



# West Spring Secondary School

## PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2023

**HUMANITIES**

**2273/02**

**Paper 2 History**

**SECONDARY**      **4 EXPRESS/ NORMAL (ACADEMIC) (Out-of-Stream)**  
**5 NORMAL (ACADEMIC)**

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_ (      )      **Date**      25<sup>th</sup> August 2023

**Class** \_\_\_\_\_      **Duration**      1 hr 40 mins

Additional      Writing papers  
Materials:

### READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

Write in dark blue or black pen.

You may use a soft pencil for any diagrams or rough working

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

#### **Section A**

Answer **all** questions from this section.

#### **Section B**

Answer **one** question from this section.

Hand in Section A and Section B **together**.

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

FOR EXAMINER'S USE	
<b>Section A</b>	<b>/30</b>
<b>Section B</b>	<b>/20</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>/50</b>

This document consists of **6** printed pages.

**Setter**

**Mr. Emmanuel Devapragasam**

**[Turn over]**

## 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 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.

Why do you think this cartoon was published at this time. Explain your answer. [5]

**(b)** Study Sources B.

How useful is the source as evidence in understanding the Cuban missile crisis? Explain your answer. [5]

**(c)** Study Sources C and D.

Would the author of Source C be surprised by what Source D is saying? Explain your answer. [6]

**(d)** Study Source E and F.

Does Source E prove Source F is reliable? Explain your answer. [6]

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

“The Cuban Missile Crisis was a result of USA’s aggression” How far do the sources agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [8]

## The Cuban Missile Crisis

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Cuban revolution in 1959 challenged USA's political and economic dominance. Castro's policies of land reform, nationalization and diversification of sugar markets were met with the USA declaring an embargo and by breaking off diplomatic relations. This was followed with the Bay of Pigs fiasco, Operation Mongoose and other attempts to remove Castro from power.

By December 1961, Castro responded by declaring himself communist and pleaded with Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev to send nuclear missiles to help protect Cuba. The placing of Soviet missiles sparked thirteen days of intense tension known as the Cuban Missile Crisis. It was perhaps the closest that the world ever came to engaging in a full-scale nuclear war. Fortunately, both President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev managed to resolve the crisis. Who bears the most responsibility for causing the Cuban Missile Crisis?

**Source A:** *A cartoon published in a French newspaper in October 1962.*



**Source B:** *A cartoon published in a British magazine in 1962 showing Khrushchev carrying a ship on his shoulder. It is borrowed from the phrase 'A chip on someone's shoulder' and refers to someone who feels that he has been treated unfairly.*



**Source C:** *An extract from a report written by a US political analyst in 1995.*

Castro's acceptance of the missiles also enabled him to achieve a far more significant objective. First and foremost, the missiles provided Castro with the ability to deter an American invasion. Still convinced that the United States would invade Cuba a second time, the missiles provided Castro with the fire power he needed to deter such an invasion and safeguard the Cuban revolution. The missiles would enable Cuba, as a member of the Soviet bloc, to "thumb its nose" at the United States. Castro was furious to learn through Radio Moscow that Khrushchev had agreed to withdraw the missiles from Cuba. He was prepared to go to war.

**Source D:** *From a statement by the former Soviet defence minister recalling the outbreak of the Cuban Missile crisis in 1992.*

Khrushchev and his defence minister, General Rodion Malinovsky, were at Khrushchev's estate on the Black Sea. They went for a walk and his Minister pointed in the direction of Turkey and said, 'That's where the American rockets are pointing at us. They need 10 minutes to reach our cities, but our rockets need 25 minutes to reach America.' Khrushchev thought for a while and said, 'Why don't we install our rockets in Cuba and point them at the Americans? Then we'll need only 10 minutes, too.'

**Source E:** *An extract from Khrushchev's memoirs, published in 1971.*

Suddenly we began to be criticized. The Chinese press at that time declared that this was treason, cowardice, and surrender on our part. But what should we have done? Carry on the game to the point of war? That's exactly what the Chinese were insisting, but we naturally considered that to be sheer stupidity. We didn't want war. Even today I think that we were correct in removing our missiles from Cuba. And we began to explain our position to Castro in writing. He was very annoyed and even blew up at us. He blasted us thoroughly. But today, Cuba exists as an independent communist country, right in front of America.

**Source F:** *An excerpt from a book published in 1968 by a Cuban exile who fled to the United States after the revolution.*

The accounts of the crisis did not make clear that it was a power confrontation, that the power of the USA was superior to that of the USSR, and that the leaders of both nations knew this to be a fact. It was wrong for Kennedy to have merely agreed to the withdrawal of missiles from Cuba. The United States, it is worth repeating, could have erased every important Soviet military installation and major Soviet cities in two or three hours while the strike capability of the USSR was negligible. Although Kennedy was in a superior position, he granted the Communist bloc a privileged sanctuary in the Caribbean by means of the "no invasion" pledge.

## Section B (Structured Essay Questions)

Answer any **one** question.

### 2 This question is about Stalin's Soviet Union.

- a) Explain why Stalin was able to defeat Trotsky after Lenin's death. [8]
- b) 'Stalin's rule devastated the Russian people'. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

### 3 This question is about the Cold War.

- a) Explain why Korea was important to the superpowers after World War Two. [8]
- b) 'Gorbachev's policies led to the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

---

#### Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A: @ <https://www.jchistorytuition.com.sg/jc-history-tuition-notes-cuban-missile-crisis-cartoon-analysis/>

Source B: © <https://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/fl-xpm-1987-10-11-8703190193-story.html>

Source C: © <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/1995/LMM.htm>

Source D: @ <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/the-cuban-missile-crisis-1962-the-world-at-deaths-door-1555622.html>

Source E : @ <http://kiatipis.org/Writers/N/Nikita.Khrushchev/Memoirs-of-Nikita-Khrushchev%5BVol3%5D.pdf>

Source F : @ <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/x2jfk.html>

**Suggested Answer Scheme**  
**\*DO NOT PRINT WITH QUESTION PAPER\***

**SECTION A**

**Structured Essay Questions**

1a) Why do you think this cartoon was published at this time? Explain your answer. [5m]

	<b>Level Descriptor and Rubrics</b>	<b>MKS</b>
<b>L1</b>	<b>Describes the source or makes an invalid inference</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Makes inference, supported with evidence</b>  <i>Award 2m for inference,  Award 3m for inference with appropriate evidence</i></p> <p>This intention of the cartoonist was to highlight to the French public that the Cuban Missile Crisis was that the Soviet Union / Khrushchev was responsible for the Cuban Missile crisis. (2 marks)</p> <p>This intention of the cartoonist was to highlight to the French public that Khrushchev / Soviet Union was the mastermind behind the Cuban Missile Crisis. This can be seen source A where Castro and Kennedy are holding missiles ready to throw at each other with Khrushchev observing the situation. (3 marks)</p>	<b>2-3</b>
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Explains purpose</b>  <i>Award 4m for inference with appropriate evidence with explanation.  Award 5 m for L2 + intended outcome, and context.</i></p> <p>The intention of the cartoonist (Author) was to inform (+active verb) the French public (Audience) that (Message) Khrushchev was responsible for the Cuban missile crisis. (Evidence) As seen in sources, it shows both Castro and Kennedy pointing missiles at each other with Khrushchev almost hiding and looking at the situation in alarm. (Explanation) This tells me that Khrushchev caused the crisis by placing missiles in Castro's hands and leading to Kennedy's threatening response. (4 marks)</p> <p>The intention of the cartoonist (Author) was to inform (+active verb) the British public (Audience) that (Message) Khrushchev was responsible for the Cuban missile crisis. (Evidence) As seen in sources, it shows both Castro and Kennedy pointing missiles at each other with Khrushchev almost hiding and looking at the situation in alarm. (Explanation) This tells me that Khrushchev was responsible for the crisis by placing missiles in Castro's hands and this had led to Kennedy's threatening response. (Intended Outcome/Impact) By drawing this the cartoonist wanted the French public to know that Khrushchev was the responsible / mastermind who caused the Cuban missile crisis. (Contextual Knowledge) Based on my contextual knowledge, the missiles were provided by the Soviet Union to deter any threat from the USA, but this was done in secret without the knowledge of the USA.</p>	<b>4-5</b>

	(Also accept - Khrushchev was the puppet master )	
--	---	--

1b) Study Source B.

How useful is this source as evidence in understanding the Cuban missile crisis? Explain your answer. [5m]

	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	MKS
L1	<b>Describes the source or makes an invalid inference</b>	1
L2	<p><b>Useful OR not useful, based on analysis of source content</b>  <i>Award 2 marks for analysing usefulness supported with evidence and explanation.</i></p> <p>Source B is <b>useful</b> in showing that the USSR was responsible for the Cuban Missile Crisis as it was the transportation and later discovery of such missiles which led to the crisis. As seen in Source, it shows a Khrushchev with a atomic missile in one hand and carrying a ship marked cargo for Cuba. The other image is that of Kennedy wearing a sheriff badge “throwing back” (returning a missile) towards Khrushchev. In addition to this, Kennedy has 2 warships and a sign that reads, Western Hemisphere. This tells me that Kennedy was responding to Khrushchev transporting and placing armaments in Cuba. As a response, Kennedy imposed a naval blockade and demanded that Khrushchev take back / remove the missiles from its sphere of influence (Western Hemisphere) Hence. Source B is useful in showing that the missile crisis started when the Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba and escalated as the USA sought to maintain its sphere of influence (Monroe doctrine).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>However, <b>Source B might not be useful</b> as seem to portray Khrushchev as the aggressor (outlaw) carrying missiles and Kennedy as defending (sheriff) / preventing these dangerous weapons from being placed in Cuba. Kennedy breaks international law by imposing a blockade around and preventing ships from going into Cuba unless searched. However, the source does not seem balanced as it does not provide reasons for Khrushchev placing nuclear missiles in Cuba. Given that there is only limited information about the reasons behind the crisis (for example retaliation for US missiles in Turkey), Source B is not useful.</p> <p>(also accept: both sides were responsible for crisis)  Source B holds both the Soviet Union and USA responsible as Soviet Union wanted to retaliate for USA placement of missiles in Turkey and USA wanted to maintain its control over the Western Hemisphere)</p>	2
L3	<p><b>Useful And Not useful, supported by reference to other sources</b>  <i>L2+ Award 3 marks for 1 source</i>  <i>Award 4 marks for 2 sources</i></p> <p>Source B is <b>useful</b> in showing that the USSR was responsible for the Cuban Missile Crisis as it was the transportation and later discovery of such missiles that led to the crisis. As seen in Source, it shows a</p>	3 - 4



	<p>Khrushchev with a atomic missile in one hand and carrying a ship marked cargo for Cuba. The other image is that of Kennedy wearing a sheriff badge “throwing back” (returning a missile) towards Khrushchev. In addition to this, Kennedy has 2 warships and a sign that reads, Western Hemisphere. This tells me that Kennedy was responding to Khrushchev transporting and placing armaments in Cuba. As a response, Kennedy imposed a naval blockade and demanded that Khrushchev take back / remove the missiles from its sphere of influence (Western Hemisphere) Hence. Source B is useful in showing that the missile crisis started when the Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba and escalated as the USA sought to maintain its sphere of influence (Monroe doctrine).</p> <p>Based on <b>cross-refencing</b> to <b>Source D</b>, it supports Source B that Khrushchev was the aggressor. As seen in source it states, “Khrushchev thought for a while and said, 'Why don't we install our rockets in Cuba and point them at the Americans? Then we'll need only 10 minutes, too.' This tells me that he placed missiles in Cuba due to its close location to the USA. Hence Source B is useful in identifying Khrushchev as the triggering the Cuban missile crisis. (Also accept – Kennedy acted to safeguard American interests and maintain the Cuba as part of the US sphere of influence as defined by the Monroe doctrine)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>However, <b>Source B might not be useful</b> as it is one sided. It portrays Khrushchev as the aggressor (outlaw) carrying missiles and Kennedy as defending (sheriff) / preventing these dangerous weapons from being placed in Cuba. Kennedy breaks international law by imposing a blockade around and preventing ships from going into Cuba unless searched. However, the source does not seem balanced as it does not provide reasons for Khrushchev placing nuclear missiles in Cuba. Given that there is only <i>limited information which is one sided</i> about the reasons behind the crisis (for example retaliation for US missiles in Turkey), Source B is not useful.</p> <p>Based on <b>cross-referencing</b> to <b>Source C</b> it supports the view that Khrushchev placed missiles in Cuba to deter US invasion. As seen in Source C, it states, “the missiles provided Castro with the ability to deter an American invasion” and “safeguard the Cuban revolution”. This gives me the reason for Khrushchev wanting to send “cargo – missiles” to Cuba. Since, this information is omitted from source, it is not balance and not useful in understanding the Cuban missile crisis.</p> <p>(also accept: both sides were responsible for crisis / background information and contextual knowledge)</p>	
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>Yes, based on the analysis of purpose</b> <i>Award 5m for answers which address and examine the context for such a letter.</i></p> <p>Nevertheless, despite the source being one sided and biased, Source B is still useful as it provides the <b>main reason/s</b> for the outbreak of the Cuban Missile Crisis.</p>	<b>5</b>

	<p>The source was created by a British cartoonist (author) to inform (+active verb) the readers/public that Soviet missiles and Monroe doctrine were responsible for the Cuban Missile Crisis. (Evidence) As seen in source, it shows Castro carrying a ship labelled cargo for Cuba with a missile in his hand. Another was a signpost marked Western Hemisphere with Kennedy and 2 warships, with him tossing back a missile. (Explanation) This tells me that the Cuban crisis started with Khrushchev placing missiles in Cuba and Kennedy initiating a naval blockade. (Intended Outcome) By drawing this the cartoonist wanted the public to understand the reason/s for the outbreak of the crisis. (Contextual Knowledge) Based on my contextual knowledge, although the cartoon was published in a British newspaper, the British government had cautioned the USA not to over-react and that the Europeans had lived within the range of Soviet missiles for years.</p> <p><b>Ultimately</b>, the British cartoonist was suggesting that <b>both sides were responsible for the crisis</b>. On one hand USA's action was to prevent any Soviet (communist) attempt at making Cuba a communist base and to protect USA dominance and sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere (Monroe doctrine). The Soviet Union on the other hand wanted to correct the missile imbalance in Turkey and felt justified in placing missiles, It had also wanted to protect Cuba from a possible invasion. Hence the source B suggests that both sides were responsible for the Cuban Missile Crisis.</p>	
--	---	--

1c) Study Source C and Source D

Would the author of Source C be surprised by what Source D is saying? Explain your answer. [6m]

	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	MKS
<b>L1</b>	<p><b>Describes the source (surprise / not surprise) without explanation.</b></p> <p>E.g., Source D surprises me about Source C in terms of why Khrushchev placed nuclear missiles in Cuba.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g., Source D does not surprise about Source C as both reveal that Khrushchev was trying to use the nuclear missiles as a bargaining tool against the USA.</p>	<b>1</b>
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Explains content that is surprising <u>OR</u> not surprising, with explanation.</b></p> <p>E.g. Source D <b>surprises</b> me about Source C in terms of the reasons Khrushchev placed nuclear missiles in Cuba. Both sources are about reasons for placing missiles in Cuba. Source D says that the nuclear missiles were put in Cuba to counter US nuclear missiles that were placed</p>	<b>2</b>

	<p>in Turkey. As seen in Source D it says, "They went for a walk and his Minister pointed in the direction of Turkey and said, 'That's where the American rockets are pointing at us.'" Source C, however claims that missiles were placed in Cuba to deter an American invasion. As seen in Source C, it states that "the missiles provided Castro with the fire power he needed to deter such an invasion". This tells me that missiles were placed for the protection of Cuba. Source D on the other hand suggests that it was for offensive purpose. Hence, there is a clash in views in both sources that makes one more surprising than the other.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. Source D <b>does not surprise me</b> about Source C as both reveal that Khrushchev was trying to use the nuclear missiles as a form of a bargaining tool against the USA. Source D says that "Why don't we install rockets in Cuba and point at the Americans? Then we'll only need 10 minutes too." This suggests it was as a retaliation for the USA placing missiles in Turkey. Similarly, Source C also suggests that the placing of the missiles was a way to get back at the USA when it says, "the missiles would enable Cuba, as a member of the Soviet bloc, to "thumb its nose" at the United States." Hence, both sources do not surprise me as the objective was to gain the advantage over the USA.</p>	
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Surprised based on comparison of both sources</b>  <i>L2 + analysis of content within both sources to determine surprise</i></p> <p><b>Both aspects of L2</b></p>	3
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>L3+ cross-refers to other sources or contextual knowledge</b></p> <p><i>Award 4 marks for one side</i>  <i>Award 5 marks for both sides</i></p> <p>E.g. E.g. Source D <b>surprises</b> me about Source C in terms of why Khrushchev placed nuclear missiles in Cuba. Source D says that the nuclear missiles were put in Cuba to counter US nuclear missiles that were placed in Turkey. As seen in Source D it says, "They went for a walk and his Minister pointed in the direction of Turkey and said, 'That's where the American rockets are pointing at us.'" Source C, however, claims that missiles were placed in Cuba to deter an American invasion. As seen in Source C, it states that "the missiles provided Castro with the fire power he needed to deter such an invasion". This tells me that missiles were placed for the protection of Cuba. Source D on the other hand suggests that it was for offensive purpose. Hence, there is a clash in views in both sources that makes one more surprising than the other.</p> <p><b>Cross-referring</b> to my <b>contextual knowledge</b>, it supports Source C, as I know the missiles were placed in Cuba as a defensive measure. The USA</p>	4-5

	<p>had already armed and support Cuban exiles in the Bay of Pigs invasion and had initiated Operation Mongoose to kill Castro and the Cuban leadership. I also know as shown in Source D, that Khrushchev wanted to gain strategic advantage over the USA by placing offensive missiles in Cuba. This is <b>surprising as it is from a US political analyst</b> who should be more supportive of the US point of view. Hence what Source D surprised me about Source C says as it differs in the reason for placing the missiles.</p> <p><b>Also accept: Based on Cross-referring to Source A</b>, it supports the view that missiles were placed in Cuba as a defensive measure. As seen in Source, it shows Kennedy with an overwhelming number of missiles which he is holding and ready to throw at Castro. Castro only had one missile. In the background is the figure of Khrushchev looking over the horizon. This tells me that Khrushchev was observing the arms disparity between Cuba and the USA and decides to provide weaponry for its defence.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>E.g. Source D <b>does not surprise me</b> about Source C as both reveal that Khrushchev was trying to use the nuclear missiles as a form of <b>a bargaining tool</b> against the USA. Source D says that “Why don’t we install rockets in Cuba and point at the Americans? Then we’ll only need 10 minutes too.” This suggests it was as a retaliation for the USA placing missiles in Turkey. Similarly, Source C also suggests that the placing of the missiles was a way to get back at the USA when it says, “the missiles would enable Cuba, as a member of the Soviet bloc, to “thumb its nose” at the United States.” Hence, both sources do not surprise me as the objective was to gain the advantage over the USA.</p> <p><b>Cross-referring to Source F</b>, it supports this point of view as it claims that the USA had superior strike capability over the Soviet Union. As seen in source, it says that , “The United States, it is worth repeating, could have erased every important Soviet military installation and major Soviet cities in two or three hours while the strike capability of the USSR was negligible”. This confirms that the USA had advantage as it had nuclear missiles in Turkey, Great Britain pointing at the Soviet Union. It also explains the reason for Khrushchev placing missiles in Cuba so that Cuba can act as a proxy and “thumb its nose at the US”. This is supported by my contextual knowledge as the USSR was using the nuclear missiles as a bargaining tool to provoke the USA and gain an upper hand in the Cold War conflict Hence Source D does not surprise me about what Source C says.</p> <p>(Also accept: Source A if student able to postulate that Khrushchev as “puppet master” placed offensive missiles in Cuba)</p>	
<b>L5</b>	<p><b>L4 + EXPLAIN THE SURPRISE THROUGH THE PURPOSE</b></p> <p><b>Ultimately Source C does surprise me.</b> The political analyst (author) wanted to persuade (+active verb) the readers / international community</p>	<b>6</b>

	<p>(audience) that it was USA threat of invasion which made Cuba accept Soviet missiles. (Evidence) As seen in source, “missiles provided Castro with the fire power he needed to deter such an invasion and safeguard the Cuban revolution”. (Explanation) This tells me it was the threat of US invasion which was the key reason for Castro wanting Soviet missiles. (Intended Outcome/Impact) By stating this, the political analyst wanted the readers to know that it was USA actions which set the stage for Castro asking for nuclear missiles. It was surprising because being a US political analyst it was anticipated that he would support USA point of view but he acknowledges that Cuba had no choice but to accept Soviet protection. Given that the source was written in 1995, after the end of the Cold War, it seems to be give a balance account of the crisis. Hence, Source C does surprise me .</p>	
--	--	--

1d) Does Source E prove that Source F is reliable? Explain your answer. [6m]

	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	
<b>L1</b>	<b>Describes the source or makes an invalid inference</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Yes based on Sources E and F in content</b>  <i>Award 2m for answers based on provenance.</i>  <i>Award 3m for answers with appropriate evidence from the source.</i></p> <p>Both are unreliable because of their provenance. E was from Khrushchev and F was anti-American account by a Cuban exile (2 marks)</p> <p><b>Yes, Source E can prove that Source F is reliable</b> because both sources agree as to the reason/s for the Soviet Union withdrawal of its missiles from Cuba. As seen in Source E, it states that, “We didn’t want war, we wanted peace. Even today I think that we were correct in removing our missiles from Cuba”. This tells me that Khrushchev withdrew the missiles as he wanted to avoid war with the USA. Likewise, this is supported in Source F, as it states that both leaders knew that “the power of the USA was superior to that of the USSR” and that “the United States could have erased every important Soviet military installation and major Soviet cities in two or three hours”. This tells me that the Soviet Union withdrew its missiles from Cuba in order to avoid war with the United States. Hence, Source E helps prove that Source F is reliable since both sources state that the Soviet Union withdrew its missiles from Cuba to avoid war.</p>	<b>2-3</b>
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Yes AND/OR No, supported by reference to other sources or contextual knowledge</b>  <i>Award 4m for L2 + supported by appropriate cross-reference.</i>  <i>Award 5m for BOTH yes AND no, supported by appropriate cross-reference.</i>  <i>L2 (analysis of sources E and F) + cross reference to another source/contextual knowledge)</i></p> <p><b>Yes, Source E can prove that Source F is reliable</b> because both sources agree as to the reason/s for the Soviet Union withdrawal of its missiles from</p>	<b>4-5</b>

	<p>Cuba. As seen in Source E, it states that, “We didn’t want war, we wanted peace. Even today I think that we were correct in removing our missiles from Cuba”. This tells me that Khrushchev withdrew the missiles as he wanted to avoid war with the USA. Likewise, this is supported in Source F, as it states that both leaders knew that “the power of the USA was superior to that of the USSR” and that “the United States could have erased every important Soviet military installation and Soviet cities in two or three hours”. This tells me that the Soviet Union withdrew its missiles from Cuba in order to avoid war with the United States. Hence, Source E helps prove that Source F is reliable since both sources state that the Soviet Union withdrew its missiles from Cuba to avoid war.</p> <p>This can be <b>cross-referenced to Source C</b>. Source C states that,” Castro was furious to learn through Radio Moscow that Khrushchev had agreed to withdraw the missiles from Cuba, He was prepared to go to war”. Source C tells me that Castro was angry with Khrushchev for agreeing to withdraw missiles and that he was even ready to go to war with the USA. As Source C supports the view that missiles were withdrawn to prevent war, it means that Source E proves that Source F is reliable.</p> <p>(Also accept background information /contextual knowledge)</p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>No, Source E cannot prove that Source F is reliable</b> Source E is an account of Khrushchev, who claims that he withdrew the missiles as he wanted to prevent war. As seen in Source E it states that,” We want peace. Even today I think that we were correct in removing our missiles from Cuba”. This tells me that Khrushchev removed the missiles willingly as he wanted peace with the USA. However, Source F suggests that Khrushchev was forced to withdraw the missiles as the USA had overwhelming superiority during the crisis. As seen in source, it states that,” power of the USA was superior to that of the USSR and that the USA could have. “erased every important Soviet military installation and major cities in two or three hours”. This tells me that USA could have won any conflict which could have arisen between the superpowers. It suggests that Khrushchev agreed to withdraw missiles from Cuba because it was a foregone conclusion that the USA would have won in any conflict.</p> <p>This can be <b>cross-referenced to Source D</b>. Source D states that the USA had superior capability to the Soviet Union. As seen in Source D, it states that, “they need 10 minutes to reach our cities, but our rockets need 25 minutes to reach America”. This show that US nuclear missiles would be able to devastate Soviet cities more effectively from Turkey and Western Europe. So, Khrushchev’s real motivation in removing the missiles was in knowing that the USA would win in any nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. This view contradicts Source E which portrays Khrushchev as a desiring peace. As Source D supports the view that missiles were withdrawn as Khrushchev knew that the Soviet Union would be defeated it means that Source E cannot prove that Source F is reliable.</p> <p>(Also accept: <b>Cross referring to Source A</b> – cartoon shows Kennedy having more missiles than Castro (meaning Cuba / Soviet Union would have been devastated / USA would probably have won any war if it had</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>broken out because of Cuban Missile Crisis) / USA would have won any potential war.</p> <p>Also accept: <b>Cross referring to Source C</b> – cartoon showing that Khrushchev “ship on his shoulder), meaning he could not send more missiles due to the effective US blockade. As such Soviet Union had lesser missiles if it wanted to attack the USA from Cuba in any potential war.)</p> <p>(Also accept Contextual Knowledge)</p>	
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>Critical evaluation of both sources based on Purpose conclusion.</b></p> <p>Source E can prove that source F is reliable due to the condition and situation in which they were both created under.</p> <p>Source E was an extract from Khrushchev memoirs published after he was forced out as Secretary General of the USSR. Khrushchev (author) wanted to influence (+active verb) readers of his memoirs / world opinion (audience) had he removed the missiles from Cuba as he wanted peace / avoid war with the USA (Message). (Evidence) As seen from source, “We didn’t want a war. We want peace. Even today I think that we were absolutely correct in removing our missiles from Cuba.” (Explanation) This tells me that Khrushchev felt that he prevented possible nuclear confrontation with the Americans. (Intended Outcome) By saying this, he wanted the audience to applaud and understand his actions in de-escalating tensions during the Cuban missile crisis. Based on my contextual knowledge, Khrushchev actions prevented Castro from taking control of the missiles and eventually allowed Kennedy to negotiate an end to the crisis.</p> <p>Source F was written by a Cuban exile who fled Cuba when Castro took power. The Cuban exile (author) wanted to convince (+active verb) the readers / US public to know (audience) that the USA should not have backed down to the Soviet Union over the missile crisis in Cuba. (Message). As seen in Source, it states that.” The United States, it is worth repeating, could have erased every important Soviet military installation and major Soviet cities in two or three hours while the strike capability of the USSR was negligible”. This tells me that the Cuban exile felt that the USA could have won any conflict with the Soviet Union (Explanation). By doing this, he wanted the audience to know and agree that it was a mistake on the part of Kennedy to agree to the withdrawal of Soviet missiles in ending the crisis. (Contextual Knowledge) Based on my contextual knowledge, this account is by an exile forced to flee Cuba who probably felt that Kennedy’s action (i.e agreeing to withdrawal of missiles in return for guaranteeing Cuban independence) was inappropriate. It had also led to the establishment of a communist nation / base in the Caribbean. The Cuban exile would have preferred the USA to invade and takeover Cuba.</p> <p><b>Ultimately</b>, both sources validate each other with respect to preventing nuclear war, guaranteeing Cuban independence and in ensuring USA’s superiority and security. Hence, Source E can be used to prove that Source F is reliable.</p>	6

1e) “The Cuban Missile Crisis was a result of USA’s aggression.” How far do the sources agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	MKS
<b>L1</b>	<b>Writes about the hypothesis with no source use.</b>	1
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>L2: Yes/No supported by valid source use</b>  <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 a maximum of 4m.</i></p> <p><i>Sources <b>A, B, E</b> (also accept if properly explained <b>C and D</b>) disagrees that it was a result of US aggression. <b>Sources C, D, E, F</b> (and <b>B</b> if well explained) that it was a result of US aggression.</i></p> <p><b>No, Source A</b> shows that the Cuban Missile Crisis was not the result of US aggression but due to the role played by Khrushchev. As seen in source A, there are 2 main figures (Castro and Kennedy) pointing missiles at each other. In the background is Khrushchev peering over the horizon looking “sneakily” at the the situation. Based on my contextual knowledge, this source tells me that Khrushchev is responsible for the crisis as he (Soviet Union) was the one which placed the missiles in Cuba. <b>Based on my contextual knowledge</b>, I know that Khrushchev placed missiles in Cuba so as to deter a US invasion but doing it in secret had led to the crisis. As such, Source A disagrees that the crisis was due to US aggression.</p> <p><b>No, Source B</b> tells me that Cuban Missile Crisis was not the result of US aggression but due to the role played by Khrushchev. As seen in source B, Khrushchev is seen carrying a ship on his should with the words, “cargo for Cuba” (presumably missiles and other armaments) and with a missile In his hands. He is however, prevented from doing so by Kennedy. Kennedy is shown throwing back a missile and having two warships under the sign Western hemisphere. This tells me that the Castro was the aggressor and he tried to transport missiles and other armaments until stopped by Kennedy. The phrase “ship on his shoulder” also suggest that he is unhappy that the US claims the Western Hemisphere as it sphere of influence. Hence, Source B disagrees that the crisis was due to US aggression.</p> <p><i>*(Alternatively – also accept)</i></p> <p><b>Yes, Source B</b> tells me that the Cuban Missile Crisis was a result of US aggression. The cartoon has a picture of a signpost with the words, “Western Hemisphere” with Kennedy standing on 2 ships and hurling back a missile. Source B suggests that the USA was aggressive because it (Kennedy) was trying to maintain the status quo spelt out in the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine viewed the Western hemisphere as being under US influence and views interference by any foreign power as a threat. Hence, it shows that Kennedy was defending the doctrine by imposing a naval blockade and driving out the Soviets (and their missiles) from Cuba. It also explains Castro image (of carrying a ship with the words “cargo for Cuba) feeling “unfair” that he could not have any influence in Cuba. Based on my</p>	2-4



	<p>contextual knowledge it was unlawful for the USA to block Cuban territorial waters and disallow any ships headed there . Hence, Source B suggest that the crisis was a result of US aggression.</p> <p><b>Yes, Source C</b> tells me that the Cuban Missile Crisis was a result of US aggression. As seen in source, it states that , “Still convinced that the United States would invade Cuba a second time, the missiles provided Castro with the fire power he needed to deter such an invasion and safeguard the Cuban revolution”. This tells me that the foiled Bay of Pigs invasion and fear of another US invasion played a major role in Castro accepting Soviet missiles. Based on my contextual knowledge, this threat remained a possibility as the US was carrying out amphibious operations off the Florida coast simulating an island invasion. Hence Source C suggests that the crisis was a result of US aggression.</p> <p>Also accept : <b>No, Source C</b>, it was <b>Castro’s</b> decision which ultimately lead to the Cuban missile crisis. As seen in Source, it states that, “Castro’s acceptance of the missiles”, “would enable Cuba, as a member of the Soviet bloc, to “thumb its nose” at the United States”. This tells me that if Castro had not accepted the missiles, the crisis could have been averted. Hence Source C suggest that Castro was responsible for the missile crisis.</p> <p><b>Yes, Source D</b> tells me that the Cuban missile crisis was a result of US aggression. As seen in source it tells me that, Khrushchev’s defence minister pointed at Turkey and had commented that American rockets only need 10 minutes to reach Soviet cities, but our rockets need 25 minutes to reach America.’ This tells me that it was USA actions of having missiles in Turkey which was the reason for Khrushchev placing missiles in Cuba. Based on my contextual knowledge, I know that the US had placed Jupiter missiles as a nuclear deterrent against any Soviet threat. Hence Source D tells me that the crisis was a result of US aggression.</p> <p>(Also accept: <b>No Source D</b> tells me that it was a result of Soviet actions. As seen in Source, it tells me that on learning about Jupiter missiles in Turkey, “Khrushchev said , ‘Why don’t we install our rockets in Cuba and point them at the Americans? Then we’ll need only 10 minutes, too.’ This tells me that the Cuban Missile crisis happened because Khrushchev wanted to have some strategic advantage over the USA by placing missiles in Cuba. Based on my contextual knowledge, I know that the USA had many missile bases in Western Europe and Turkey whereas the Soviet lacked a strategic base to threaten the USA. Hence, Source D tells me that it was Khrushchev’s action which led to the missile crisis.)</p> <p><b>No, Source E</b> tells me that Khrushchev was responsible for the Cuban missile crisis. As seen in Source, it states that, “Even today I think that we were absolutely correct in removing our missiles from Cuba.”. This tells me that he claims ownership of the missiles and admits that he withdrew the missiles to prevent war. Based on my contextual knowledge, even in Cuba, the missiles were under the direct control of the Soviet Union. Hence, Source E tells me that Khrushchev was responsible for the crisis.</p> <p><b>No, Source F</b> tells me that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cuban missile crisis. As seen in source, it states that, “it was wrong for Kennedy</p>	
--	---	--

	to have merely agreed to the withdrawal of missiles” and that “the strike capability of the USSR was negligible”. This tells me by inference that the Soviet Union owned the missiles in Cuba and should be held accountable for the missile crisis.	
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>L3: Yes and No, supported by valid source use.</b>  <i>Award 5m for one Y and N supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7m. When analysing the <b>reliability</b> of a source in order to test the statement, students are entitled a bonus of up to 2 marks.</i></p> <p>See answers in L2.</p> <p><b>Source C</b> can be used to show that the Cuban missile crisis was a result of US aggression. Source C is from an extract of a report written by a US political analyst suggesting that it was USA actions which led to the outbreak of the crisis. He mentions that it was fear of US military superiority and threat which forced Castro to accept the placement of Soviet missiles. The political analyst mentions that Castro wanted to avoid a second invasion and safeguard the Cuban revolution. He also correctly suggests that the first, Bay of Pigs invasion was backed through CIA funding and training to overthrow Castro. Based on my contextual knowledge, it was also followed up with Operation Mongoose aimed at eliminating the Cuban leadership. The report goes on to state that the missiles were Cuba’s defence against any further provocation and would be a effective nuclear deterrent. It also accurately states Castro’s reaction upon learning through Radio Moscow about Khrushchev deal with Kennedy to withdraw the missiles from Cuba. Based on my cross-referring to my contextual knowledge and the background information, the political account is strictly reporting the facts instead of leaning to one side. Also he is based in the USA and is actually suggesting that the USA had a primary role for the missile crisis. Hence Source C appears to be unbiased. Hence Source C can be used to show that the Cuban Missile crisis was a result of the US aggression.</p>	5 - 8

**SECTION B**  
**Structured Essay Questions**

2(a) Explain why Stalin was able to defeat Trotsky after Lenin's death.

	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	MKS
<b>L1</b>	<p><b>Describe reasons for Trotsky's defeat.</b>  <i>Answers which describe without focus on the question.</i>  <i>Award 1m for each detail up to a max of 2 marks.</i>            e.g. Trotsky was considered an enemy by Soviet leaders (1 mark)            and he also argued with Lenin on many occasions (2 marks)</p>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>L2</b>	<p><b>Describes reasons</b>  <i>Award 3m for description of one reason.</i>  <i>Award 4m for description of two reasons.</i></p> <p>E.g One reason for Trotsky defeat is his unpopularity in the politburo. Trotsky was unpopular due to his <b>outspoken personality</b> and his <b>public criticism of Lenin's policies</b>. These differences suggested that he did not respect or agree with Lenin. The Politburo also felt that he was rude to criticize Lenin publicly. Hence, this made Trotsky unpopular with party members and led to their support for Stalin.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Another reason for Trotsky's defeat was due to fear within the Soviet government over his <b>role during the Bolshevik Revolution</b>. Trotsky was put in charge of the Red Army and led it to victory. Given his important role Trotsky saw himself as the rightful heir to Lenin. Other party leaders left he was arrogant and supported Stalin over Trotsky.</p> <p>And/ Or</p> <p>Another reason for Trotsky's defeat was Stalin manipulating his role as Secretary General after Lenin's death. He used his position as the Secretary General of the Communist Party to remove Trotsky from power. Hence, he used his post to defeat Trotsky.</p>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>L3</b>	<p><b>Explains reasons</b>  <i>Award 5-6m for one explained reason. Award 7-8m for two explained reasons.</i>            E.g. One reason for Trotsky's defeat was his <b>outspoken personality</b> and his <b>public criticism of Lenin's policies</b>. For example, Trotsky had criticized Lenin's New Economic policy and also the increasing control of the party by the Politburo and the Party Executive Committee. Stalin, on the other hand portrayed himself as being close to Lenin and did not have</p>	<b>5-8</b>

	<p>any opposition to Lenin's policies. These criticisms openly challenged the organization and policies of the Party. The Politburo considered such criticism as acts of disloyalty to Lenin and to the Party. Hence, Trotsky's outspoken personality and public criticism of Lenin and communist party made enable Stalin to win more support from party leaders and defeat Trotsky.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Another reason for Trotsky's defeat was due to fear within the Soviet government over his <b>role during the Bolshevik Revolution</b>. In 1918, Trotsky was appointed the People's Commissar of Army and Navy affairs. This put him in charge of the Red Army which he led to victory against the Whites in the civil war of 1918 – 1922. Given his important role Trotsky saw himself as the rightful heir to Lenin and unwilling to get involved in party politics. The Politburo members however, considered him arrogant and feared his powerful influence over the Red Army. Stalin was less charismatic and as Secretary General more involved in party matters. He also posed little threat to other members. Hence, Trotsky's role and influence over the Red Army was another reason for the Soviet government supporting Stalin over Trotsky.</p> <p>And/ Or</p> <p>Another reason for Trotsky's defeat was Stalin manipulating his role as Secretary General after Lenin's death. He used his position as the Secretary General of the Communist Party which gave him considerable power to appoint his supporters to important posts. He used his position to remove opponents from various positions in the party. He also removed Trotsky (as Head) and his supporters from the Red Army. Hence, Trotsky lost considerable influence within the army and his importance in the revolution. Since many owed their positions to him and were loyal to him, Stalin he was able to spread his influence broadly among party members. Hence, his manipulation of his role as Secretary General was another reason for Trotsky's defeat.</p> <p><b>(also accept ideological differences)</b></p> <p>Most of the party members supported Stalin's idea of building "<b>Socialism in One country</b>". Building "Socialism in One country" suggested that Russia had to become a strong country first before trying to make other countries adopt socialism. Trotsky, on the other hand believed in "<b>permanent revolution</b>" which wanted to promote and incite revolutions worldwide. Since, most of the party members and government supported "building Socialism in One Country" it appeared that Trotsky was moving away from the party's decisions and ideas. Hence, Stalin used ideological differences to defeat Trotsky after Lenin's death.</p>	
--	--	--

2(b) 'Stalin's rule devastated the Russian people'. How far do you agree with this statement?  
Explain your answer [12]

	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	MKS
L1	<p><b>Describes Soviet Union, but without focus on the question</b></p> <p><i>Award 1m for each detail, up to a maximum of 2m.</i></p> <p>e.g. Stalin wanted to transform the Soviet Union (1m) Stalin wanted to solve hunger and make the Soviet Union a modern country. (2m)</p>	1-2
L2	<p><b>Explains Agree <u>OR</u> Disagree</b></p> <p><i>Award 3m for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail, up to a maximum of 6m.</i></p> <p>See L3</p>	3-6
L3	<p><b>Explains Agree <u>AND</u> Disagree</b></p> <p><i>Award 7m for 1 explanation of Agree and 1 explanation of Disagree and further additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, up to a maximum of 10m.</i></p> <p>Eg: <b>Yes, I agree.</b> I feel that Stalin's rule devastated the Soviet Union. On example was his attempt to improve agriculture. Stalin wanted to transform the Soviet Union into a modern country by <b>mechanizing agriculture through collectivization</b>. Stalin wanted to implement collectivization so as to combine smaller farms into larger units, mechanize the farming process through use of tractors and increase harvests so as to feed the population. Stalin also wanted to do this so that any manpower saved through mechanization could be moved to the cities and help with rapid industrialization. However, forcible collectivization led to more harm than good since it lead to riots and resistance from farmers who opposed collectivization. Many peasants, especially the Kulaks killed their own animals, burnt their grain or hid their produce from being taken over by the state. The Kulaks were either killed for sent to imprisonment camps (gulags). Many farm animals were also killed so as to encourage the use of tractors in collective farms. These animal populations such as pigs and horses only recovered after World War Two. The eradication of the Kulaks (a land-owning class) led to a decrease in harvests and worsened the Great Famine which broke out between 1932-1933. Hence, forced collectivization and mechanization especially during the initial period devastated the Soviet Union during Stalin's rule.</p>	7-10

	<p>Eg: <b>Yes, I agree.</b> I feel that Stalin rule devastated the Soviet Union. Stalin implemented <b>rapid industrialization</b> to transform the Soviet Union into a modern state. Rapid Industrialization led to the establishment of thousands of industrial cities such as, Magnitogorsk across the Soviet Union. Apart from producing equipment to support collectivization, the emphasis was on the development of heavy industries such as coal, iron, steel and electricity. The establishment of industrial cities meant that people were moved from the countryside / farms to these cities. Workers lived in overcrowded and unhygienic conditions. Workers had to work long hours, fulfil unreasonable quotas and often goods produced were of low quality. The standard of living for the Soviet people suffered as there was little growth in consumer industries such as house building, fertilizers, woolen textiles, bicycles and even sugar. His two 5-year plans were marked by poor coordination, wastage and focused on industrial, agricultural targets and armament production. The living conditions deteriorated and there was a lack of consumer goods available for the people. Hence, Stalin's rule brought about devastation for the Soviet people.</p> <p><b>Also accept: The Great Terror / NKVD, Show trials / purges, gulag</b></p> <p>And</p> <p><b>No I disagree.</b> I feel that Stalin's rule did not devastate the Soviet Union but rather had positive results. As part of his industrialization policy , Soviet factories in the cities produced equipment for farming such as tractors. Such mechanization enabled Stalin to achieve some of the aims of Collectivization. Gradually, collectivized farms were able to produce food especially for factory workers, the Soviet people and even for could export grain overseas. Stalin then used the revenue gained from such exports to buy more industrial equipment. This in turn helped rapid industrialization. Mechanization also enabled any surplus workforce to be moved to newly build industrial cities so that these workers can be trained to help transform the Soviet Union into industrial state. Hence, inspite of initial challenges, both of his rapid industrialization and collectivization policies were a success. It had led to a significant increase in grain production and transformed Soviet Union as a industrial nation. Hence, Stalin's rule did have some positive outcomes for the Soviet Union.</p> <p>Or</p> <p><b>No I disagree.</b> I feel that Stalin's rule had positive outcomes for the Soviet people in terms of education and women's rights. Under rapid industrialization, thousands of industrial cities were established. The development of heavy industries such as coal, iron, steel and electricity greatly accelerated the need for mass education. Compulsory education was then introduced for the Soviet people and at least 94% of the population became literate by 1939. The status of women and their rights</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>expanded during Stalin's rule. Stalin's industrialization efforts encouraged women to join the workforce and compulsory education increased their literacy rates to up to 65%. In recognition of their contributions, women were granted equal rights in voting, marriage and even divorce. As such during Stalin's rule, he was able to transform the Soviet Union from a backward state and into an industrialized country second only to the USA by 1941.</p>	
<b>L4</b>	<p><b>Level 3 plus reaches a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of 'How far'?</b></p> <p><i>Award the higher mark for the level for more developed answers.</i></p> <p>e.g. <b>In the short run</b>, Stalin's rule devastated the Soviet Union. In wanting to transform the Soviet Union into a industrial power, he introduced forced collectivization of agriculture, eliminated the Kulaks as a land owning class and even exterminated farm animals so as to encourage mechanization. There was forced movement of people from farms into new industrial cities. Many of the workers often had to endure poor, overcrowded, often unhygienic condition and meet work quotas and targets with emphasis on heavy industries. People suffered due to a lack of consumer goods and lack basic amenities.</p> <p><b>In the long run</b>, especially after 1935 conditions slowly improved for workers. After the Great Famine (1934), Collectivization was able to produce sufficient food to feed the Soviet people and even export surplus grain. Industrialization also successfully enabled the Soviet Union to defend itself from Nazi invasion. Soviet industries switched production from manufactured items to making armaments successfully. It was Stalin's industrialization plan which enabled the Soviet Union to defend itself and stand undefeated until the 2<sup>nd</sup> front was initiated by the Allies. Therefore, in the long run, Stalin's rule enabled the Soviet Union and people to survive.</p>	<b>11-12</b>

3 (a). Explain why Korea was important to the superpowers after World War Two. [8m]

	<b>Level Descriptor and Rubrics</b>	<b>MKS</b>
<b>L1</b>	<p><b>Describe reasons</b></p> <p><i>Answers which describes without focus on the question.</i></p> <p><i>Award 1m for each detail up to a max of 2 marks.</i></p> <p>e.g Korea was in important as it was a Japanese colony (1 mark) and surrendered to the Soviet Union (North) and British-American forces (South). (2 marks)</p>	<b>1-2</b>

<p><b>L2</b></p>	<p><b>Describes reasons</b>  <i>Award 3m for description of one reason.</i>  <i>Award 4m for description of two reasons.</i></p> <p>e.g. One of the reasons Korea was important to the superpowers was due to its strategic location. Korea was important to the Soviet Union after World War Two was because the communists sought to expand their global influence especially in the Asia-Pacific. For instance, Korea was in close proximity to the Soviet Union, China and other countries in the Asia-Pacific. By taking over the whole of Korea it would provide the communists with a platform to spread their ideology to other countries in the Asia-Pacific</p> <p>Or / And</p> <p>E.g. Korea was important to the USA due to its Containment policy. There was considerable pressure on the American government to do more to prevent the spread of Communism in the Asia-Pacific. For example, Americans criticized President Truman and Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, for the detonation of the Soviet Atomic bomb and loss of China to the communists. Hence, it became important for the Americans not to lose Korea to the communists.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p>
<p><b>L3</b></p>	<p><b>Explains reasons</b>  <i>Award 5-6m for one explained reason. Award 7-8m for two explained reasons.</i></p> <p>E.g. One of the reasons Korea was important to the superpowers was due to its strategic location. Korea was important to the Soviet Union after World War Two was because the communists sought to expand their global influence especially in the Asia-Pacific. For instance, Korea was in close proximity to the Soviet Union, China and other countries in the Asia-Pacific. When North Korea was incorporated into the Communist bloc after World War Two, it provided the Communists with a platform to spread their ideology to various countries in the Asia-Pacific. By September 1949, the Soviet Union had successfully exploded its first atomic bomb. In addition to that in October 1949, China had fallen to the communists under Mao Zedong. Given this situation, Stalin became more inclined to support Kim Il Sung's idea of unifying the entire Korean peninsula. He could count on Chinese support and takeover South Korea easily to establish a sphere of influence in the Far East.</p> <p><b>OR/AND</b></p> <p>E.g. Korea was important to the USA due to its Containment policy. By 1948, the communists had taken over Korea, north of the 38 parallel. In addition to this China fell to the communists in October 1949. There was</p>	<p><b>5-8</b></p>



	considerable pressure on the American government especially President Truman and Secretary of State, Dean Acheson to do more to prevent any further spread of communism. By 1950, the USA backed Syngman Rhee in founding the democratic Republic of South Korea as a buffer against the communist North Koreans. The US government also prepared a report called the National Security Council (NSC-68). The report concluded that the Soviet Union was set against the USA and it called for a drastic increase in American military capability in order to apply containment on a global basis. Hence, having become the extension of the Cold War outside Europe, Korea became important to the USA.	
--	--	--

2(b). Gorbachev's policy lead to the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12m]

	Level Descriptor and Rubrics	MKS
<b>L 1</b>	<p><b>Describes without focus on question.</b></p> <p>Gorbachev decided that Eastern European countries should handle their own internal problems (1 mark)</p> <p>Gorbachev introduced policies such as "New Thinking", Glasnost (Openness) and Perestroika (Restructuring) (2 marks)</p>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>L 2</b>	<p><b>Explains Yes <u>OR</u> NO</b></p> <p><i>Award 3 marks for an explanation and further remarks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, up to a maximum of 6 marks.</i></p> <p><i>See L3</i></p>	<b>3-6</b>
<b>L3</b>	<p><i>Explains Yes and NO</i></p> <p><i>Award 7m for an explanation of Agree and an explanation of Disagree and further additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, up to a maximum of 10m.</i></p> <p>Eg: <b>Yes, I agree that Gorbachev's</b> "New thinking policy, Glasnost (Openness) and "Perestroika" (economic and political restructuring) led to the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.</p> <p>Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' foreign policy meant that the Soviet Union would reduce its intervention in countries to support communist revolutions or regimes. This Brezhnev doctrine (through armed intervention) had been used to ensure that Eastern European member states do not leave the Soviet sphere of influence. Gorbachev however declared that Eastern European states should be allowed to handle their political affairs without Soviet interference. Gorbachev also withdrew 50,000 Soviet troops from Eastern Europe. This abandonment of the Brezhnev doctrine emboldened</p>	<b>7-10</b>

	<p>Eastern European countries for greater freedom and led to widespread protests demanding change. Sensing the lack of support from Soviet Union, most East European countries had to allow for open elections (Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria) and were replaced by democratically elected non-communist governments. In Romania, the communists were forcibly removed from power. Gorbachev's New thinking policy which included the abandonment of the Brezhnev doctrine led to the end of communism in Eastern Europe from 1988 to 1990. Hence Gorbachev was responsible for the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe.</p> <p>In addition to the "New Thinking policy", Glasnost and Perestroika led to the downfall of communism in the Soviet Union. As part of his "New Thinking" policy he removed Soviet troops from Afghanistan and demobilised 500,000 Soviet troops. His efforts to divert funds from military spending towards economic reconstruction was eventually met with an attempted coup in 1991.</p> <p>It failed as soldiers refused to fire upon the people and also due to intervention by Boris Yeltsin. The coup demonstrated to the people that hard-line communists and indeed the communist party had to be removed from the political system altogether.</p> <p><b>Eg. Yes, I agree</b> Gorbachev's policy Glasnost and Perestroika led to the downfall of communism in the Soviet Union. Glasnost called for greater transparency, freedom of speech and expression. By implementing Glasnost, Gorbachev sought to give his supporters permission to speak out in favour of reform and to provide space and opportunities to convince the Soviet people that these reforms were necessary. Glasnost also included measures such as relaxing the censorship of books, journals and newspapers. His release of dissidents such as Andrei Sakharov also showed that they could voice their opinions without fear of imprisonment. New discussions, revisions and revelations about Soviet history were permitted. These highlighted many negative aspects of Communist rule such as the atrocities of Stalin's rule. Western media broadcasts such as Free Radio Europe and the Voice of America were allowed and this exposed the Soviet public to Western culture and its higher standard of living. Glasnost backfired on Gorbachev as this policy of openness exposed the lies and weaknesses of the Communist system. Many citizens felt that their governments had lied to them and deprived them of what the rest of the world had access to. They lost confidence in the communist system and increasingly desired independence. Instead of rallying the people behind the Communist Party's leadership, Glasnost had unintentionally created a platform for the criticism, both of Communist rule and Gorbachev's inability in changing the system. Hence Glasnost (openness) led to the collapse of the Soviet Union.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Gorbachev's policy of Perestroika (economic and political restructuring) led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. Perestroika refers economic reforms meant to encourage greater interest, productivity and investment amongst Soviet workers in their respective industries. It also included political reforms such as the election of candidates to local party positions, the separation of communist party and government positions (up to regional level) and allowing candidates from non-communist organisations to be elected into a newly formed Congress of People's Deputies in 1989. Economic restructuring failed as the Communist government still controlled the means of production such as trucks and tractors and technology. Agricultural production was hampered by poor roads and inadequate storage and refrigeration facilities. High taxes and corruption discouraged Soviet citizens from starting their own businesses. As such shortages of food and other necessities were common. Political restructuring challenged the Communist one party rule as officials within and outside the party became increasingly critical of the communist (Gorbachev's) government. The open elections for the Congress of the Peoples Deputies in 1989 led to the rise of other non-communist opposition groups and leaders such as Boris Yeltsin. In March 1990, Gorbachev was elected for a newly created post of the President of the Soviet Union. In June 1991, Boris Yeltsin was elected as President of Russia (the largest component with the USSR). As a backlash to these reforms, hardliners within the Communist party staged a coup in August 1991 an attempt to replace Gorbachev. The timely intervention of Boris Yeltsin prevented the hardliners from taking over the government. He also suspended the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. By December 8, 1991, the leaders of three main Soviet republics (Russia, Ukraine d Belarus) signed the Belavezha Accord) to dissolve the Soviet Union. Other Soviet republics overwhelmingly agreed and on 25<sup>th</sup> December Gorbachev resigned as President of the Soviet Union. Hence, Perestroika, particularly, political restructuring were the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union.</p> <p>However, apart from Gorbachev's policies, there were other reasons which led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. This included American economic superiority and renewal of the arms race.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p>No, I disagree that Gorbachev's policies were the main reason for the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.</p> <p>Another reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union was <b>US economic superiority</b>. In the 1980's the USA experienced an economic boom due to Ronald Reagan's economic liberalisation policy. The objective of economic liberalisation was to encourage individual enterprise instead of having people dependent on the government for goods and services. He also cut the national budget and sold off national assets such as airlines, phone and oil companies. Similar policies were adopted in Britain and other Western European countries While controversial, these</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>reforms greatly restructured the economies of the USA and Western Europe. Economic liberalisation stimulated economic growth and launched a financial boom in the West during the 1980s'. In addition to this, the growth of the West German and Japanese economy and their partnership with the USA further contributed to the growth of the American economy during the 1980's. Unlike the USA, the Soviet economy stagnated from the early 1970's. This was due to inherent flaws of its command economy and centralised planning. The government owned and controlled all industries. There was also a lack of innovation, creativity and this led to poor quality of Soviet goods. <b>Due to its focus on the production of military goods and weapons</b>, the USSR was unable to produce sufficient consumer goods such as clothes, electronics, housing and foodstuff. This was the main reason for Gorbachev's economic restructuring which failed. The USA, on the other hand, where market forces determined demand and supply led to greater competition, individual creativity, enterprise and profits. As such, USA's economic liberalisation policy was another reason for the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.</p> <p>Also accept : USA did not support Gorbachev in his economic re-structuring as there was no massive support in terms of US investments or economic assistance.</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Also accept – Renewal of Arms Race by USA</b></p> <p>No, I disagree. Another reason for the downfall of the Soviet Union was the <b>renewal of the arms race by the USA</b>. The growth of the economy enabled Ronald Reagan to renew the arms race against the Soviet Union. Instead of producing more nuclear weapons, the USA developed the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), i.e "Star Wars" programme. This involved developing new technologies by placing satellites in orbit so as to destroy any nuclear missiles launched against the USA. Although it was an expensive programme, the USA was able to fund this research through its extensive financial networks. In addition to this, over a hundred Pershing II nuclear armed missiles were also stationed in West Germany. These could be moved around so as to hit any targets in the Western USSR. The USA also organised "Able Archer 83" which involved a 10 day military exercise involving its NATO allies which threatened the Soviet Union. This renewal of the arms race meant that the Soviet Union needed to allocate substantial financial resources to counter the US threat. At the height of the arms race, the USA spent 6 percent of its gross national product on defence, while the Soviet Union with an economy half the size of the USA spent 16 percent on defence. As such, this meant that Soviet Union diverted money which could have been used for economic development and social welfare programme for its people. This would lead to dissatisfaction, loss of confidence and demands that the communist system be replaced. Hence, the renewal of</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the arms race was another reason which led to the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Economic burdens of the Soviet Union (1/2: Partial Answer only)</b></p> <p>No, I disagree. Another reason for the downfall of communism in the Soviet Union was the <b>external economic burdens to the Soviet Union</b>. Due to its ideological commitment to its Eastern European satellite states, the Soviet Union supported poorer communist countries through economic bartering. The Soviet Union's annual subsidy to its Warsaw Pact allies through discounting oil prices amounted to US\$ 3 billion. In addition to this, the decade long, Soviet Union's war in Afghanistan caused a huge drain on its economy in terms of money, resources and human casualties. For the Soviet Union, the cost of the war in Afghanistan was substantially higher than that of the Vietnam war for the USA. Given that Soviet allies were not rich, such involvement drained its resources. As such, support of its allies and the war in Afghanistan meant that such resources could not be used to address economic and social needs within the Soviet Union. Hence, external economic burdens were another reason for the downfall of communism in the Soviet Union.</p>	
<b>L 4</b>	<p><b>L3 + balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of 'How far'?</b></p> <p>e.g. Yes, In my opinion, Gorbachev's policies of 'New Thinking', Glasnost and Perestroika were the most important reasons for the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.</p> <p>Glasnost ("Openness") emboldened the Soviet people to discuss and disagree openly with no consequences. These included issues related to Soviet history, leadership, purges, and the economy among other issues. It backfired as people focused on shortcoming of the communist system and eventually started to criticize Gorbachev handling of these reforms. Perestroika (economic restructuring) through individual enterprise failed to stimulate economic growth and demonstrated the extent of state control of resources. It showed people that the communist system needed not reform but a replacement. The most significant area which shows how Perestroika (political restructuring) led to the collapse of the Soviet Union is the creation of the Congress of Peoples Deputies which allowed for often anti communist / democratic groups representation and election of respective Presidents for each of the socialist states. His "New Thinking" policy with the withdrawal from Afghanistan, reduction of Soviet military forces and the abandonment of the Brezhnev doctrine acted as a trigger for simultaneous protest throughout Eastern Europe. It also meant that communist East European countries could not count on Soviet support for any assistance.</p>	<b>11-12</b>

	Hence, Gorbachev was instrumental for the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe. His attempts at reducing military spending were met with an the military coup in 1991. This had a negative effect leading to the Belavezha Accord and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Hence, it was Gorbachev's policies which were directly responsible for the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.	
--	---	--

The End