collective farms grew more food.	1
L2	Both are not wrong / biased or can't tell, justifies different point of view. OR Answer based on provenance <i>Award additional marks for explanation</i> E.g. Both sources were not wrong, because they were eyewitness account to what happened. E.g. Source B is by British while source C is by a French communist. So they will be different. E.g. Both sources were not wrong as they are from different perspectives.	2-3
L3	Choice base on content only E.g. Source B is not wrong as it tells me that collectivisation made people suffer as everywhere there was cry of 'There is no bread; we are dying'. It states that collectivisation led to great hunger and the peasant was even willing to take out the bread he threw away, "fished it out and ravenously ate it" Eg. Source C is not wrong as it tells me that the benefits of collectivisation is the industrialisation of Soviet Union 'become the greatest industrial country in Europe' 'achieved by the power of an idea'. The great benefits of collectivisation as the country is no longer in poverty and "People are prosperous and happy"	3
L4	Reliability tested by Cross-Referencing to other sources or Contextual Knowledge. Biasness explained E.g. Source B is not wrong as it blames the collectivisation programme for the devastating impact on Soviet Union. Famine. From Source B, it states that collectivisation led to great hunger and the peasant was even willing to take out the bread he threw away in a spittoon and "fished it out and ravenously ate it". It showed the great extent the hungry peasant was willing to go to just to have something to eat. This hunger/famine present amongst the peasants is also supported in Source A whereby the people are so starved that they were forced to eat their 'horses' and 'dogs'.	4-5

	E.g. Source C is not wrong as it wrote of the great benefits of collectivisation as Soviet Union has been 'transformed' positively and "The most poverty stricken state in Europe, ignorant, ill-treated, starved and shattered, has, in seventeen years, become the greatest industrial country in Europe". This progressive transformation whereby the peasants now used more machinery than before is also supported in Source D whereby there was an increase in agricultural and industrial output <i>"quote evidence from source"</i> E.g. Source C is wrong as it is by a French communist who will be biased towards Communist Soviet's policies, thus the Source only wrote of the great benefits of collectivisation as Soviet Union has been 'transformed' positively and "The most poverty stricken state in Europe, ignorant, ill-treated, starved and shattered, has, in seventeen years, become the greatest industrial country in Europe. The negative impact of collectivisation was thus not mentioned in the source. From Source E, it mentioned that the collectivisation was achieved at the cost of human suffering. "Progress of Soviet Union was evident but it was at a huge cost" where people starved to death.	
L5	C is wrong. Reliability explained in relation to propaganda/ Purpose E.g. <u>Source C is wrong</u> as the source is from the French communist party, which was of similar ideology as Soviet Union communist party. The source is thus biased as it aims to glorify the success of the collectivisation programme under a communist government. I know from my contextual knowledge that Soviet Union suffered great famine in 1933 but the source mentioned that the "people were happy and prosperous.", The source is thus wrong as it is biased as it aims to convince the world that the communist ideology will improve and strengthen a country tremendously "it has been achieved by the power of an idea"	6

(c)	Study Source D How useful is Source D in showing the impact of Stalin's collectivisation programme on Soviet Union. Explain your answer.	[6]
L1	Not Useful based on provenance, unexplained / Misinterpretation/ bias / typicality E.g. Yes, the source is useful because it gives an overview of the Russian economy from 1913-1940. Eg. Yes the source is useful as it is from the official newspaper. Eg. No, it is not useful as it is from the official newspaper.	1
L2	Useful, based on source content OR/AND Not useful based on missing information. E.g. The source is useful as it shows It shows that there was an increase in the production of steel, electricity, oil, trucks and tractors from 1928 to 1940. Or The source is not useful because it is only show the positive impact of collectivisation. It did not show the negative impact.	2
L3	Both aspects of L2	3
L4	Useful based on source content, cross reference to support OR Not useful based on missing information / contextual knowledge, cross reference to support <i>Award 5m for additional details <u>or</u> for both Useful and Not Useful</i> The source is useful as in showing the positive impact of Stalin's collectivisation programme on the development of Soviet Union as an industrial power. The source is useful as it is reliable in showing the following: It shows the agricultural production was low before 1928: less than 73 million tonnes for grain, 13 million tonnes for pigs, industrial production was also low before 1928. And there was a steady increase in all industrial, agricultural and consumer goods from 1928. This is supported by source E which stated that collective farms was successful as it resulted in increased harvest, "collective farms, despite their inefficiencies, did grow more food than the tiny, privately-owned holdings." OR The source is not useful as it did not present the full picture of collectivisation, It only shows the positive side and not the negative side. The source only shows an	4-5

(d)	Study Source E Can you trust this source? Explain your answer	5
L1	Yes/No. Provenance unexplained OR Describe source E.g. Yes, I can trust the source as it is from an objective website E.g. No, I cannot trust the source as it is from an American website	1
L2	Yes, reliable based on source content E.g. Yes, the source can be trusted as it is reliable in what it said about the impact of collectivisation. It mentioned the collectivisation helped to increase the harvest which was sold overseas to generate more revenue for Soviet's industrialisation effort "The collective farms, despite their inefficiencies, did grow more food" "Much of the abundant wheat crop harvested that year was sold internationally to generate cash to aid Stalin's Five Year Plan for the modernisation of the Soviet Union and also to help finance his massive military build-up"	2
L3	Yes/No, <u>reliable</u> based on source content + Cross reference to other sources or Using Contextual Knowledge to explain E.g. Yes, the source can be trusted as it is reliable in what it said about the impact of collectivisation. It mentioned the collectivisation helped to increase the harvest which was sold overseas to generate more revenue for Soviet's industrialisation effort "The collective farms, despite their inefficiencies, did grow more food" "Much of the abundant wheat crop harvested that year was sold internationally to generate cash to aid Stalin's Five Year Plan for the modernisation of the Soviet Union and also to help finance his massive military build-up". This is supported by Source D which showed the steady increase of agricultural, industrial and consumer output " from 1921 there was 36m tonnes of grain produced to 1933, there was 89m produced...." Source C also supported the idea that collectivisation was beneficial as "people were prosperous and happy". Therefore I can trust the source as it is reliable in what it said about the benefits of collectivisation. OR NO, I cannot trust the source as it is unreliable in what it said about collectivisation. It said the benefits of collectivisation like how it helped to increase the harvest, "collective farms, despite their inefficiencies, did grow more food than the tiny, privately-owned holdings." This is contradicted by Source A which states that collectives did more harm than good as the peasants were starving and questioned "How the collective farms had become prosperous?"	3

L4	Yes. Reliable based balanced view of content Yes. I can trust the source as it provides a balance view of the impact of Stalin's collectivisation, <u>stating both positive and negative results</u>. The source mentioned the positive impact of collectivisation was that it helped to increase the harvest which was sold overseas to generate more revenue for Soviet's industrialisation effort "The collective farms, despite their inefficiencies, did grow more food" "Much of the abundant wheat crop harvested that year was sold internationally to generate cash to aid Stalin's Five Year Plan for the modernisation of the Soviet Union and also to help finance his massive military build-up. The negative impact of collectivisation was that it led to starvation as the grain that was meant to feed the people was exported for revenue, "On Stalin's order, foodstuffs to be shipped out to the Soviet Union were drastically increased in 1933, until there was simply no food remaining to feed the people of the Ukraine"	4
L5	L4 + Developed provenance /Context Yes. I can trust the source because even though it's from an American, a Soviet Union former cold war enemy, it was objective in stating the positive and negative impact. This source was published in 1996, after the end of Cold War, when USA and Soviet's relations had improved tremendously. There was thus no reason for the author to be bias against Soviet Union's policies. The source is from the Humans rights website and though it gave a balanced view of the impact of the policy, the focus was that the Stalin's collectivisation policies succeeded in moving the country forward but at the heavy cost of human lives / suffering/ standard of living.	5

(9)	Study all the Sources. "Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward." How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.	[8]
L1	Writes about hypothesis, no valid source use E.g. Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward as many people joined the collectivisation effort. The collectivisation has brought progress to Soviet Union	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 2m for one Y or N supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to maximum of 4m</i> [C, D, support] [A, B and E do not support] Eg. Source A does not support the view that Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward. This is because the source mocked the impact collectivisation programme on the people as they starved and contrary to 'eating well', they are hungry and resorted to eating their own livestock and animals like 'horse' and 'dogs' Source B does not support the view that Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward as there was famine everywhere. Though the communist denied it but the evidence of starvation was stark as peasant was willing to eat "food flung into spittoon" just to satiate his hunger. This shows that the collectivisation programme did not succeed in moving the country forward as it was plagued by famine. Source C supports the view that Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward. It shows how collectivisation has led to more mechanisation of farms which subsequently led to increased production and thereby allowing Soviet Union to be "transformed from a poverty stricken state" to "become the greatest industrial country in Europe"/ Source D supports the view that Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward the statistical data shows a steady increase in production in all three key sectors: agriculture, industrial and consumer. Collectivisation was the foundation/key to the success of the Five Year Plan. When the agriculture sector modernised and increased its output drastically under the collectivisation programme, this will in turn positively impact the industrial and consumer sectors as shown in the source. (quote data)	2-4

	Source E does not support the view that Stalin's collectivisation programme succeeded in moving the country forward as the source shows that though food production did increase and the revenue was channelled to building and strengthening Soviet's industries and militaries. But it mentioned that though moved the country forward, it was at the expense of suffering of the people when they starved to death even though there was enough food to feed them. "On Stalin's order, foodstuffs to be shipped out to the Soviet Union were drastically increased in 1933, until there was simply no food remaining to feed the people of the Ukraine.	
L3	Both side of L2 Award 5m for one Y and N supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to maximum of 7m	4-7
L4	For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to 2 marks (+1/-1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark for this question must not exceed 8m • To score in L2/L3 there must be source use, i.e. direct reference to source content • Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues in the source is not enough. • Higher marks in L2/L3 to be awarded on number of sources used •	8

2.	This question is on war in Europe	
a.	Explain how USA's indirect involvement in World War II in Europe helped the Allies.	[8]
L1 E.g.	Writes about WWII in Europe <i>Award 1 mark for each detail up to a maximum of 2 marks.</i> World War II in Europe began when Britain and France declared war on Germany after it attacked Poland on 1 September 1939. The war devastated Europe's economy and resulted in heavy casualties.	[1-2]
L2 E.g.	Identifies or Describes the way(s) in which USA was indirectly involved in WW2 in Europe. <i>Award 3 marks for describing the given policy, additional marks for details up to 4m.</i> <u>Cash and Carry' policy and Lend-Lease Act</u> USA was indirectly involved in the war in Europe before December 1941 by supplying aid to countries involved in the war through its 'Cash and Carry' policy and Lend-Lease Act. The 'Cash and Carry' policy was passed on 21 September 1939 to allow Britain and France to buy goods, such as arms, from the USA if they paid in full and transported them on their own. Payments for the goods had to be made immediately in cash and recipients of the aid had to bear all transport equipment, costs and risks. The USA then passed the Lend-Lease Act on 11 March 1941 which gave President Roosevelt authority to supply weapons, food and equipment to Britain and any country whose defence the President thought was vital to the national security of the USA. Payment for the aid could be deferred and need not be made in cash. Recipients also did not have to provide for their own transportation. <u>Other forms of aid</u> The USA was also indirectly involved in the war in Europe before December 1941 by providing other forms of aid. The USA helped the Allies in providing escort roles for all Allied convoys at sea so as to prevent German military submarines from firing on them. Roosevelt also imposed economic sanctions on the Axis Powers to deprive them of resources needed for their war effort. For example, he restricted supplies of important materials such as iron to Japan from 1940 onwards to cripple Japan's efforts on carving out its own empire in the Far East.	[3-4]
L3	Explains the ways in which USA was indirectly involved in WW2 in Europe	[5-8]

Award 5- 6 marks for explaining one factor

Award 7- 8 marks for explaining two factors

Cash and Carry Policy and Lend-Lease Act

USA was indirectly involved in the war in Europe before December 1941 by supplying aid to countries involved in the war through its 'Cash and Carry' policy and Lend-Lease Act. The 'Cash and Carry' policy was passed on 21 September 1939 to allow Britain and France to buy goods, such as arms, from the USA if they paid in full and transported them on their own. Payments for the goods had to be made immediately in cash and recipients of the aid had to bear all transport equipment, costs and risks. The USA then passed the Lend-Lease Act on 11 March 1941 which gave President Roosevelt authority to supply weapons, food and equipment to Britain and any country whose defence the President thought was vital to the national security of the USA. Payment for the aid could be deferred and need not be made in cash. Recipients also did not have to provide for their own transportation. **Providing these aids allowed USA to indirectly assist the Allies, particularly Britain and Soviet Union, in their war efforts while at the same time maintaining her position of not entering the war. The aid solved Allied military shortages and bolstered Allied war machine at a rate that the Axis Powers could not keep up with. This indirect assistance by the USA became even more important when the unwanted possibility of Germany winning the war became greater after a series of rapid offensives that enabled her to conquer even France. It was USA's indirectly involvement that helped provide Britain and Soviet Union with the materials needed to resist and defeat Germany in the war.**

AND

Other forms of aid

The USA was also indirectly involved in the war in Europe before December 1941 by providing other forms of aid. The USA helped the Allies in providing escort roles for all Allied convoys at sea so as to prevent German military submarines from firing on them. Roosevelt also imposed economic sanctions on the Axis Powers to deprive them of resources needed for their war effort. For example, he restricted supplies of important materials such as iron to Japan from 1940 onwards to cripple Japan's efforts on carving out its own empire in the Far East. **The escort role provided by the USA was invaluable in protecting the Allies' shipments of war materials across the Atlantic. This allowed the Allied war efforts to be sustained and contributed to its eventual victory as the important materials, such as weapons, needed were shipped efficiently. At the same time, USA's trade sanctions on the Axis Powers severely hampered their war effort as they depended**

heavily on materials supplied by USA. This indirect US involvement turned the tide of the war against the Axis Powers as the Allied Powers were able to secure their war materials while the Axis Powers were losing theirs.	
---	--

2b)	"Hitler's aggressive foreign policy brought about the outbreak of World War II in Europe." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer	[12]
L1	Writes or Describes topic but without focus on question <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks</i> E.g. The outbreak of World War II in Europe was started by Hitler when he attacked Poland on 1 September 1939.	[1-2]
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, up to a maximum of 6 marks.</i> Agree/Yes/ E.g. The outbreak of World War II in Europe was due to Hitler's aggressive expansionist foreign policies, which contributed to tensions in Europe and made war imminent. When Hitler came to power in 1933, he challenged the Treaty of Versailles and adopted his aims, which was to destroy the Treaty of Versailles, bringing more German speakers into the Reich and creating Lebensraum for the Germans. For example, Hitler demanded that France disarm to the same level as Germany did under the Versailles Treaty during the Geneva Disarmament Conference in 1933. France refused and Hitler used this as an excuse to withdraw from the conference and League of Nations. Thus, Hitler was free to re-introduce conscription and rearmament in violation of the Treaty of Versailles. He proceeded to remilitarise the Rhineland in March 1936. Hitler justified this action by saying that it was defending its own frontiers as Germany was now under threat from France and the USSR. Hitler faced little opposition and he was emboldened to establish a political union with Austria, which he could now take advantage of Austria's gold and iron ore, as well as army and weapons. Hitler invaded Poland after securing a Nazi-Soviet Pact with USSR, which prompted a declaration of war on Germany by both Britain and France. <u>Hence, Hitler's aggressive expansionist policies and actions in achieving his aims increased tensions in Europe and caused the outbreak of World War II to be inevitable.</u> E.g. The outbreak of World War II in Europe was due to the weaknesses of the League of Nations played a part in motivating Hitler in starting a war in Europe. Firstly, the League failed in getting major powers to disarm. The major powers were unwilling to cooperate. Disarmament would make the country vulnerable to foreign attacks and thus the major powers were determined to protect their national interests. It also highlighted the importance of commitment of the main members of the League – Britain and France. However, both nations were	[3-6]

L4	L3 + Reaches a balanced conclusion based on relevant significance of factors <i>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers.</i> E.g. In conclusion, the outbreak of World War II in Europe was largely unavoidable given the fact that Hitler was emboldened by the failure of the League of Nations and the policy of appeasement adopted by Britain and France. Thus, Hitler was able to pursue his aggressive foreign policies without fear of reprisal and retaliation from the other European countries.	11-12
----	--	-------

3.	This question is on Cold War.	
a.	Explain how Gorbachev's Glasnost and Perestroika reforms improved the lives of the Soviet people	[8]
L1 E.g.	Writes about the topic but without focus to the question. <i>Award 1 mark for each detail up to a maximum of 2 marks.</i> Gorbachev saw a need to reform Soviet Union domestic and foreign policy in order to develop the country and made it stronger economically.	[1-2]
L2	Describes how Gorbachev's Glasnost and Perestroika improved the peoples' lives <i>Award 3 marks for describing one reason, additional marks for details up to 4m.</i> He introduced Glasnost. Glasnost means openness, essentially calling for greater transparency, freedom of speech and expression. Gorbachev believed that changes for SU could only happen if the economic and social problems of the country were allowed to be discussed openly. By implementing Glasnost, he sought to give his supporters permission to speak out in favour of reform and to provide the space and opportunities to convince the Soviet people these reforms were necessary. Gorbachev launched a series of public debates in 1986. Gorbachev instructed Soviet censors to relax the censorship of books, journals and newspapers. Gorbachev also allowed historians to examine Soviet history and to tell the people the truth about famines and killings that Stalin was responsible for. He also allowed the media to report on the problems that the Soviet Union faced. Gorbachev loosened government control over what was said or written in the media. For example, Stalin's past atrocities and the problems of the Soviet Army in Afghanistan were subject to media attention. He introduced Perestroika. Perestroika means restructuring. It was a programme of economic and political reforms which Glasnost was meant to pave the way for. Gorbachev wanted to encourage greater interest, productivity and the investment among Soviet workers in their respective industries. He advocated that cooperative ownership was vital to the new Soviet economy, and believed that these reforms were consistent with socialism. He also believed that Communist Party would be rejuvenated only by admitting leaders who would carry out his institutional and policy reforms. He permitted prices of goods and services to be set by enterprises themselves. State control over the banking centre was decentralized and he even allowed private ownership of small businesses. He believed that by empowering the locals, they would be faster and more flexible than the central government at making wise economic decisions. Individuals and businesses also had a better idea of local conditions than the central government when making decisions. Thus they were in a better position to	[3-4]

	decide how to use the country's resources efficiently.	
L3	Explains how Gorbachev's Glasnost and Perestroika improved the peoples' lives <i>Award 5- 6 marks for explaining one factor</i> <i>Award 7- 8 marks for explaining two factors</i> He introduced Glasnost. Glasnost means openness, essentially calling for greater transparency, freedom of speech and expression. Gorbachev believed that changes for SU could only happen if the economic and social problems of the country were allowed to be discussed openly. By implementing Glasnost, he sought to give his supporters permission to speak out in favour of reform and to provide the space and opportunities to convince the Soviet people these reforms were necessary. Gorbachev launched a series of public debates in 1986. Gorbachev instructed Soviet censors to relax the censorship of books, journals and newspapers. Gorbachev also allowed historians to examine Soviet history and to tell the people the truth about famines and killings that Stalin was responsible for. He also allowed the media to report on the problems that the Soviet Union faced. Gorbachev loosened government control over what was said or written in the media. For example, Stalin's past atrocities and the problems of the Soviet Army in Afghanistan were subject to media attention. As a result of people enjoying greater liberties, their quality of life has increased, were exposed to different ideas and ways of living. People were more informed about the government's performance in governance. As a result, they would be more engaged in political affairs and more willing to give suggestions to the government to improve the system. As such, they were no longer exposed to solely communist ideals, thus Gorbachev's rule improved the lives of the Soviet people. He introduced Perestroika. Perestroika means restructuring. It was a programme of economic and political reforms which Glasnost was meant to pave the way for. Gorbachev wanted to encourage greater interest, productivity and the investment among Soviet workers in their respective industries. He advocated that cooperative ownership was vital to the new Soviet economy, and believed that these reforms were consistent with socialism. He also believed that Communist Party would be rejuvenated only by admitting leaders who would carry out his institutional and policy reforms. He permitted prices of goods and services to be set by enterprises themselves. State control over the banking centre was decentralized and he even allowed private ownership of small businesses. He believed that by empowering the locals, they would be faster and more flexible than the central government at making wise economic decisions. Individuals and businesses also had a better idea of local conditions than the central government when making decisions. Thus they were in a better position to	[5-8]

decide how to use the country's resources efficiently. As a result of this initiative, people's lives improved because they had more say over production of goods and services. They were also able to enjoy a greater variety of goods and services as evidenced in the opening of the first McDonald's in the USSR. This will in turn result in better profits for the businesses because they are producing what people want to buy. More profits will mean more earnings for the government, thus improving the economic growth of the country and allowing more people to be able to escape from poverty.	
---	--

b)	'Mikhail Gorbachev's foreign policies single-handedly brought about the end of the Cold War.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer	[12]
L1 E.g	Describes the end of the Cold War, but without focus on the question <i>Award 1m for additional detail up to a maximum of 2m</i> The end of the Cold War took place after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.	[1-2]
L2	Explains Yes OR No. <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, up to a maximum of 6 marks.</i> <u>Agree/ Yes</u> e.g. Yes, Mikhail Gorbachev foreign policies single-handedly brought about the end of the Cold War. He believed that command economy was inefficient and military force was no longer a viable option for addressing social dissent. He believed that the solution was to reform Soviet economy as well as to end the military competition with USA. In short, he wanted to end the Cold War. He introduced 'New Thinking' to Soviet Foreign policy. It advocated the idea that global problems ought to be solved based on shared moral and ethical principle instead of conflict between communism and capitalism. Thus, Gorbachev sought to cultivate friendly relationship with the west, esp USA. For example in Nov 1985, Reagan and Gorbachev met for the first time and then again in 1986 to discuss nuclear disarmament. These friendly meetings culminated in nuclear disarmament agreement for eg Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) in 1987. This was a significant milestone as it was the first agreement between the superpowers which eventually led to arms reduction. It was thus Gorbachev's foreign policies that lay the groundwork to an open and friendlier relationship with USA in the discussion of nuclear arms reduction which was a key to end the Cold War. Thus Gorbachev's foreign policies single-handedly ended the Cold War. Gorbachev's de-ideologisation of Soviet Foreign policy was arguably the most obvious example of the extension of his 'New Thinking' to Soviet Foreign policy. He intended to end the ideologically driven policies that brought Soviet Union into conflict with USA. These policies previously included intervention in other countries to support communist revolutions or regimes. In demonstrating his commitment to his new foreign policy Gorbachev withdrew Soviet troops from Afghanistan from 1988-1989. This marked the end of the Soviet war in Afghanistan which lasted for a decade. In 1988, in his UN speech, Gorbachev also emphasised each country's right to choose its political and economic system. Gorbachev's de-ideologisation was instrumental in removing direct confrontations with USA which reduced the tensions between the two Superpowers	[3-6]

	and led to the end of Cold War. Moreover, an ideological conflict was the root of the cause of Cold War and Gorbachev's foreign policies of 'de-ideologisation' removed the main reason why the USA and USSR came into conflict as it advocated the idea that global problems ought to be solved based on shared moral and ethical principle instead of conflict between communism and capitalism. Thus Gorbachev's foreign policies single-handedly ended the Cold War. OR <u>Disagree/ No</u> e.g. No, Mikhail Gorbachev did not single-handedly bring about the end of the Cold War because there were other factors such as the <u>economic and military strength of the United States</u>. By the 1980s, it was clear that the United States were economically way stronger than the Soviet Union and that the American people enjoyed a much better quality of life. This was more evident under Reagan's successful economic liberalisation and soon other western countries also implemented similar measures. In addition, the United States military was much stronger than the Soviet Union as can be seen from the renewal of arms race under Reagan's 'Star Wars' programme. This led to the development of various inter-continental ballistic missiles by the United States. The strength of the United States convinced the people living in Soviet Union that life in the United States under democracy and capitalism was much better than life under communism. This led to the resistance and calls for reforms within the Soviet Union that eventually resulted in its collapse. Therefore, the economic and military strength of the United States was another reason that brought about the end of the Cold War because it convinced the Soviets that communism was not working. Note: Award three marks for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, up to a maximum of six marks.	
L3	Explains Yes AND No. Award 7 marks for an explanation of responsible and an explanation of not responsible and further additional reasons or supporting details or reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks <i>Both aspects of L2</i>	[7-10]
L4	L3 + Reaches a balanced conclusion based on relevant significance of factors Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers. Eg I agree that Gorbachev's single-handedly brought about the end of Cold war because of his openness and willingness to transform Soviet Union. His	

policies was a catalyst that led to the end of Cold War. Not only did it resulted in the lessening of the tensions between the two superpowers but it led to strengthening the good relations between the two former enemies. As the leader of the communist bloc, Gorbachev's policies was the catalyst that led the countries in the communist bloc to press more similar openness which led to the eventual collapse of the communist governments in Eastern Europe. Without the disintegration of the communist bloc also signifies the disappearance of Cold War enemies. Hence Gorbachev single-handedly ended the Cold War.	
---	--

