

Visit
FREETESTPAPER.com
for more papers



Website: freetestpaper.com



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



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

Name:	Index No:	Class:
-------	-----------	--------



ANGLICAN HIGH SCHOOL **PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2017**

S4

COMBINED HUMANITIES (HISTORY ELECTIVE)

2267/03

Paper 3: The Making of the Contemporary World Order (1900s-1991)

21 July 2017

Secondary 4

1 hour 40 minutes

Additional Materials: 5 sheets of writing paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Follow the instructions on the front cover of the Answer Booklet.

Write your index number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen on both sides of the paper.

Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **either** Question 2 or Question 3.

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

Hand in the question paper, Section A and Section B separately.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

Section A		30 marks
Section B Qn. No: ()		20 marks
TOTAL:		50 marks

Parent's Name:	
Parent's Signature:	
Date:	

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates

Study the background information and all 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 are 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.

What is the message of this cartoon? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How far does Source C prove that Source B is wrong about Castro? [6]
Explain your answer.

(c) Study Source D.

How useful is the source as evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis? Explain your answer. [5]

(d) Study Sources E and F.

Why did Khrushchev write Source F? Explain your answer. [6]

(e) Study **all** the sources.

'USA was responsible for the escalation of the Cuban conflict.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Who was responsible for the escalation of the conflict in Cuba?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Read this carefully. It may help you to answer some of the questions.

The Cuban Missile Crisis broke out on 16 October 1962 after USA discovered the presence of Soviet missiles on Cuban ground. Even though the conflict was resolved eventually through diplomatic means, the next thirteen days marked the most dangerous period in the conflict, where the United States and Soviet Union faced each other down in a confrontation that would be the closest the world came to nuclear annihilation during the Cold War. Who was to be blamed for the escalating the conflict within the thirteen days?

Source A: *A British cartoon produced in October 1962, after the end of the Cuban Missile Crisis.*



Source B: *An extract from a letter from Khrushchev to Castro on 30 Oct 1962.*

We understand your situation and have taken into account your concerns of an attack by American imperialists. On October 26, you proposed that we be the first to carry out a nuclear strike against the enemy's territory. I find your proposal to be wrong, even though I understand your reasons. Of course the United States would have suffered enormous losses, but the Soviet Union and the whole socialist bloc would have also suffered greatly. The measures which we have adopted have allowed us to reach our goal. We have extracted from the United States the commitment not to invade Cuba, and we have accomplished all of this without a nuclear war.

Source C: *An account by a reporter recalling his interview with Fidel Castro. The interview took place in 2010.*

I mentioned to Castro the letter he wrote to Khrushchev at the height of the crisis, in which he recommended that the Soviets consider launching a nuclear strike against the U.S. I asked him, "At a certain point it seemed logical for you to recommend that the Soviets bomb the U.S. Does what you recommended still seem logical now?" He answered: "It wasn't worth it at all."

[Turn over

Source D: *An extract from a letter from Castro to Khrushchev on 28 Oct 1962.*

I must clarify a point relating to the anti-aircraft measures which we adopted. You said: "Yesterday you shot down one of them, yet previously you did not when they flew over your territory." Previously, there were isolated violations with no particular military purpose, and they did not result in real danger. This is no longer the case. Yesterday the American Government tried to make official the privilege of violating our air space at any time, day and night. This we could not accept. We must consider the dangers of possible incidents in the present conditions of high tension.

Source E: *An extract from Kennedy's televised speech on 22 Oct 1962.*

This urgent transformation of Cuba into an important strategic base by the presence of these large, long-range, and clearly offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction constitutes an explicit threat to the peace and security of all Americas. Acting, therefore, in the defence of our own security and of the entire Western Hemisphere, a strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba is being initiated to halt this offensive build up. It shall be the policy of this nation to regard any nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack on the United States, requiring a full retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union.

Source F: *An extract from a letter from Khrushchev to Kennedy on 24 Oct 1962.*

Mr. President, if we were to present to you such an ultimatum as you have presented to us by your actions, how would you react to it? By agreeing to these demands, it would mean for us to conduct our relations with other countries not by reason, but by yielding to tyranny. Therefore, we do not accept this. Our instructions to Soviet sailors are to observe strictly the accepted standards of navigation in international waters and not retreat one step from them. If the American side violates these rights, we will not remain mere observers of pirate actions by American ships in the open sea.

Section B: Structured-Essay QuestionsAnswer **one** question.**2 This question is about the impact of WWI in Europe**

- (a) Explain why the League of Nations was unable to stop acts of aggression by major powers in the 1920s. [8]
- (b) How far was the Treaty of Versailles a success in ensuring a lasting peace? Explain your answer. [12]

3 This question is about the Cold War

- (a) Explain why USA was involved in the Korean War in 1950. [8]
- (b) "The Cold War broke out because of Allied differences at the Potsdam Conference." How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [12]

- End of Paper -

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A : <https://jsimmon.wordpress.com/2014/03/23/arm-wrestling-for-world-dominance/>
 Source B : http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nsa/cuba_mis_cri/621030%20Letter%20to%20Castro.pdf
 Source C : <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/11/fidel-castro-obituary/508805/>
 Source D : http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nsa/cuba_mis_cri/19621028caslet.pdf
 Source E : <http://www.historywiz.com/primarysources/kennedyspeechcuba.html>
 Source F : <http://www.atomicarchive.com/Docs/Cuba/khrushchevletter1.shtml>

ANSWER KEY
ANGLICAN HIGH SCHOOL
PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2017

COMBINED HUMANITIES (HISTORY ELECTIVE) 2267/03

Section A (Source-Base Case Study)

1.

(a) Study Source A [5]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Inference without focus on key issue</u> The message is that Kennedy and Khrushchev were fighting with each other.
L2	<u>Sub- message</u> To show both superpowers played a role in the escalation of the conflict
L3	<u>Message</u> The cartoonist wants to blame both superpowers for the escalation of the conflict in the Cuban missile crisis. This can be supported by the source which shows Kennedy & Khrushchev involved in a game of arm wrestling while sitting on missiles, which shows that the desire of the superpowers to demonstrate their dominance in Cuba where neither was ready to give in. This worsened the conflict & pushed the world closer to nuclear war.

(b) Study Source B & C. [6]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Provenance only.</u> OR <u>Similarity In content due to incomplete understanding of Source C.</u> Source Proves Source B wrong as they are written by different people who have different viewpoints on Castro.
L2	<u>Source C proves N wrong based on different in content.</u> <i>Award L2/2 if content comparison is made without reference to the role of Castro.</i> Source C proves B wrong about Castro's intent in escalating the Cuban Missile Crisis. Source B states 'On October 26, you proposed that we be the first to carry out a nuclear strike against the enemy's territory. I find your proposal to be wrong', which shows Castro's intent to launch a Pre-emptive strike on USA, which would likely result in a nuclear war, thus highlighting his aggression and attempt to worsen the conflict. However, Source C states 'it wasn't worth it at all'. Which shows Castro retracting his decision for a pre-emptive strike, thus he had no intent to escalate the crisis after all.
L3	<u>L2+ Cross Reference C to CK/ other sources to evaluate reliability of C</u> Source C is not supported by my contextual knowledge and thus is unreliable and cannot prove B wrong. According to my CK, Castro feared that USA Would pose a threat to Cuba's national security. In his suggestion to Khrushchev, he highlighted the aggressive tendencies of USA and the possibility of an American attack, and declared Cuba's intention to resist at any cost, thus showing how Castro was ready for the possibility for nuclear war and suggested the pre-emptive strike even though he was aware of the consequences. Thus Source C is unreliable in showing that Castro had no intent to escalate the crisis and cannot prove B wrong.
L4	<u>Source C cannot prove B wrong- Unreliable</u> <i>Award L4/5 if content of one source is well developed and the other is not.</i> Source C cannot prove Source B wrong as Source C was written after the crisis. Hence it is unreliable and cannot prove is wrong.

(c) Study Source D. [5]**How useful is the source as evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis?****Explain your answer [5]**

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Undeveloped provenance.</u> Not useful as it is written by Castro and thus would be biased.
L2	<u>Useful based on content</u> The source is useful in showing that USA was responsible for the escalation of the conflict. The source states how the American government was 'violating our air space at any time, day and night' and how Cuba 'could not accept' this, which shows how USA's actions had posed a threat to Cuba's security. In reaction to the threat, the U2 plane was shot down, which escalated the tensions in the conflict.
L3	<u>Useful/ Not Useful based on CR to CK</u> The source is not supported by my CK, and thus is unreliable and not useful in showing that USA was responsible for the escalation of the conflict. According to my CK, by this point in time, attempts had already been made by Kennedy's administration to resolve the conflict through peaceful means, such as making use of the naval blockade to buy time for negotiations to be made between the superpowers. As such, it was evident that USA did not have the intention to worsen the conflict. Thus, the source is not useful.

(d) Study Source E and F. [6]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Undeveloped provenance</u> Because Khrushchev was unhappy about Kennedy's actions in the Cuban Missile Crisis.
L2	<u>Reasons based on message</u> Because Khrushchev wanted to condemn Kennedy for implementing the blockade.
L3	<u>Reasons based on context without explicit reference to Source E</u> This letter was written to in reply to Kennedy's announcement of the blockade to condemn his decision and to warn him about USSR's response. This can be seen in Source E, where Kennedy announced a "strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba". In response, Khrushchev condemns the blockade as aggressive and declares that all ships would "observe strictly the accepted standards of navigation in international waters and not retreat one step from them". This is in context of 24 th October before the involvement of UN. Khrushchev saw the blockade as a direct declaration of war on Cuba, And therefore in the letter adopts brinkmanship by expressing his intent to continue defending Cuba.
L4	<u>Purpose – Impact</u> Candidates must make references to Source E. If not, marks will be capped at L4/5 This letter was written to in reply to Kennedy's announcement of the blockade to condemn his decision and to warn him about USSR's response so that he will reconsider his decision and withdraw the blockade. This can be seen in Source E, where Kennedy announced a "strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba". In response, Khrushchev condemns the blockade as aggressive and declares that all ships would "observe strictly the accepted standards of navigation in international waters and not retreat one step from them".

(e) Study all the sources. [8]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.</u>
L2	<u>Yes Or no, supported by valid source use.</u> <u>Yes</u> Source A shows that USA was responsible for escalating the conflict as it shows that conflict was a result of the competition for dominance. Source A shows how Kennedy refuses to back down in face of the conflict with USSR, despite knowing how the conflict could possibly lead to nuclear war. Source D supports the statement that USA was responsible for escalating the conflict as it shows that USA's actions provoked Cuba into taking a more hostile stance towards the conflict. This can be supported by Source D which "Yesterday the American Government tried to make official the privilege of violating our air space at any time, day and night," which shows how USA's actions had posed a threat to Cuba's security. Source D supports the statement that USA was responsible for escalating the conflict as it shows that USA's announcement of the blockade that provoked USSR into adopting brinkmanship as well. This can be supported by the source where Khrushchev declares that all ships would "observe strictly the accepted standard of navigation in international waters and not retreat one step from them" in reaction to the blockade, which would in turn increase the possibility of nuclear war. <u>No</u> Source A does not support the statement as it shows that USSR was also to be blamed for the escalation of the conflict. The source shows Khrushchev engaged in an arm wrestling game and Khrushchev refuses to back down despite understanding the possibility of a nuclear war. Source B does not support the statement as it shows that it was Castro who was intent on worsening the conflict even after the superpowers had resolved the conflict peacefully. This can be supported by Source B which states that it was Castro who "proposed that we be the first to carry out a nuclear strike against the enemy's territory".
L3	<u>Yes Or no, supported by valid source use.</u> For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (ie+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks must not exceed 8.

Section B:**2. (a) [8m]**

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Describes the League of Nations without focus to question</u> The League of Nations was an international peacekeeping organization which was formed to stop acts of aggression by major powers and to work towards disarmament.
L2	<u>Identifies or describes factors</u> The League of Nations was unable to stop acts of aggression by major powers in the 1920s due to the absence of the USA from the League of Nations. The USA, despite being the world's largest national economy at the time and having her status as a military power in World War 1 did not join the league as the US government refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and preferred to engage in international affairs when it suited them. The League was left leaderless as it did not have the necessary economic and military backup from the United States to enforce its will and discredited the League as it was predominantly an idea that was pushed by Wilson during the Paris Peace Conference. Therefore, it failed to enforce its mandate on the members. The League of Nations was unable to stop acts of aggression by major powers in the 1920s due to its structural weakness which made it hard to take decisive action and gave too much power to the major powers. Authorisation for any action required both a unanimous vote by the council and a two-third majority in the Assembly. The requirement for unanimity came about because the most influential members of the League did not want other nations to control their actions. Therefore, failed to enforce its mandate on the members.
L3	<u>Explains factors</u> The League of Nations was unable to stop acts of aggression by major powers in the 1920s due to the absence of the USA from the League of Nations. The USA, despite being the world's largest national economy at the time and having her status as a military power in World War 1 did not join the league as the US government refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and preferred to engage in international affairs when it suited them. The League was left leaderless as it did not have the necessary economic and military backup from the United States to enforce its will and discredited the League as it was predominantly an idea that was pushed by Wilson during the Paris Peace Conference. Due to the League's lack of power and credibility, it found it hard to impose its will and to stop acts of aggression by major powers. The League of Nations was unable to stop acts of aggression by major powers in the 1920s due to its structural weakness which made it hard to take decisive action and gave too much power to the major powers. Authorisation for any action required both a unanimous vote by the council and a two-third majority in the Assembly. The requirement for unanimity came about because the most influential members of the League did not want other nations to control their actions. Thus, council members were effectively given the power of Veto and thus, the League found it hard to take action.

(b) [12m]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Describes terms of the TOV- No focus on question</u> The Treaty of Versailles was a success in ensuring a lasting peace because it was able to prevent German aggression and protect France in the 1920s. This was achieved through the disarmament and economic terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The military terms sought to reduce the size and capacity of Germany to make war in Europe. The German Army was reduced to 150,000 men with no conscription allowed. In addition, German was only allowed to have 6 battle-ships, no tanks, aircraft or submarines. In the long term, the Treaty of Versailles was not a success in ensuring a lasting peace because it led to German objections and resentment against the Treaty of Versailles. The Germans objected strongly to the Treaty of Versailles as the felt that they were not solely responsible for the outbreak of World War One and were resentful that the Allies had imposed the Article 231, the War Guilt Clause, making Germany take full responsibility for the war. In addition, Germany felt that the Treaty was unfair as Wilson's 14 points were not applied to Germany as Germany had lost various territories such as the Polish Corridor to the Newly created states along with the port of Danzig which had become a free port under the League of Nations. The amount of reparations levied on Germany as a part of the War Guilt Clause was also seen to be excessive by the Germans leading to even greater resentment by the Germans.
L2	<u>Yes/ No, Explained</u> The Treaty of Versailles was a success in ensuring a lasting peace because it was able to prevent German aggression and protect France in the 1920s. This was achieved through the disarmament and economic terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The military terms sought to reduce the size and capacity of Germany to make war in Europe. The German Army was reduced to 150,000 men with no conscription allowed. In addition, German was only allowed to have 6 battle-ships, no tanks, aircraft or submarines. This severely reduced the size and capability of Germany's armed forces ensuring that it was unlikely to be able to undertake an aggressive foreign policy. In addition, the security of France was further safeguarded by the demilitarisation of the Rhineland which saw Germany forbidden to station troops in the Rhineland area bordering France which further guaranteed France's security. Furthermore, Germany was Crippled by the reparations of 6,600 million pounds which crippled the German economy and consigned Germany to a period of economic instability. Or In the long term, the Treaty of Versailles was not a success in ensuring a lasting peace because it led to German objections and resentment against the Treaty of Versailles. The Germans objected strongly to the Treaty of Versailles as the felt that they were not solely responsible for the outbreak of World War One and were resentful that the Allies had imposed the Article 231, the War Guilt Clause, making Germany take full responsibility for the war. In addition, Germany felt that the Treaty was unfair as Wilson's 14 points were not applied to Germany as Germany had lost various territories such as the Polish Corridor to the Newly created states along with the port of Danzig which had become a free port under

	the League of Nations. The amount of reparations levied on Germany as a part of the War Guilt Clause was also seen to be excessive by the Germans leading to even greater resentment by the Germans. Despite the German objections to the Treaty, they were forced to sign the Treaty, making them view it as a Diktat. Nonetheless, despite the harshness of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was not permanently crippled by the terms as both Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson sought to moderate Clemenceau's demands to cripple Germany.
L3	<u>Yes AND No, Explained</u> Yes The Treaty of Versailles was a success in ensuring a lasting peace because it was able to prevent German aggression and protect France in the 1920s. This was achieved through the disarmament and economic terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The military terms sought to reduce the size and capacity of Germany to make war in Europe. The German Army was reduced to 150,000 men with no conscription allowed. In addition, Germany was only allowed to have 6 battle-ships, no tanks, aircraft or submarines. This severely reduced the size and capability of Germany's armed forces ensuring that it was unlikely to be able to undertake an aggressive foreign policy. In addition, the security of France was further safeguarded by the demilitarisation of the Rhineland which saw Germany forbidden to station troops in the Rhineland area bordering France which further guaranteed France's security. Furthermore, Germany was Crippled by the reparations of 6,600 million pounds which crippled the German economy and consigned Germany to a period of economic instability. No In the long term, the Treaty of Versailles was not a success in ensuring a lasting peace because it led to German objections and resentment against the Treaty of Versailles. The Germans objected strongly to the Treaty of Versailles as they felt that they were not solely responsible for the outbreak of World War One and were resentful that the Allies had imposed the Article 231, the War Guilt Clause, making Germany take full responsibility for the war. In addition, Germany felt that the Treaty was unfair as Wilson's 14 points were not applied to Germany as Germany had lost various territories such as the Polish Corridor to the Newly created states along with the port of Danzig which had become a free port under the League of Nations. The amount of reparations levied on Germany as a part of the War Guilt Clause was also seen to be excessive by the Germans leading to even greater resentment by the Germans. Despite the German objections to the Treaty, they were forced to sign the Treaty, making them view it as a Diktat. Nonetheless, despite the harshness of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was not permanently crippled by the terms as both Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson sought to moderate Clemenceau's demands to cripple Germany.
L4	<u>Balanced conclusion with explicit consideration of how far.</u> Whilst the Treaty of Versailles was able to ensure peace in the 1920s, it was unable to ensure a lasting peace in the long run as it set the scene for the outbreak of World War Two due to the nature of the treaty which led to even more instability in Europe once Hitler had risen to power.

3.

(a)[8m]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Describes the Korean War with no reference to question demands</u>
L2	<u>Identifies & describes relevant factors for US involvement</u> <u>E.g.</u> US was motivated to get involved in the Korean War to undermine/counter communist influence in Asia Pacific. <u>E.g.</u> US was also motivated to become involved in the Korean War to uphold ideal of the United Nations and to take up arms in support of peace and freedom.
L3	<u>Explains US motivations for involvement</u> <u>E.g.</u> US was motivated to get involved in the Korean War <u>to undermine/counter communist influence in Asia Pacific</u> . The key motivator for USA's military intervention in the Korean War was that of containment. The American aims to work with its allies to contain the spread of soviet and communist Chinese power using political, economic and if necessary military pressures. The US administration was accused of being too soft on communism by their opponents. In addition, at the North Korean invasion of South Korea, US feared the loss of Japan should the Korean Peninsula fall to communist influence and this necessitated US intervention in Korea. Americans were made to believe with the rise of McCarthyism and the Red Scare that Soviet Union controlled all communist movements and parties throughout the world and that any manifestation of communist aggression must have been inspired and assisted by Moscow. Consequently, with North Korea initiated the attack on South Korea, USA intervened in the Korean War to contain the spread of communism in Asia. <u>AND/OR</u> US went to war in Korea <u>to protect their economic interests in Japan</u> . US involvement was motivated by their desire to retain their military bases in Japan. Furthermore Japan was identified by Kennan as one of the Five military-industrial world powers which must remain within US orbit. US saw it necessary to support and protect Japan as a bulwark to Soviet Union and had contributed to the post-war economic revival of Japan. US therefore had built up Japan as a major power and military ally to assist US in the Pacific region. Truman was worried that, if Korea fell to communism, the next 'domino' to fall would be Japan, which was very important for American trade.

(b) [12m]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Writes about the start of Cold War without relating to question demands</u>
L2	<u>Explains one side (Agree or disagree)</u> <u>AGREE</u> I agree that the Cold War broke out due to Allied differences at the Potsdam Conference <u>because the breakdown of Allied relations contributed towards the tension that emerged after the defeat of Japan</u> . With the defeat of Germany, there was little else to unity them; deep rooted divisions that existed between the democratic countries of the West and the communist Soviet Union began to resurface in the post-war conferences. Suspicious between superpowers USSR and USA began to build up. Relations Between the West and Soviet union broke down largely due to disagreements that surfaced in the Potsdam Conference. An example was Stalin's change of mind about Poland and the Declaration of Liberated Europe. It was an agreement at Yalta between Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin to allow the people of Europe "to create democratic institutions of their own choice". Stalin promised at Yalta to allow free elections in the countries of the area but he changed his mind at Potsdam and this led to the West feel that the USSR was bent on expanding communism. Truman, who took over Roosevelt at Potsdam was increasingly suspicious when Stalin did not keep to his word. Stalin's reneging on his promise at Potsdam worsened the relations between the superpowers and also caused the western powers to become defensive. The animosity and mistrust between US and Soviet Union which was evident since Yalta was made evident at Potsdam when they could not resolve their differences and manifested itself in the Cold War tensions after the defeat of Japan. OR <u>Disagree</u> • Wartime tensions • Historical mistrust and suspicions
L3	<u>Explains both Sides(Agree and Disagree)</u> Both sides of L2 examples
L4	<u>Balanced conclusion with explicit consideration of how far.</u>