

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)



BUKIT PANJANG GOVERNMENT HIGH SCHOOL

Preliminary Examination, 2017

SECONDARY 4 EXPRESS

2267/03

Combined Humanities **History Elective**

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

Date: 11th August 2017 (Friday)

Duration: 1 hr 40 mins

Time: 7.45am – 9.25am

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **one** question.

Write all the answers in the answer paper provided.

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

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

Submit Section A and Section B separately.

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

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

Study the Background information and 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.

(a) **Study Source A.**

What is the message of the cartoon? Explain your answers using details from the source. [5]

(b) **Study Sources B and C.**

How far does the ex-US soldier John Kim in Source B agree with the US Secretary of State in Source C? Explain your answer. [6]

(c) **Study Source D.**

How useful is the source as evidence of USA's ability to win the Korean War? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) **Study Source E.**

Are you surprised by the source? Explain your answer. [6]

(e) **Study all sources.**

'The United States was responsible for the Korean War'. How far do the sources support the statement? Explain your answer. [7]

[30 marks]

Who was responsible for escalating the conflict during the Korean War?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Korean War was the first significant armed conflict of the Cold War. In 1950 the Soviet Union boycotted the United Nations Security Council. In the absence of an opposing voice from the Soviet Union, who could have vetoed it, the United States and other countries passed a Security Council resolution authorizing military intervention in Korea.

The United States of America provided 88% of the 341,000 international soldiers which aided South Korean forces in repelling the invasion, with twenty other countries of the United Nations offering assistance. Suffering severe casualties, within two months the United Nations troops were pushed back to a small area in the south of the Korean Peninsula, known as the Pusan perimeter. A rapid U.N. counter-offensive then drove the North Koreans past the 38th Parallel and almost to the Yalu River, when the People's Republic of China (PRC) entered the war on the side of North Korea. Chinese intervention forced the United Nations troops to retreat behind the 38th Parallel. While not directly committing forces to the conflict, the Soviet Union provided material aid to both the North Korean and Chinese armies.

The active stage of the war ended on 27 July 1953, when the armistice agreement was signed.

Source A: A cartoon by an American cartoonist on the Korean War published in a US newspaper in February 1951. The caption reads 'Always Glad to Loan My Neighbour a Shovel'.



Source B: A comment on USA's actions during Korean War by John Kim, a member of the Veterans for Peace (VFP), 2008. VFP members are largely ex-US soldiers who are opposed to the US government using war as an instrument of national policy.

The official American history is that the Korean War started on June 25, 1950 when the North Korean forces suddenly attacked the South under Stalin's order. This is a huge distortion of the origin of the War. For one thing certain now, according to the Russian documents recently made public, is that Stalin did not order Kim Il Sung to start the War. It was Kim Il Sung who sought permission to attack the South in case the North was attacked. The truth is that the Korean War really started in 1945 when the US crushed the South Korean government and imposed its military rule in the southern part of Korea.

Source C: *An explanation by US Secretary of State Dean Acheson on the North Korean Offensive of 25 June 1950.*

It seemed close to certain that the North Korean attack on the South had been organised, supplied and initiated by the Soviet Union. Only the use of force can stop them. America intervened as the South Korean forces proved inadequate to do the job. The attack on the South was an open challenge to our internationally accepted position as the protector of South Korea, an area of great importance to the security of American-occupied Japan. To back away from this challenge would be highly destructive of the power and prestige of the United States.

Source D: *A speech given by the captain of the Chinese People's Volunteer Force to the Chinese forces during the Korean War.*

America invaded China in the past and had occupied Taiwan. We, Chinese, were victims of American imperialism. If we didn't stop Americans in Korea now, we would have to fight them later in China. For us to help Korea was the same as defending our homeland...even though the U.S. military has modern weapons, the American troops are fighting an unjust war and suffering from low morale. The Americans are short of manpower, and their support has to come from a great distance. Our army is dedicated to a just cause. We have the brilliant leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and Chairman Mao (Zedong), and the full support of our own people, the Korean people, and peace-loving people from around the world. Our weapons are not as advanced as the Americans, but we have a numerical advantage.

Source E: *An excerpt from a radio interview with Taft on the 29 June 1950. Taft was a member of the United States government and leader of the opposition party.*
This was his response when asked: do you approve the action of the President [Truman] in sending our armed forces to stop this Communist aggression?

Well, generally, yes. I believe in a firm attitude against communism in the Far East and China. The President's new policy (worldwide containment) moves in that direction. That has been our policy in Europe. We have to put a stop to communist aggression. However, in this case, whether the President has chosen the right time or the right place to declare this policy is certainly questionable. He knows more about it than I do. I can't be certain. But the new policy seems to be adopted at an unfortunate time — and involves the attempt to defend Korea, which is a very difficult military operation indeed. I sincerely hope that the policy won't lead to war with Russia. The President did not consult with the leaders of our Party before making this very drastic decision. I do believe the general principle of the policy is right, and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the American men in our armed forces who have been moved into Korea.

Source F: *A historian's view on Chinese and Russian reactions to US military action in Korea.*

China entered into the Korean War not just to safeguard the Chinese-Korean border. Mao Zedong wanted to win a glorious victory that would restore China's world status as the 'Central Kingdom'. He also wanted to repay a debt to North Korea, which had sent thousands of soldiers to fight in the Chinese Civil War. Furthermore, after the Inchon Landing, Stalin also had been pressing China to intervene and prevent US conquest of North Korea.

Section B: Structured-essay Questions

Answer **one** question.

2 *This question is on Stalin's USSR.*

- (a) Explain how Stalin's economic policies worsened the lives of the people in USSR. [8]
- (b) 'Trotsky was responsible for the rise of Stalin.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

3 *This question is on the Cold War.*

- (a) Explain how deteriorating relations between USA and Cuba led to the Cuban Missile Crisis. [8]
- (b) 'US President Ronald Reagan was responsible for the end of Cold War.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

ANSWER KEY
BUKIT PANJANG GOVERNMENT HIGH SCHOOL
Preliminary Examination, 2017
SECONDARY 4 EXPRESS

Combined Humanities History Elective
2267/03

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1.

(a) Study Source A. [5]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Describing, no interpretation</u> Mao depicted as Stalin's dutiful and exhausted minion shovelling great scoops of Chinese troops into the cannon's mouth. Soviet leader Joseph Stalin looking over Mao Zedong's shoulder as the Chinese leader shovels his soldiers into a cannon.
L2	<u>Literal Interpretation, support from 1 part of the source only (role of China not stated)</u> E.g. Mao is sending troops to Korea; Chinese soldiers were involved in the war E.g. Many Chinese soldiers died in the Korean War (high casualties) Misinterpretation
L3	<u>Valid interpretation on the role of China (Mao) in the Korean War</u> E.g. China was directly involved in the Korean War, sending military support to North Korea.
L4	<u>Valid interpretation on the role of USSR in the Korean War</u> <u>Link between Stalin & China</u> E.g. USSR responsible for causing the Korean War, mastermind. Stalin tasked Mao to aid North Korea in the war. OR <u>Interpretation of message within the context of Korean War</u> E.g. USSR responsible for causing the Korean War, mastermind. Stalin tasked Mao to aid North Korea in the war. The soviet Union supplied the Chinese people's Liberation Army with weapons during the Korean war but did not send ground troops. Chinese occupied Seoul because the large army willingly pursued the United Nations troops southward despite the high rate of Chinese casualties. context)

(b) Study Sources B and C. [6]

Any comparison of purposes is not valid unless students proceed to state that 'because they have different intentions/purposes, therefore they will disagree in their views of __'

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Uses sources (lifting). No comparison (no match)</u>
L2	<u>False matching (e.g. Source B says this but Source C does not mention it)</u>
L3	<u>Agree OR disagree using source content</u> <i>4m for quality of answers</i> <u>Agree</u> <u>Both shows that USA claimed that North Korea started the war</u> Source B – 'official American history is that the Korean War started on June 25, 1950 when the North Korean forces suddenly attacked the South' Source C – 'seemed close to certain that the North Korean attack on the South' <u>Agree</u> <u>USA wants power and prestige</u> Source B – 'US crushed the South Korean government and imposed its military rule in the southern part of Korea.' Source C – 'To back away from this challenge would be highly destructive of the power and prestige of the United states.' <u>Disagree</u> <u>Role of Stalin (USSR) in the Korean War</u> Source B – Stalin did not initiate to start the war Source C – Stalin instigated NK to start the war <u>Role of USA in South Korea</u> Source B – destroyed South Korea Source C – protector of South Korea Disagreement of views because of differences in intentions/purposes (not just a comparison of purposes) –L3/3 that is, students did not show any disagreement in views but simply state that

	'both sources will disagree in views as both have different intentions/purposes' – and proceed to give differences in purposes only
L4	<u>Agree AND disagree using source content</u> <i>Award 5m if both agreement and disagreement are supported</i>
L5	<u>Answers point out that the reason for their Differences in opinions / perspectives is because both the ex-US soldier and Acheson had different intentions.</u> <i>Award higher mark for quality of answer</i> This level is not just a comparison of purposes, it is explaining to us that the two sources disagree because both sources have different intentions Source B was written because the ex-US soldier who opposes war wanted international audience to know that it was US's ambition that caused the Korean war so as to <u>push the blame of the Korean war to USA</u>. However Acheson in Source C wrote that in his memoirs because he wanted the international community to know that it was Stalin who initiated the war in Korea so as to <u>push the blame of the Korean war to USSR</u>. Because they have different intentions, the ex-US soldier John Kim in Source B disagree with US Secretary of State in Source C <u>on who was responsible for the starting the Korean War</u>.

(c) Study Source D. [6]

Note:

Inference must be on US actions during the Korean War

Students should not use 'extent' in their answer, e.g. small extent, large extent. Answers must be definite, YES or No.

Important, please note

Concluding statement on reliability [if test of reliability is performed – bias, cross-reference, critical analysis of provenance] must be made before Utility can be established. Students will not be awarded marks if they fail to provide concluding statement on reliability.

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Yes or No, based on provenance</u> No, Source D is not useful about USA's ability to win the Korean War as it is a speech by Chinese captain who was fighting against the US. OR Yes, Source D is useful about USA's ability to win the Korean War as it is a speech delivered during the Korean war by Chinese captain who was also involved in the Korean War. OR <u>Yes Useless, Undeveloped explanation of provenance (undeveloped bias)</u> E.g. No, not useful as it is too one-sided and from a Communist state China. That makes it unreliable, therefore, not useful.
L2	<u>Yes, Useful because of the information it provides about the issue</u> <i>[2-3m] Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers.</i> E.g. Yes, Source D is useful about USA's ability to win the Korean War as it states that US army seems to be unable to sustain a long war (any other acceptable message from the source) – '...even though the U.S. military has modern weapons, the American troops are fighting an unjust war and suffering from low morale. The Americans are short of manpower, and their support has to come from a great distance. ... Our weapons are not as advanced as the Americans, but we have a numerical advantage.' OR <u>No, not useful because of what it does not tell you about the issue (missing info)</u> <u>– max. 2m</u> i.e. something specific about issue that is not shown OR <u>No, not useful because of bias</u> Undeveloped bias – L1/1 E.g. No, Source D is not useful. Source D presents a grim and negative perception of USA's ability to win the Korean War – '...even though the U.S. military has modern weapons...The Americans are short of manpower, and their support has to come from a great distance. ... Our weapons are not as advanced as the Americans, but we have a numerical advantage.' He seemed to have exaggerated to deceive his troops. Thus Source D is <u>unreliable</u>, therefore Source D is <u>not useful</u>.
L3	<u>Not useful because not reliable / Useful because reliable – concluding statement on reliability must be present</u> <i>Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers.</i> <i>Do not award marks if there is no concluding statement on reliability.</i> <u>Challenged by Background Information</u> No. Source D states that <u>USA is unable to win the Korean War</u> – '...even though

	the U.S. military has modern weapons, the American troops are fighting an unjust war and suffering from low morale. The Americans are short of manpower, and their support has to come from a great distance. ... Our weapons are not as advanced as the Americans, but we have a numerical advantage.' However this is challenged by Background Information which states that <u>USA is able to win the Korean War (with a large military force)</u> – 'The United States of America provided 88% of the 341,000 international soldiers which aided South Korean forces in repelling the invasion, with twenty other countries of the United Nations offering assistance'. Thus Source D is unreliable, therefore Source D is <u>not useful</u>. <u>Supported by Source E</u> Yes. Source D states that <u>USA is unable to win the Korean War</u> – '...even though the U.S. military has modern weapons, the American troops are fighting an unjust war and suffering from low morale. The Americans are short of manpower, and their support has to come from a great distance. ... Our weapons are not as advanced as the Americans, but we have a numerical advantage.' However this is challenged by Source E which states that <u>USA is unable to win the Korean War</u> – 'But the new policy seems to be adopted at an unfortunate time — and involves the attempt to defend Korea, which is <u>a very difficult military operation indeed</u>'. Taft's statement suggests that it was difficult, so it seems to indicate there was high risk involved North Korea. Thus Source D is reliable, therefore Source D is <u>useful</u>.
L4	<u>Critical analysis of provenance – concluding statement on reliability must be present</u> No, Source D is not useful about <u>USA's ability to win the Korean War</u> during the Korean War as it may have been produced for a purpose. The captain gave the speech in Source D because he wanted his men to know that they <u>USA is unable to win the Korean War</u> (+evidence). By criticising the Americans, he wanted the Chinese soldiers to have the morale to fight and win the war. Therefore, it has a dubious purpose. This makes Source D not reliable, therefore not useful.

(d) Study Source E. [6]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Identifies content that is surprising / not surprising without explanation (lifting)</u> E.g. Yes, surprised that he said 'whether the President has chosen the right time or the right place to declare this policy is certainly questionable'. E.g. No, not surprised that he said 'Well, generally, yes. I believe in a firm attitude against communism in the Far East and China. The President's new policy (worldwide containment) moves in that direction'. No based on provenance

	E.g. No, not surprised. Taft was a member of US government, not surprising that he show support for Truman's policy.
L2	<u>Yes based on the context – 29 June 1950 – after the North invaded the South on 24 June 1950 (did not use of content in Source F)</u> E.g. No, not surprised. Taft was speaking on 29 June, a few days after the war started. OR <u>No based on Taft's emotions (did not use of content in Source F)</u> E.g. No, not surprised. Taft was not pleased. No, based on intention of author (did not use of content in Source F) E.g. No, not surprised. Taft was part of the US government.
L3	<u>Yes, surprised / No, not surprised. Answers use content in Source F, supported</u> e.g. Yes, surprised that Taft's party was not consulted since they are part of the US government – 'President did not consult with the leaders of our Party before making this very drastic decision'. e.g. Yes, surprised that he still supported Truman's policy despite being in the opposition party and was not consulted. e.g. No, not surprised. Taft shows he supports Truman's policy - 'Well, generally, yes. I believe in a firm attitude against communism in the Far East and China. The President's new policy (worldwide containment) moves in that direction. That has been our policy in Europe' - because he does not want to appear to be against the government since he is part of it. e.g. No, not surprised. Taft was not pleased that his minority party was not consulted so he was doubtful – 'But the new policy seems to be adopted at an unfortunate time — and involves the attempt to defend Korea, which is a very difficult military operation indeed. I sincerely hope that the policy won't lead to war with Russia'.
L4	<u>Both elements of L3 – Yes AND No</u>
L5	<u>Yes based on contradictions within the source / doubts / uncertainty in Taft's response</u> <u>If answers do not surface contradictions clearly, award L3</u> <i>Award 5m for quality of answers.</i>
L6	<u>Yes, surprised / No, not surprised. Checking with other sources</u> <i>Award 6m for quality answers</i> Using other source to check content of Source E E.g. No, Not surprised. Source E – Taft agrees that USA had to stop North Korea

	(Communist aggression) – Source C says the same thing ... E.g. No, Not surprised. Source E – Taft says that it will be a large US military force ('with every available resource the American men in our armed forces who have been moved into Korea') – Background Info agrees ... ('The United States of America provided 88% of the 341,000 international soldiers which aided South Korean forces in repelling the invasion') Any other checking of Source E's content
--	---

(e) Study all sources. [7]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	Writes about hypothesis, no valid source use OR Identifies sources, however, no valid source use (simply quoting evidence)
L2	<u>Yes OR No, supported by valid source use</u> (students must provide reasons (message from each source) why they are using each source to support or not support the statement, i.e. The source supports that USA was responsible because message of the source ...) <i>Award 2m for ONE YES OR NO supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to maximum of 3m [2-3]</i> <u>Support the statement</u> Sources B and D support the statement. Source B supports the <u>US was responsible for the Korean War as it was US's ambition that pushed them to war (message). (+evidence)</u> Source D supports the statement because it shows <u>that US was responsible for the Korean War as it wanted to conquer Asia for power (message)</u> – 'We, Chinese, were victims of American imperialism. If we didn't stop Americans in Korea now, we would have to fight them later in China. .. the American troops are fighting an unjust war...' <u>Does not support the statement</u> Sources A, C, E and F do not support the statement. Source A does not support the statement because it shows that <u>USSR was responsible for causing the Korean War, the mastermind as Stalin tasked Mao to aid North Korea in the war which provided North Korea military strength to attack the South (message). (+evidence)</u> Source C does not support the statement because it <u>shows that USSR was responsible for causing the Korean War by providing aid to North Korea which</u>

	<u>gave North Korea military strength to attack the South (message). (+evidence)</u> OR Source C does not support the statement because it shows that USSR was the mastermind – ‘initiated’ (message). (+evidence) Source E does not support the statement because it shows that <u>Communist nations were responsible as they had plans to spread communism and US responded with Containment policy which saw the conflict in Korea (message).</u> – ‘We have to put a stop to communist aggression.’ Source E shows that US containment policy was a response to Communist aggression in the Far East. Source F does not support the statement because it shows that <u>USSR was responsible for causing the Korean War, the mastermind as Stalin tasked Mao to aid North Korea in the war (message). (+evidence)</u> <u>Question reliability of Source B [+1m]</u> Source B which states that USA started the Korean War challenged by Background Information / Contextual knowledge that it was North Korea who started the war – ‘The situation escalated into open warfare when North Korean forces invaded South Korea on 25 June 1950.’ <u>Thus, although Source B supports the statement, I may not want to use it to test the assertion as it is not reliable.</u>
L3	<u>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use (detailed reference to sources) – Both aspects of L2</u> <i>Award 4m for ONE YES AND NO supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to maximum of 6m</i>
L4	<u>Evaluate the sources in terms of their reliability in order to address the ‘how far’ aspect of the question.</u> Students should demonstrate the ability to bring sources together and offer a perspective based on the sources given to them. [7] For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to 1mark (+1) for use of <u>contextual knowledge</u> to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark for the question must not exceed 7marks.

SECTION B (STRUCTURED-ESSAY QUESTION)

2. (a) Explain how Stalin's economic policies worsened the lives of the people in USSR. [8]

Content Concepts

Worsened - negative impact must be demonstrated with the use of relevant examples from Stalin's economic policies.

Content

Information can be presented in many form. However, answers must sound like they are talking about Stalin's USSR with reference to specific terms and examples and use them to illustrate negative impact on the people.

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Describes the USSR / Stalin, no reference to economic policies</u> <i>Answers which describe the event/feature without focus on the question</i> <i>Award one mark for each detail, up to a maximum of two.</i>
L2	<u>Describes factors (describe policies, did not show how it worsen the lives)</u> <i>Award 3 marks for one detailed description</i> <i>Award 4 marks for another detailed description.</i>
L3	<u>Explains reasons (using relevant examples from Stalin economic policies to show negative impact on the lives of the people)</u> <i>Award 5-6 marks for one explained factor.</i> <i>Award 7-8 marks for two explained factors.</i> <u>Industrialisation</u> <u>Stalin's economic policies resulted lack of consumer goods in USSR & poor work conditions</u> <u>Shortage of consumer goods & poor living conditions</u> Although there were successes, central planning was not very efficient. Some industries over-produced, others under-produced. There was a shortage of consumer goods as industries focused on heavy industries. The Russians suffered in the bitterly cold winters because they could not buy suitable clothing and their houses were poorly heated. Basic goods, including food, clothes and shoes, were in short supply. These items had to be rationed, which meant that each family could only buy a fixed amount of the items. The shortages also led to high prices. Between 1928 and 1933, the actual value of the workers' salaries fell by 50%, as they could buy less with the same amount of money. Many of the industrial workers were farmers who had lived in the countryside, they were not used to life in the cities and often found it hard to adjust to their new living environment.

Poor work conditions - 'Wreckers and saboteurs' were found to blame for mistakes

The system could not be at fault. So, 'wreckers' or 'saboteurs' were found, blamed and put on trial. The hysteria and fear created by the trials and accusations made people cover up mistakes and faults by inflating output figures. Workers were intimidated so that they would work harder. Many prisoners (peasants sent to labour camp) were made to work hard by compulsion, fear of physical punishment or being denied food.

Collectivisation

Increasing use of force & removing those who opposed collectivisation

In the winter of 1928-29 Stalin led a drive to encourage voluntary entry into collective farms. This had little effect and getting grain from peasants was still a problem. The state had now entered into a conflict with the peasants. With so little peasant support for collectivisation the only way forward was through increasing use of force. Backed by Stalin's secret police, the NKVD, Party officials and volunteers were sent to the countryside to form collective farms. These officials often forced the farmers to sign documents agreeing to the formation of collective farms. They would then take over the fields, livestock, farming tools and buildings of the farmers. The NKVD was especially harsh to the kulaks. Orders were given to shoot farmers who resisted or to send them to labour camps (Gulags) to the north of the Soviet Union where they were to work on Stalin's ambitious construction projects. Peasants who failed to deliver the set amount of grain were punished.

Dekulakisation - To remove the rich peasants as a class

Attacks on 'kulaks' increased and Party leaders began to call for mass collectivisation. In December 1929 Stalin called for the "liquidation of the kulaks as a class". If the peasants refused to join a collective, they would be labelled as kulaks and shot, deported or sent to labour camps. 'Dekulakisation' was important to the collectivisation process. It was important to have a class enemy - kulaks - to blame for everything that went wrong. Even where kulaks did not exist, the Communists insisted that they had to be found and cleaned out. Stalin said, 'We must liquidate them as a class'. Thousands of kulaks were rounded up and either killed or sent to labour camps since they preferred destroying their crops to handing them over to the government.

Famine

The human effects were catastrophic. So much disruption was caused to agriculture that there were severe food shortages. Farmers burnt their crops and grew less food rather than send them to the Communist officials. Disastrous harvest in 1932 resulted in a famine in 1932-1933. The decline in crop production was made worse by natural disasters such as droughts and floods. Famine raged in southern Russia, while food was exported to buy machines from other countries. It is estimated that more than 10 million peasants and their families died in the famine.

Any other factually correct information from Stalin's USSR.

(b) 'Trotsky was responsible for the rise of Stalin.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Describes Stalin / Trotsky with no reference to the rise of Stalin</u> Award one mark for each detail, up to a maximum of two.
L2	<u>Explains Yes OR No</u> Award 3 marks for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, up to a maximum of 6 marks.
L3	<u>Explains Yes AND No</u> Award 7 marks for an explanation of Yes and an explanation of No and further additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks. <u>Agree</u> Yes, agree. Stalin rose to power because of Trotsky's weaknesses. Trotsky had a narrow support base – mostly the Red Army and youths. Because he assumed he would succeed Lenin, he was complacent about winning over his rivals in the Party or cultivates support. His ideas, such as support for 'world revolution', also lost him a lot of support because the Russians were tired of war. This enabled Stalin to win over the support that Trotsky, as Lenin's natural successor, might otherwise have had. Yes, agree. Trotsky's unpopularity led to Stalin's rise in power. Trotsky was unpopular because he was arrogant and critical of others. Trotsky was outspoken and had argued with Lenin and others in the party. For example, he had criticised Lenin's New Economic Policy and the increasing control by the Central Executive Committee. His arguments were seen as acts of disloyalty to Lenin and the party. His extreme ideas (world revolution as opposed to Stalin's Socialism in one country') were also not popular. Thus party members started to exclude him from decision making. This removed Stalin's major competitor from power and made party members support Stalin's rise to power. <u>No, disagree</u> No disagree. Stalin rose to power because he manipulated the rest of the Central Executive Committee to not publish Lenin's Last Testament. Before he died, Lenin wrote a Testament that criticised many members of the party. In the Testament, Lenin said specifically that Stalin should be removed from the position of Secretary General. However, Stalin managed to convince the rest of the party to not publish the Testament since all of them were criticised. By not publishing the Testament, Stalin managed to hold on to the position of Secretary- General and retain the impression that he was the natural successor to Lenin. He also made use of the position of Secretary-General to place people who are loyal to him in key party positions so that they will support him taking over control of the party.

No disagree. Stalin rose to power because he pretended to be close to Lenin. Stalin visited Lenin frequently when Lenin was ill. After Lenin died of a heart attack in 1924, Stalin organised Lenin's funeral, making it a grand affair. He ordered Lenin's body to be embalmed and displayed in a mausoleum in the Red Square in Moscow. Stalin also gave the funeral speech and established himself as the chief mourner, showing himself deeply sorrowful over the loss of Lenin. Stalin arranged for the city of Petrograd to be renamed 'Leningrad' in Lenin's honour. This gave his fellow Party members, as well as the general public, the impression that Lenin had favoured and trusted Stalin thus they supported Stalin's as they saw him as the rightful successor.

No disagree. Stalin's abilities were the main reasons for his rise to power. Stalin rose to power because of his cunning / manipulations. He had come to power by exploiting ideological divisions in the party. Members of the Communist Party were divided between the moderates and the radicals. The moderates were those who followed Lenin's leadership and ideology closely, while the radicals formed new ideas and challenged the system. Stalin took advantage of these ideological divisions within the Party, allying himself with both sides at different times. With this, he was able to eliminate his competitors. I agree. Stalin allied himself with moderate Politburo members, who saw Trotsky as a radical because Trotsky criticised and challenged Party organisation and policies which caused Trotsky to be expelled from the Party. Then Stalin broke the troika alliance with Kamenev and Zinoviev. This convinced the moderates that Kamenev and Zinoviev were plotting with Trotsky to overthrow the government. Then Stalin switched over to win support of the radicals and targeted Bukharin and Rykov, who were moderates. By doing this, Stalin managed to divide the support of his major rivals and remove them from the party. With the removal of his major rivals, Stalin seized overall control of the party.

No disagree. Stalin rose to power by making use of his position as Secretary-General. Stalin used his position to appoint his supporters to key roles in the Politburo and control the local Party committees. He was able to give newer, poorly educated members positions so they felt grateful to him, while expelling the more radical elements likely to support Trotsky. In 1925, Stalin was able to pack a Party meeting with his supporters and successfully vote Trotsky out of his post as Commissar of War. His position enabled him to win over a broad support base, who voted him into power.

No I disagree. Stalin rose to power because his opponents under-estimated him and made key mistakes. The Bolsheviks underestimated Stalin because they thought that he was dull, hardworking and loyal, without extreme views. Because they were self-interested and underestimated Stalin, they decided not to publish Lenin's testament. As the Politburo did not consider him as much as threat as Trotsky, and were more concerned to get rid of Trotsky, this helped Stalin REMOVE HIS OPPONENTS.

L4 Level 3 plus reaches a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of

'How far?'

Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers.

Not just L3, but an explicit consideration of 'How far?' using criteria additional to those used in L3.

- By showing how one is more important, the other less important using a criteria
- By showing how one is link to the other by showing cause and effect.
- By showing one is more important because it is the decisive factor and the other less important because it is a contributing factor
- By categorising factors into root cause (long term), short-term causes and/or catalyst.

3. This question is on the Cold War.

(a) Explain how deteriorating relations between USA and Cuba led to the Cuban Missile Crisis. [8]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>L1 Describes the Cuban Missile Crisis / Cuba-US relations with no reference to the causes of CMC</u> <i>Answers which describe the event/feature without focus on the question</i> <i>Award one mark for each detail, up to a maximum of two.</i>
L2	<u>L2 Describes factors (no link of factor)</u> <i>Award 3 marks for one detailed description</i> <i>Award 4 marks for another detailed description.</i> <u>Cuba/s actions</u> • Actions from Cuba must be from Sept 1960 when Castro established economic relations with USSR OR when Dec 1961 formal alliance with USSR – led to deteriorating relations between USA and Cuba <u>USA's actions</u> Actions from USA must be from events leading to escalating tensions – e.g. Operation Mongoose, Bay of Pigs – present a threat to Cuba – led to deteriorating relations between Cuba & USA Pigs – present a threat to Cuba – led to deteriorating relations between Cuba & USA
L3	<u>Explains reasons</u> <i>Award 5-6 marks for one explained factor.</i> <i>Award 7-8 marks for two explained factors.</i> <u>Answers must reflect Cold War – Communism vs democratic nations</u> <u>Cuba/s actions</u> • Actions from Cuba must be from Sept 1960 when Castro established economic relations with USSR OR when Dec 1961 formal alliance with USSR – led to deteriorating relations between USA and Cuba • Cuba accepting missile from USSR – discovery of missiles – increased fear and suspicion between USA and USSR – crisis <u>USA's actions</u> • Actions from USA must be from events leading to escalating tensions – e.g. Operation Mongoose, Bay of Pigs – present a threat to Cuba – led to deteriorating relations between Cuba & USA • Cuba seek USSR's help in defending Cuba – installed missiles – discovery of missiles - increased fear and suspicion between USA and USSR - crisis

(b) 'US President Ronald Reagan was responsible for the end of Cold War.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

Level	Level Descriptor
L1	<u>Describes Cold War or collapse of communist regime, but without focus on the question</u> <i>Award one mark for each detail, up to a maximum of two.</i>
L2	<u>Explains Yes OR No</u> <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, up to a maximum of 6 marks.</i>
L3	<u>Explains Yes AND No</u> <i>Award 7 marks for an explanation of Yes and an explanation of No and further additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks.</i> <u>Yes (Reagan's economic liberalisation led to prosperity and an increased arms race + Reagan's change in attitude from confrontational to peaceable after 1983 Able Archer)</u> Eg. Yes, Reagan was responsible. US economic superiority was responsible as it led to renewed arms race which bankrupted the USSR. US President Reagan initially believed that the West needed to strengthen its armed forces to deter Soviet communist aggression. The capitalism system of the West encouraged private enterprise and economic efficiency which brought them financial boom in the 1970s. He could thus increase military expenditure in the 1980s to deliberately start an arms race to bankrupt the USSR. The US could develop technologically more capable and mobile Pershing II nuclear missiles and a defensive shield of laser-beam firing space satellites, which could intercept and destroy any Soviet missile fired at the USA (Star Wars program). He stationed over a hundred of the latest Pershing II mobile nuclear missiles in West Germany which were aimed at the USSR. The US also conducted a very realistic military with its NATO allies known as Exercise 'Able Archer' in 1983. This so alarmed the USSR that it mobilised its military and those of Warsaw Pact nations in readiness for an expected NATO invasion. The Soviet government further increased its military expenditure to match the US military advancement and had little money to improve the economy and infrastructure of the USSR. The USSR ended up spending more money than it was getting from taxes and was on the brink of bankruptcy with its huge debts. <u>As the USSR could not afford to keep up with the arms race, it had to find a way to end the Cold War that it could not win which involved reducing military expenditure. On the other side, Reagan was more willing to negotiate with USSR to avert nuclear war. Thus, the Cold War ended.</u> <u>Yes, Ronald Reagan's change in attitude towards the Soviet Union</u> Why the change in attitude – (1) renewed fear in nuclear war, (2) public

opposition to 'Star Wars', (3) realized USSR wanted peace too (from 'Able Archer 83')

- Reagan's change in attitude from confrontational to peaceable - desire to improve superpower relations enabled him to cooperate with Gorbachev on matters such as nuclear disarmament. This was evident in the breakthrough in arms reduction through the signing of the INF Treaty in 1987 - significantly **improved superpower relations***.
- The transformation in Reagan's attitude towards the Soviet Union - Reagan realised that his aggressive stance during his first presidential term pushed the superpowers **closer to another nuclear war**, as seen from 'Able Archer 83' which provoked a fearful reaction from the Soviet Union.
- Although he was a staunch anti-communist who initially adopted a confrontational attitude against the Soviet Union, he was flexible and responded to Gorbachev's gestures.

No – Gorbachev's policies – Perestroika / economic restructuring

(describe) Government allowed privatization of small businesses and relaxed control of prices. Yet, government officials still controlled the means of production, such as transport and machineries. The small business owners had to pay high taxes and pay high prices to corrupted government officials to buy these means of production. Many small businesses closed down leading to shortages of basic goods while the remaining ones charged high prices for their goods to maintain profitability. Gorbachev's economic restructuring was responsible as it seemed to make life worse for the people. The Soviet people did not see how Perestroika (led to improvements to their lives as shortages of basic good worsened).

(Explain)

- This led the people to organize protests against the government to demand for more basic goods.
- These developments further **worsened the criticisms of and loss of confidence in the Communist Party as well as Gorbachev's authority** within the Soviet Union.
- They also **contributed to the outbreak of political revolutions in the Eastern European countries as well as the Soviet Union – *led to the collapse of communism.**

OR

No – Gorbachev's policies - Glasnost

(Describe) Through the relaxation of propaganda and censorship, the Soviet people became aware of the many misdeeds, mistakes, hypocrisies, problems and corruptions of the communist government from Stalin's time till the present. They also became aware of the comfortable lifestyles, wealth of consumer goods and freedom that people in democratic and capitalist countries enjoyed, which was in contrast to them. These had shocked the people who had previously been subjected to propaganda and censorship into believing that the communist system was the best in the world.

(Explain)

- All these made the Soviet people lose even more faith in the communist system, who yearned for a complete change in government. Glasnost weakened the authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.
- The allowance of public debates, relaxation of censorship and new revelations on Soviet history **made the Soviet people lose even more confidence in the vision and rule of the Communist party.**
- This eventually led to ***revolutions which led to the collapse of the communist bloc.**

No – Gorbachev's foreign policy – removing Brezhnev Doctrina

(Describe) As part of his plan to save the USSR from bankruptcy and to make more money available to develop the Soviet economy, Gorbachev aimed to cut down on military expenditure. He announced in 1988 that Soviet troops in Afghanistan and Eastern Europe would be withdrawn and that he would not interfere with the politics of these countries. This was a reversal of the "Brezhnev Doctrine". Moreover, Gorbachev's reforms in the USSR also encouraged the citizens of Eastern Europe to demand for similar reforms in their own countries.

(Explain)

- The people of Eastern Europe became less afraid to oppose and to speak out against their communist governments. They organized protests and strikes which eventually grew in size and intensity into full-scale rebellions, in many cases with the military supporting the people.
- Without the assistance of Soviet troops, the communist governments of Eastern Europe had to give in to the demands of their people to have more political freedom.

No – dissent and discontentment in Eastern Europe

(Describe) There was much discontentment within the communist bloc. After World War II, the USSR had used foul means to install unpopular communist governments in its satellite countries of Eastern Europe. It had to send troops to crush popular revolts by the people of Eastern European in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Since then, the USSR had formulated the 'Brezhnev Doctrine', which stated that the USSR will use military force to keep the Eastern European communist governments in power and to make these countries stay under the influence of the USSR via the Warsaw Pact. In addition, Eastern Europeans dissenters who spoke against their communist governments were often arrested and even executed. This made these communist governments seemed hypocritical as they had violated basic human rights which were supposed to be part of communist principles. Furthermore, the economy of Eastern Europe under communism remained weak in contrast with the West.

(Explain)

- This further made the Eastern European people disillusioned with communism and resentful of their own communist governments and of

	the USSR. - Thousands began to participate in street protests and strikes demanding for political reforms which weakened the authority of the communist governments in Eastern Europe. <u>No – Gorbachev's Foreign policy reforms – nuclear disarmament</u> (Describe) Nuclear Disarmament - 1987 – INF Treaty - Signing of Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (both agree to remove intermediate-range nuclear missiles deployed in Europe as a result of 'Able Archer 83') (Explain) - Superpower relations improved greatly. - Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' was acknowledged by the West as a sincere effort to reduce Cold War tensions, thus creating opportunities for the superpowers to establish goodwill and cooperate with each other.
L4	<u>Level 3 plus reaches a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of 'How far?'</u> <i>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers. Not just L3, but an explicit consideration of 'How far?' using criteria additional to those used in L3.</i> - By showing how one is more important, the other less important using a criteria - By showing how one is link to the other by showing cause and effect. - By showing one is more important because it is the decisive factor and the other less important because it is a contributing factor - By categorising factors into root cause (long term), short-term causes and/or catalyst.