

Name	Index Number	Class
------	--------------	-------



WOODGROVE SECONDARY SCHOOL

A COMMUNITY OF FUTURE-READY LEARNERS AND THOUGHTFUL LEADERS

N-LEVEL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS 2023

LEVEL & STREAM : SECONDARY 4 NORMAL (ACADEMIC)

SUBJECT (CODE) : HUMANITIES (SOCIAL STUDIES, HISTORY) (2176)

PAPER NO : 02

DATE (DAY) : 14 AUGUST 2023 (MONDAY)

DURATION : 1 HOUR 40 MINUTES

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

Write in dark blue or black pen.

You may use an HB pencil for any rough working.

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

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **one** question.

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

An answer booklet will be provided with this question paper.

If you need additional writing papers, ask the invigilator for additional writing papers and tie them together.

For Examiner's Use

Section	Marks
A	/30
B	/20
Total	/50

Student's Signature		Parent's Signature	
Date		Date	

This document consists of **6** printed pages including this cover page.

Setter: Ms Ellie Yeo

Section A: Source-Based Study

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

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.

1 (a) Study Source A.

Why was this source published? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

In what ways are they similar? Explain your answer. [5]

(c) Study Source D.

How surprised are you by this source? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Source E.

How useful is this source as evidence of the major powers' involvement in the Korean War? Explain your answer. [6]

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

'The Korean War was escalated due to China's involvement.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Did China's involvement extend the war?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Korean War was fought between the North and South Korea from 1950 to 1953. It began when North Korea, supported by the Soviet Union, invaded South Korea. The war saw rapid shifts in momentum as North Korean forces swiftly captured Seoul in June 1950. However, a successful United Nations (UN) counteroffensive, led by the United States (US), at Inchon in September 1950, turned the tide, leading to the recapture of Seoul and a push northward.

The conflict took a significant turn when China intervened in North Korea in October 1950, resulting in the prolonged draining of resources and loss of human lives.

Did China's involvement extend the war?

Source A: *A leaflet distributed in North Korea produced by the US Army, 8th Psychology Warfare Section in 1952. It shows Kim Il-Sung feeding the Chinese communist forces.*



The caption says: "The North Korean puppets are the real traitors of our country for they feed Chinese Communist soldiers with our deficient provisions without paying any attention to our hungry brothers in North Korea."

Source B: *A historian's account about the prolonging of the Korean War, published in a think-tank research journal online, June 2020.*

October 1950, when the UN/US troops carried out a sweeping counteroffensive after the Inchon landing and crossed the 38th parallel, Zhou Enlai, the Chinese Premier, used explicit language to warn Washington that if UN/US forces continued to advance in Korea, "We will intervene."

However, US policymakers and military planners dismissed Zhou's warnings as "bluffing". This was not due to an intelligence failure. Since late summer, US intelligence services had known well about Chinese military deployments along the Yalu River. Yet US policymakers did not take this information seriously. They were convinced that China was backward and weak, not daring to fight a war against the powerful America.

Source C: *Adapted from an article about General MacArthur's leadership in the Korean War, published in the TIME magazine, 2019.*

After capturing Seoul and advancing to the 38th Parallel, General MacArthur set his eyes on a far bigger prize. Why not seize Pyongyang?* Why not drive all the way to the Yalu River, North Korea's border with China, and unite Korea? What a blow against Communism, against Stalin, against totalitarian regimes everywhere!

What he didn't know was that hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers were already streaming across the Yalu and getting into position in preparation for MacArthur's armies. Mao's troops were preparing a trap deep in the mountains of North Korea. How could he miss this? Once the intelligence finally came in loud and clear, he and his staff of sycophants** continued to dismiss it or wilfully misinterpret its importance.

*Pyongyang: capital of North Korea

**sycophant: one who tries to gain favour by flattering influential people

Source D: *An account by Young Sik Kim, published in 1955. Young was born in North Korea and pledged himself as an anti-communist who worked for the Americans during and after the Korean War.*

The Korean War was fought to defend a corrupt dictator Syngman Rhee who was destroying the lives of his own people. It was fought to feed the fragile ego of a weak American President, Truman, trying to prove his own strength at the expense of his countrymen. He was assisted in this by an old fading warmonger, MacArthur, groping for his last hurrah. A civil war which would have been short and relatively bloodless was turned into a major battle ground by Truman.

Source E: *An American leaflet with Chinese words titled, 'Why Die for Soviet Union?' being dropped in North Korea during the war. Cartoon depicts Stalin on the left, a Chinese soldier in the middle and a North Korean soldier on the right. They are headed towards a land called Korea.*



Section B: Structured Questions

Answer **one** question.

2 This question is on Stalin's rule in Soviet Union.

- (a) Describe the role of Stalin's personality in contributing to his rise to power in Soviet Union. [8]
- (b) Explain how each of the following impacted Soviet Union during Stalin's rule:
- (i) Industrialisation through Five-Year Plan
 - (ii) Great Terror (1934-1938) [12]

3 This question is on the development of Cold War in Europe.

- (a) Describe the role of the post-war conferences in leading to the Cold War. [8]
- (b) Explain how each of the following impacted the development of the Cold War in Europe:
- (i) Marshall Plan
 - (ii) Berlin Blockade [12]

End of Paper

Adapted from:

- Source A <https://www.digitalhorizonsonline.org/digital/collection/ndsu-korea/id/493/rec/8>
- Source B <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/chinese-and-american-misjudgment-and-making-and-prolonging-korean-war>
- Source C <https://time.com/5724009/douglas-macarthur-is-one-of-americas-most-famous-generals-hes-also-the-most-overrated/>
- Source D http://www.johndclare.net/cold_war10_YoungSKim.htm Anonymous.
- Source E <https://www.awm.gov.au/visit/exhibitions/korea/weapons/propaganda>

SOURCE-BASED STUDY ANSWER SCHEME**1(a) Study Source A. Why was this source published? Explain your answer. [5]**

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	Description of the source/Misinterpreted Source/Copies Source <i>e.g. The source shows Kim Il-Sung feeding the Chinese communist forces and how the North Korean puppets are the real traitors.</i>	1
L2	Sub-Message, supported and explained. Award 2m for sub-message / outcome of author. Award 3m for sub-message / outcome explained. <i>E.g. The leaflet was published to convince North Koreans that Kim Il-Sung was responsible for the prolonging of the Korean War.</i> OR e.g. The leaflet was published to convince North Koreans that the North Korean people were suffering due to the ongoing Korean War.	2-3
L3	Main message supported and purpose with context explained. Award 4m for main message, supported and explained with context. Award 5m for main message, purpose explained with impact on audience. The leaflet was published to convince North Koreans that the <u>North Koreans have been exploited by the Chinese communist forces in this conflict.</u> Source A shows Kim Il-Sung forcing bowls of rice down the Chinese communist soldiers at the expense of the North Koreans with a caption that blamed the North Korean “puppets” and addressed them as “real traitors of the country.” This means that the US Army 8 th Psychology Warfare Section wanted the North Koreans to recognize how they are being manipulated by the Chinese Communist Forces so that the North Koreans will revolt against their own North Korean government and cease war efforts. (Outcome) Coming from the context of the Korean War, such propaganda pamphlets were commonly used by USA and UN as psychological warfare to try to promote dissent and apathy among the North Korean enemies and make the North Korea soldiers believe that they were pawns being manipulated by Soviet Union. (context) <i>Audience: Can accept both NK civilians and soldiers</i>	4 – 5

1(b) Study Sources B and C. In what ways are they similar? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Generalised comments / invalid matching / similarity in provenance</p> <p><i>e.g. Source B and Source C both talk about the prolonging of the Korean War.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Source B is a historian's account about the prolonging of the Korean War while Source C is an article from the TIME magazine.</i></p>	1
L2	<p>Similarity in content, supported and explained. Award 2 marks for valid comparison, supported. Award 3 marks for valid comparison, explained. Award 3 marks for two comparisons, unsupported.</p> <p><i>e.g. Both sources are similar <u>in attributing America's complacency as reason for triggering the Chinese pushback at Yalu River.</u> Source B says that "They were convinced that China was backward and weak, not daring to fight a war against a powerful America." Similarly, Source C says that "Once the intelligence finally came in loud and clear, he and his staff of sycophants** continued to dismiss it, suppress it, or willfully misinterpret its importance."</i></p> <p>OR / AND</p> <p><i>e.g. Both sources are similar in <u>suggesting China as a ready and prepared agent in a probable time of war against the Americans / was ready to fight the war against Americans.</u> Source B says that "When the UN/US troops carried out a sweeping counteroffensive after the Inchon landing and crossed the 38th parallel, Zhou Enlai used explicit language to warn Washington that if UN/US forces' advance in Korea continued, "We will intervene." Similarly, Source C says that "What he didn't know was that hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers were already streaming across the Yalu and getting into position in preparation for MacArthur' armies. Mao's troops were preparing a trap deep in the mountains of North Korea."</i></p>	2-3
L3	<p>L2 + another similarity, supported and explained. Award 4 marks for second comparison, supported. Award 5 marks for two similarities well-explained.</p> <p><i>e.g. Both sources are similar <u>in attributing America's complacency as reason for triggering the Chinese pushback at Yalu River.</u> Source B says that "They were convinced that China was backward and weak, not daring to fight a war against a powerful America." Similarly, Source C says that "Once the intelligence finally came in loud and clear, he and his staff of sycophants** continued to dismiss it, suppress it, or willfully misinterpret its importance." This means that the protraction of conflict in Korea was due to America's ignorant and superior attitude towards</i></p>	4-5

	<p>China. The complacency of America and their perception of China as an unworthy enemy crippled their decision making and led to many lives lost at the Yalu River and caused the Korean War to reach a stalemate.</p> <p>OR / AND</p> <p>e.g. Both sources are similar in <u>suggesting China as a ready and prepared agent in a probable time of war against the Americans/ was ready to fight the war against Americans.</u> Source B says that "When the UN/US troops carried out a sweeping counteroffensive after the Inchon landing and crossed the 38th parallel, Zhou Enlai used explicit language to warn Washington that if UN/US forces' advance in Korea continued, "We will intervene." Similarly, Source C says that "What he didn't know was that hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers were already streaming across the Yalu and getting into position in preparation for MacArthur' armies. Mao's troops were preparing a trap deep in the mountains of North Korea." This means that the Chinese was firm and resolute against American aggression. They were strategic in their defense against the incoming Americans and ensured that they were militarily ready to tackle the Americans.</p>	
--	---	--

1(c) Study Source D. How surprised are you by what this source says? Explain your answer. [6]

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Answer based on provenance/no matching of content/stating the obvious / do not consider the concept of surprise.</p> <p>e.g. Truman was responsible for expanding the Korean War into an international one.</p>	1
L2	<p>Surprise / lack of surprise, explained.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for surprise/ lack of surprise without explanation.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for surprise / lack of surprise based on undeveloped provenance.</p> <p>Award 3 marks for answers that are based on common sense in response to the content in D, which applies in any historical context.</p> <p>e.g. I am surprised because I did not expect Truman to be a weak leader that implicated the Korean War for his own purposes. [2]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised because it is expected that Truman was responsible for expanding the Korean War into an international one. [2]</p> <p>OR</p>	2-3

	<p>e.g. I am surprised by Source D because Young Sik Kim worked for America but he was critical of Truman's actions and labels him as a bad leader. (2m)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. I am surprised by Source D because I did not expect Truman to be a weak leader that implicated the Korean War for his own purposes. Source D says that "It was fought to feed the fragile ego of a weak American President, Truman, trying to prove his own strength at the expense of his countrymen." This means that Truman was a leader who made poor decisions that sacrificed his people for his personal ambition. Furthermore, it revealed that Truman was cause for protracting the war due to unprofessional and unsound judgements for his personal gain. [3]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>I am not surprised by Source D because it is expected that the Korean War was fought for the selfish ambition of leaders that came at the cost of the people. Source D says that "The Korean War was fought to defend a corrupt dictator Syngman Rhee who was destroying the lives of his own people" and it was "fought to feed the fragile ego of Truman" as well as "MacArthur" who was "groping for his last hurrah." This means that the suffering and trajectory of war was often determined by important leaders who had personal interests over the well-being of the people. These leaders held tightly to their ideological beliefs and personal gain, and failed to consider the own socio-economic circumstances and needs of their countries. [3]</p>	
L4	<p>Surprise / lack of surprised based on cross-reference to other sources. <i>Award 5 marks for the well-explained answer.</i></p> <p>e.g. I am surprised by Source D because I did not expect Truman to be a weak leader that implicated the Korean War for his own purposes. Source D says that "It was fought to feed the fragile ego of a weak American President, Truman, trying to prove his own strength at the expense of his countrymen." This means that Truman was a leader who made poor decisions that sacrificed his people for his personal ambition. Furthermore, it revealed that Truman was cause for protracting the war due to unprofessional and unsound judgements for his personal gain.</p> <p>By cross-referencing to my contextual knowledge, I know that Truman was the American leader in power that made crucial decisions during the Korean War and involved the United Nation troops to pushback communist forces as part of his containment strategy. This means that Truman was a strong leader who was able to make decisions that benefit and impact the rest of the world positively. Furthermore, he was confident that American involvement in Korea was justified. Since my contextual knowledge does not support Source D, Source D is surprising.</p>	4 – 5

	<p>OR</p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised by Source D because I expected Truman to be responsible for expanding the Korean War into an international one. Source D says that “A civil war which would have been short and relatively bloodless was turned into a major ground by Truman.” This means that Truman was the key mastermind that influenced the course of the Korean War and intensified the conflict between North and South Korea by American intervention.</p> <p>This is supported by my contextual knowledge that American involvement through the UN troops in the Inchon Landing in September 1950 protracted the war and further generated more bloodshed as it triggered the Chinese involvement in the Korean War. This also meant a greater loss of number of lives as many more Chinese and North Korean soldiers fought against the UN troops and South Korean army. Since my contextual knowledge supports Source D, I am not surprised.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>I am not surprised by Source D because it is expected that the Korean War was fought for the selfish ambition of leaders. Source D says that “The Korean War was fought to defend a corrupt dictator Syngman Rhee who was destroying the lives of his own people” and it was “fought to feed the fragile ego of Truman” as well as “MacArthur” who was “groping for his last hurrah.” This means that the suffering and trajectory of war was often determined by important leaders who had personal interests over the well-being of the people. These leaders held tightly to their ideological beliefs and personal gain, and failed to consider the own socio-economic circumstances and needs of their countries. [3]</p> <p>By cross-referencing to Source C, C says that “MacArthur set his eyes on a far bigger prize. Why not seize Pyongyang?” This means that MacArthur’s decisions in the Korean War and his push towards the Yalu River was driven by his own agenda despite intelligence that kept coming their way, in which their response was to “dismiss” and disregard them. Since C supports D, I am not surprised by Source D.</p>	
L4	<p>L3 + Not surprised based on critical analysis of provenance.</p> <p>e.g. However, I am not surprised because Young Sik Kim’s account came from his own experience of witnessing the Korean War and was able to observe and make conclusions about American involvement. He would have understood American ambition and involvement not just in Korea, but also in Europe and Southeast Asia. Since he worked for the Americans during and after the Korean War, it is valid that by 1955, he will have criticism for leaders like Syngman Rhee, Truman and MacArthur as he saw how there were many more deaths and suffering since the start</p>	6

	of Korean War. It is thus not surprising that in retrospect, he believed that the war was “turned into a major battle ground by Truman.”	
--	--	--

1(d) Study Source E. How useful is this source as evidence of major powers’ involvement in the Korean War? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	Undeveloped Provenance <i>e.g. Yes it is useful because it is a leaflet by the Americans about the involvement of Soviet Union and Chinese in the Korean War.</i>	1
L2	Utility based on information in the source, supported. Award 2 marks for one aspect and 3 marks for both aspects [useful and not useful] E.g. Source E is useful as evidence of the major powers’ involvement in the Korean War <u>because it implies that the North Koreans in their war against the South were being propelled by the Chinese and mainly the Soviet Union.</u> [2] Source E shows a North Korean soldier being pushed towards a battlefield titled Korea by a Chinese soldier that was pushed by Stalin. [3] OR Source E is not useful because it does not tell me about the agency of North Korea in the Korean War. [2] Source E shows a North Korean soldier being pushed towards a battlefield titled Korea by a Chinese soldier that was pushed by Stalin. E does not tell me about how North Korea a say had in launching the attack against the South in June 1950. [3]	2 - 3
L3	Not useful based on assertions about the inherent bias in American perspective and its intentional portrayal of Soviet Union as controlling <i>e.g. Source E is not useful because it is unreliable. Source E <u>biasedly implies that the North Koreans did not have a say in the Korean War but was instead acting on the orders and demands of the major powers like Soviet Union.</u></i> [3] Source E shows a North Korean soldier being pushed towards a battlefield titled Korea by a Chinese soldier that was pushed by Stalin. It is from an American perspective and thus it demonstrates its American bias of political rivalry with the Soviet Union and portraying it as manipulative. [4]	4
L4	Useful and reliable in showing major powers’ involvement in the Korean War, based on reliability upon cross-referencing to another source. Answers which address just reliability and not utility should be given L2/3.	5

	<p>e.g. Source E is useful as evidence of major power's involvement in the Korean War <u>because it implies that the Soviet Union was the evil mastermind behind the atrocities of the Korean War.</u> Source E shows a North Korean soldier being pushed towards a battlefield titled Korea by a Chinese soldier that was pushed by Stalin.</p> <p>By cross-referencing, this is supported by Source A. Source A supports major powers' involvement by demonstrating and addressing the North Koreans as "puppets" and "real traitors" of North Korea. Source A shows Kim Il-Sung feeding the Chinese communist soldiers at the expense of the well-being of the North Koreans. This means that the Communist bloc, inclusive of both Soviet Union and China were involved in the conflict and contributed to prolonging the Korean War.</p> <p>Since A supports E, E is reliable and thus useful as evidence of major powers' involvement in the Korean War.</p>	
L5	<p><u>L2 + Useful and reliable in showing how propaganda was used by USA to influence morale during the Korean War.</u></p> <p>e.g. Source E is useful as it is reliable as evidence of major powers' involvement in the Korean War because it demonstrated how the US used propaganda as a means to influence the morale of the Chinese people. Source E was an anti-Soviet Union propaganda used to convince the Chinese that Stalin was the mastermind behind the suffering of the Chinese and North Korean soldiers during the Korean War. This was done to cause them to be discouraged and surrender to the US instead of choosing to die for the Soviet Union. Propaganda pamphlets were commonly used by the USA as psychological warfare to manipulate and cause dissent amongst the Chinese and North Korean soldiers. (6m)</p>	6

1(e) 'The Korean War was escalated due to China's involvement.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid use	1
L2	<p>Yes OR No, supported by valid source use.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for <u>one yes OR no</u>, supported by valid source use, and an addition mark for another valid source used, up to a <u>maximum of 4 marks</u>.</p>	2 – 4
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use.	5 – 8

Award 5 marks for one Yes AND one No, supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for another valid source used, up to a maximum of 7 marks.

Award a bonus of up to 2 marks (i.e. +1 or +2) for use of contextual knowledge to question the reliability of a source. The total mark must not exceed 8.

Yes (extended due to china's involvement)	No (other reasons)
A E	B C D E

AGREES: A, E

e.g. Source A supports the view that the Korean War was escalated due to China's involvement because of how North Korean resources were depleted for funding the Korean War. Source A shows Kim Il-Sung feeding lots of rice to the Chinese communist forces alongside the scrawny looking North Koreans that were dying from lack of basic needs. This suggests that the escalation of the Korean War was due to the involvement of the Chinese and more resources are needed to fund a war that persisted after October 1950 when the Chinese pushed back the UN/US troops.

e.g. Source E supports the view that the Korean War was escalated due to China's involvement because it demonstrated China's active role in propelling the North Koreans deeper into the war. Source E shows the Chinese soldier being pushed by Stalin and also kicking the North Korean soldier eventually into the land of Korea. Based on my contextual knowledge, I know that Chinese involvement led to a stalemate and war of attrition for the next two and a half years.

DOES NOT AGREE: B, C, D, E

e.g. Source B does not support the view because it shows how American misjudgement and complacency contributed to the escalation of the Korean War and the Chinese pushback. Source B says that "US intelligence services had known well about Chinese military deployments along the Yalu River. Yet US policymakers did not take this information seriously." This means that the American attitude of superiority and underestimation of their enemies led to the escalation of Korean War and eventual attack of the Chinese that the Americans fail to anticipate.

e.g. Source C does not support the view because it shows how MacArthur's delusion and over-ambition led to the escalation of the

	<p>Korean War. Source C says that “once the intelligence finally came in loud and clear, he and his staff of sycophants continued to dismiss it, suppress it or willfully misinterpret its importance.” <u>This means that MacArthur’s negligence for intelligence led to the Chinese pushback and demonstrated how MacArthur took his Chinese enemy too lightly.</u></p> <p>e.g. Source D does not support the view because it demonstrated American responsibility in escalating the Korean War. Source D says that “A civil war which would have been short and relatively bloodless was turned into a major battle ground by Truman.” <u>This means that Truman was responsible for turning the civil war into an international one and expanding the scope of the conflict. By involving the UN and other countries, Truman involved more countries and people against the North Koreans and Soviet Union.</u></p> <p>e.g. Source E disagrees with the view as it demonstrated Soviet Union’s responsibility in worsening the Korean War. Source E shows a cartoon of Stalin pushing the Chinese and North Korean soldier in the battlefield. <u>This means that with more powers such as China and Soviet Union being involved in the war, the escalation and protraction of war was inevitable.</u></p> <p><i>For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to 1 mark for use of contextual knowledge/purpose to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark for the question must not exceed 8.</i></p> <p>Looking back at Source A, A is not a sufficient or reliable source in implying how Chinese involvement escalated the war. Source A is a propaganda produced by the US that was used to convince the North Koreans that they were heavily manipulated by Soviet Union as the superpower that in turn also managed and influenced Chinese action. Since it is an American perspective, it is biased in putting the blame towards the communist bloc and thus insufficient in addressing the extent of the role played by Chinese involvement in expanding or escalating the war.</p>	
--	--	--

Structured Questions

2(a) Describe the role of Stalin's personality in contributing to his rise to power in Russia. [8]

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Writes about Stalin's rise to power in Russia without answering the question. Award 1m for each detail, to a maximum of 2m.</p> <p><i>E.g. Stalin was a strong leader and rose to power because of propaganda.</i></p>	1 - 2
L2	<p>Identifies or describes one aspect of his personality Award 3 marks for each identified aspect up to a maximum of 5 marks OR award 4 marks for one described aspect and 5 marks for 2 described aspects.</p>	3 - 5
L3	<p>Describes two aspects of his personality Award 6 marks for describing two reasons and an additional mark for the depth of supporting information and the number of aspects covered.</p> <p>Stalin's manipulative personality allowed him to rise in power as he was able to ensure a positive reputation in comparison to his competitor and land himself in advantageous position. One example was how Stalin was skilful and strategic in manipulating other party members by pretending to be close to Lenin. He paid frequent visits to Lenin when he was alive to give the impression that Lenin favoured and trusted Stalin. When Lenin died in 1924, Stalin organised Lenin's funeral and purposely gave Trotsky the wrong date for the funeral, making himself look like the natural successor to Lenin. This was significant because this was able to increase support and favour for Stalin over his competitor Trotsky. By portraying himself as the "chief mourner," Stalin was successful in manipulating public opinion against his competitor, contributing to his rise to power in Russia as Trotsky was now seen as disrespectful and an unlikely successor of Lenin.</p> <p>In addition, Stalin's strategic nature allowed him to gain quick control over the party organisation. By 1922, Stalin was the Secretary-General of the Communist Party. This later gave him power to appoint and re-assign party members by replacing opponents with allies. He was able to exploit ideological divisions within the Party to his advantage. He allied with different members of the Politburo at different times. First, he allied with Kamenev and Zinoviev to remove Trotsky and later turned against them by convincing the moderates that Kamenev and Zinoviev were plotting with Trotsky to overthrow the government. Stalin later switched sides to the radicals and removed Bukharin and Rykov was Politburo and position of Premier in 1930. With these political opponents and competitors removed and executed, Stalin was able to become the supreme leader of Russia.</p>	6 - 8

2(b) Explain how each of the following impacted Russia during Stalin's rule:

- (i) Industrialisation through Five-Year Plans
- (ii) Great Terror (1934-1938)

[12]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Describe 5 Year Plans or The Great Terror without focus on the question.</p> <p><i>Award 1 mark for each detail up to a maximum of 2 marks.</i></p> <p>Stalin initiated the 5 Year Plans. He made the Soviet Union advanced.</p>	1-2
L2	<p>Describe factors</p> <p><i>Award 3-4 marks for one described factor</i> <i>Award 5-6 marks for two described factors</i></p> <p>Stalin's Five-Year Plans were implemented to transform the Soviet Union from an agrarian economy to an economy driven by industrialization. The Five-Year Plans aimed to help the Soviet Union catch up with the West, namely, the USA and Britain, in the production of steel, metallurgy, chemicals, coal, oil and electricity within 10 years. His Five Year Plans involved the setting of production quotas for the various industries. Hundreds of factories were formed. Workers who did not meet the set quota would be severely punished and branded as enemy of the state. The fear of punishment forced many workers to be stretched to their limits in their desire to meet the targets.</p> <p>The Great Terror refers to the period of intense political repression and mass executions orchestrated by Stalin's regime from 1934-1938 with the main aim of eliminating political opponents within the Communist Party and society. This became a series of campaigns of political repression and purges to remove opposition to the Soviet government, characterized by show trials, arrests and interrogations. One example was the Kirov affair and the removal of Kirov and his powerbase, the Leningrad Party. Stalin's manipulation also allowed him to use this opportunity to eliminate political rivals such as Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin in the show trials. In fact, many of the intellectuals and experienced Red Army officers were accused of treason and tortured.</p>	3-6
L3	<p>Explain factors</p> <p><i>Award 7-9marks for one explained factor</i> <i>Award 10-12 marks for two explained factors</i></p> <p>Stalin's Five-Year Plans were implemented to transform the Soviet Union from an agrarian economy to an economy driven by industrialisation. The Five-Year Plans aimed to help the Soviet Union catch up with the West, namely, the USA and Britain, in the production of steel, metallurgy, chemicals, coal, oil and electricity within 10 years. This was significant because the emphasis on heavy industry helped to strengthen the country's economic foundation and prepared it for military conflicts.</p>	7-12

As a result, industrial output experienced significant growth. His Five Year Plans involved the setting of production quotas for the various industries. Hundreds of factories were formed. Workers who did not meet the set quota would be severely punished and branded as enemy of the state. The fear of punishment forced many workers to be stretched to their limits in their desire to meet the targets. **This also meant that workers had to endure harsh working conditions while living standards stagnated when the focus on heavy industry came at the expense of consumer goods production such as house-building fertilisers and woollen textiles, leading to food shortages.** With the focus on catching up with the West in industrializing and increasing weapon production, the Five-Year Plans propelled Soviet economy at the expense of workers' and people's welfare. Furthermore, many of the factories overproduced in their attempts to exceed the targets, resulting in sub-standard and hazardous goods. On the positive side, it also led to rapid urbanization as millions of peasants migrated from towns to cities in search of better job opportunities.

The Great Terror refers to the period of intense political repression and mass executions orchestrated by Stalin's regime from 1934-1938 with the main aim of eliminating political opponents within the Communist Party and society. This became a series of campaigns of political repression and purges to remove opposition to the Soviet government, characterized by show trials, arrests and interrogations. One example was the Kirov affair and the removal of Kirov and his powerbase, the Leningrad Party. Stalin's manipulation also allowed him to use this opportunity to eliminate political rivals such as Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin in the show trials. In fact, many of the intellectuals and experienced Red Army officers were accused of treason and tortured. **This was significant because it meant that Russia had a lack of experienced government members as Stalin promoted younger, inexperienced members who pledged their allegiance to him alone.** The loss of intellectuals and skilled workers also affected the efficiency of administration. Furthermore, it promoted a culture and atmosphere of fear and suspicion as nobody dared to challenge him. People lived in paranoia of one another under constant surveillance.

3(a) Describe the role of the post-war conferences in leading to the Cold War.

[8]

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Writes about the Cold War without focusing on the question Award 1m for each detail, to a maximum of 2m.</p> <p><i>E.g.</i> After the end of World War II, the world entered a period known as the Cold War era. It focused primarily on tensions between the US and the Soviet Union, the two superpowers that emerged after World War II.</p>	1 - 2
L2	<p>Identifies or describes one factor Award 3 marks for each identified aspect up to a maximum of 5 marks OR award 4 marks for one described aspect and 5 marks for 2 described aspects.</p>	3 - 5
L3	<p>Describes two factors Award 6 marks for describing two factors and an additional mark for the depth of supporting information and the number of aspects covered.</p> <p><i>E.g.</i> The post-war conferences such as the Yalta conference revealed the differences in ideological vision for Europe between US and the Soviet Union. The Yalta Conference held in February 1945 saw the leaders coming together to discuss the partition of Germany and the issue of Poland. During the Yalta Conference, The Western powers wanted the revival of the European economy after the losses suffered from World War II. However, in contrast, the Soviet Union wanted a weak Germany that would be unable to threaten the Soviet Union and extract maximum reparations from Germany. This meant running Europe with a capitalist system rather than a communist one which meant a clash in ideological handling of the European economy. This was significant because the difference in ideologies and vision for Germany and post-war Europe caused the western powers and the Soviet Union to realize their <u>visions are not aligned and saw cracks in the Grand Alliance.</u> In the long run, these ideological differences become more obvious and became the <u>bedrock upon which greater hostility and antagonism form.</u></p> <p><u>Additionally,</u> the Potsdam Conference of July 1945 revealed largely the differences in political vision for Europe. The Potsdam Conference saw new leaders like President Truman and British Prime Minister Atlee. With the removal of Germany, their common enemy, the leaders no longer needed to compromise and agree. At Potsdam, their <u>differing political ambitions were revealed.</u> Through the conference, the issue of free elections in Eastern Europe was contested. The leaders of the Western powers and the Soviet Union were not able to agree on the type of governments to be set up in Eastern Europe. The Western leaders believed that democracy and free elections should be the way forward for Europe. The push for free elections <u>resulted in Soviet disagreement</u> as it clashed with their communist beliefs. Furthermore, the Soviet Union had gained significant control over Eastern</p>	6 – 8 m

	Europe and established communist governments in the area. This resulted in greater tensions between the leaders and revealed the ideological differences and ambitions (clash between democracy and communism) for post-war Europe. Such tensions fragmented the Grand Alliance and contributed to the start of the Cold War – with Truman taking a more confrontational and assertive stance towards Stalin.	
--	---	--

3(b) Explain how each of the following impacted the development of the Cold War in Europe:

- (i) **Marshall Plan**
- (ii) **Berlin Blockade**

[12]

Level	Level descriptor and rubrics	Marks
L1	<p>Writes about the Cold War without focus on question Award 1m for each detail, to a maximum of 2m.</p> <p><i>E.g. After World War Two, the USA and Soviet Union entered into the Cold War era. The two superpowers became involved in several conflicts in other parts of the war such as Asia.</i></p>	1 - 2 m
L2	<p>Describes events Award 3-4 for one described factor and 5-6 marks for two described factors.</p>	3 - 6 m
L3	<p>Explains how the events impacted the development of Cold War / concretise further division between the two superpowers. Award 7-9 marks for one explained reason and 10-12 marks for two explained reasons.</p> <p>The Marshall Plan refers to the economic aid plan launched in June 1947 to revive the working economy in the world and mainly to create a prosperous Europe. The USA gave billions of dollars in economic aid to reconstruct European countries. Western Europe's economy was progressively improving due to the Marshall Plan and this prevented the spread of Soviet influence to Western Europe. <u>Trade was revived in war-torn Europe and receiving countries allowed the USA to invest in their factories. In accepting the USA's aid, these countries were actually opening themselves up to the USA's influence, hence, resisting the extension of Soviet influence. This became a plan that was perceived by the Soviet Union as an act to undermine Soviet influence in Europe, portraying the USA as a saviour. Due to the improvement in living standards in Western Europe, communism would not appeal to the people living in these countries and they would rather support the USA.</u> This contributed to the economic division of Europe as countries took up economic aid by the USA. Determined, Soviet Union also responded by setting up the COMECON in 1949 (Council of Mutual Economic Assistance) to coordinate and control Cominform's economic policies. This economic organization aimed at</p>	7 - 12 m

allowing the Soviet Union to make use of the resources in the satellite countries. The US perceived these Soviet organizations with suspicion, as they were clearly introduced to counteract the US containment measures. As a result, the Soviet responses to counteract the US containment measures added to the atmosphere of hostility and led to the worsening of Cold War tensions.

The Berlin Blockade refers to the blockade that Stalin placed on West Berlin. Stalin **shut off** all links and roads to West Berlin to *protest against the currency reforms* and political plans for Germany, which **cut off essential supplies** to 2 million West Berliners. This was in response to the establishment of the Deutschemark in the Western zone. This was significant because the Berlin Blockade was intended to pressure the West to abandon their plans for an independent, democratic West Germany. The blockade was thus meant to force West Berliners to turn to Soviet communism for survival. **This act of blockade illustrated to the West about Soviet tendencies to seize Berlin for itself, resulting in the physical division of Berlin, creating tension and competition between USA and USSR. Perceived by the USA as an expansionist move from the Soviet Union, the USA was convinced that a military alliance amongst capitalist, democratic countries were needed, resulting in the formation of NATO in 1955.**