

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



YISHUN TOWN SECONDARY SCHOOL

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2023 SEC 4 EXPRESS / SEC 5 NORMAL ACADEMIC HUMANITIES HISTORY (2273/2)

DATE : 25 August 2023

DAY : Friday

DURATION: 1 hour 40 minutes

MARKS: 50

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Writing Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

Write in dark blue or black ink.

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.

Write your answer in the writing paper provided.

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

This question paper consists of 6 printed pages

SECTION A: Source-Based Case Study

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

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

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

1 (a) Study Source A.

Why do you think this cartoon was published? Explain your answer, using details from the source. [5]

(b) Study Source B .

Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer. [5]

(c) Study Sources C and D.

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

(d) Study Sources E and F.

Which source is more useful as evidence about the USSR's intentions in the Cuban Missile Crisis? Explain your answer. [6]

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

'The Cuban Missile Crisis was a product of Soviet aggression.' How far do the sources support this judgement? Use the sources and knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Was the Cuban Missile Crisis a product of Soviet aggression?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Cuban Missile Crisis was a direct and dangerous confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Both the superpowers engaged in a tense 13-day political and military standoff in October 1962 over the installation of nuclear-armed Soviet missiles on Cuba, just 90 miles from the US. Over the course of 2 extremely tense weeks, US President John F. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev managed to negotiate a peaceful outcome to the crisis. The crisis evoked fears of nuclear destruction, revealed the dangers of nuclear brinkmanship. Thus, this has initiated attempts to halt the arms race between the 2 superpowers.

Source A: *An American cartoon titled 'Pulling Castro's Beard' published in October 1962. The characters on the right is the Soviet Premier, Nikita Khrushchev.*



Source B: *A letter from Nikita Khrushchev to John F. Kennedy on 27 October 1962.*

Our purpose is to help Cuba, and no one can challenge our motives to help Cuba live peacefully and develop as its people desire. You want to relieve your country from danger and this is understandable. However, Cuba also wants this. Your rockets are stationed in Britain, Italy and Turkey pointing at us. You are worried over Cuba. You say that it worries you because it is 90 miles from your shores. However, Turkey lies next to us. Do you believe that you have the right to demand security for your country and the removal of such offensive weapons, while not recognizing this right for us? You have stationed devastating rocket weapons in Turkey literally right next to us. This does not tally at all.

Source C: *An letter from Cuban leader Fidel Castro to Nikita Khrushchev on 26 October 1962 .*

Dear Comrade Khrushchev,

I consider an attack coming within the next 24 to 72 hours. If the imperialists invade Cuba, the dangers of their aggressive policy are so great that after such an invasion, the imperialists must never be allowed to carry out a nuclear first strike on the USSR. The imperialists' aggressiveness makes them extremely dangerous, and that if they manage to carry out an invasion of Cuba—a brutal act in violation of universal and moral law—then that would be the moment for us to eliminate this danger forever, in an act of legitimate self-defence. The imperialists, without regard for world's opinion, have blockaded the seas, and violated our air-space, while at the same time blocking any possibility of negotiation.

Source D: *Adapted from a poem written by an American writer in 2015.*

Newsmen call it the Cuban Missile Crisis.
Teachers say it's the end of the world.

At school, they instruct us to look up
And watch the Cuban-cursed sky.
Search for a streak of light.
Listen for a piercing shriek,
The whistle that will warn us
As poisonous A-bombs
Zoom close.

Source E: *Adapted from a White House press statement on 27 October 1962 on the dismantling of Soviet missiles that have been constructed in Cuba.*

The action of the Soviet Government secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba had created the current crisis that affect the USA and Europe. Work on these offensive weapons is still proceeding at a rapid pace. We must deal with this immediate threat before any sensible negotiation can proceed. It is therefore the position of the United States that any proposals to work on the Cuban bases must stop. Offensive weapons must not be used. There should be no further shipment of offensive weapons to Cuba. These efforts can continue as soon as the present Soviet-created threat is ended.

Source F: *A speech by Nikita Khrushchev at a Cuba-USSR Friendship Meeting on 23 May 1963.*

The Cuban crisis was one of the sharpest clashes between socialism and imperialism. When they prepared their invasion of Cuba, the American belligerents* thought that the geographical remoteness of Cuba from the socialist countries would allow them to utilise their overwhelming military superiority and attack the Cubans to wipe out their revolutionary gains. The American imperialists are known to suppress the liberation struggle around the world. The imperialists' plans to strangle the Cuban revolution failed thanks to the firm stand of the Cuban Government headed by Comrade Fidel Castro, the fighting solidarity of the Cubans, the military might of the USSR and the powerful political and moral support of the socialist countries who joined the united front to defend the heroic Island of Freedom.

**belligerents: a person or country which exhibits hostility and combativeness.*

Section B: Structured-Essay Questions

Answer **one** question.

2 This question is on the impact of World War I in Europe.

- (a) Explain why did the “Big Three” have different aims in the negotiations of the Treaty of Versailles. [8]
- (b) “The major powers were responsible for the failure of the League of Nations.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

3 This question is on the end of the Cold War.

- (a) Explain why was there an improvement in the US-Soviet relations during the period of détente in the 1960s. [8]
- (b) “The USSR was responsible for the end of the Cold War.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

-----END OF PAPER-----

Copyright Acknowledgements

Source A	https://www.reddit.com/r/PropagandaPosters/comments/ys68vc/pulling_castros_beard_political_cartoon_made_by/
Source B	https://www.commackschools.org/Downloads/Choices-%20The%20Cuban%20Missile%20Crisis-%20Considerin%20its%20Place%20in%20Cold%20War%20History.pdf
Source C	https://microsites.jfklibrary.org/cmc/oct26/doc2.html
Source D	https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/141882/more-dangerous-air
Source E	https://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/press_statement_by_the_white_house_on_the_cuban_missile_crisis_27_october_1962-en-443c7ebd-6197-4b4d-a4cc-41e1fd1503f7.html
Source F	https://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/speech_by_nikita_khrushchev_on_the_cuban_crisis_23_may_1963-en-7a223f24-7d74-434c-928b-85724626734d.html

Sec 4E/5NA HY Elective Prelim 2023 Suggested Mark Scheme
Section A: Source Based Questions

(a)	Study Source A. Why do you think this cartoon was published? Explain your answer.	[5]
L1	Describing/ Answer based on provenance/Context/Misinterpretation The cartoon shows that Fidel Castro was actually Nikita Khrushchev.	1
L2	Message based on context / Sub messages The message of this cartoon is that the Cuban Missile Crisis was a product of Soviet aggression. The message of this cartoon is to blame / criticise the USSR. The message of this cartoon is that Nikita Khrushchev was acting on behalf of Cuba / Fidel Castro. This cartoon was published in response to Soviet installation of nuclear missiles in Cuba which was discovered by the American spy planes. The photos taken by the spy planes revealed how these Soviet missiles were capable of devastating major American cities due to the close proximity of Cuba to the USA. This prompted the US naval blockade on Cuba to stop the USSR from sending more weapons to Cuba.	2

L3	<p>Message explained / Outcome explained <i>Award the higher mark for a well-developed answer</i></p> <p><u>Message</u> (Focus on the USSR's role in the CMC)</p> <p>The message of this cartoon is to criticise / condemn / expose the USSR's hypocrisy in exploiting Cuba / Fidel Castro in an attempt to threaten the USA's national security. The cartoon depicts a hand labelled "US" pulling on a mask with the face of Cuban leader Fidel Castro. It showed the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev behind the mask with him wearing a jacket labelled "Offensive missile bases in Cuba". The background also highlighted a fearful globe which represents the world and a shocked Latin America. Thus, it showed a manipulative Nikita Khrushchev in instigating the Cuban Missile Crisis by helping Cuba to fight against the Americans. The USSR should hence be blamed for causing the world to come close to nuclear annihilation in the CMC.</p> <p>(Other accepted message: Cuba was actually acting behalf of the USSR / the world was tricked by the USSR's manipulation in causing the CMC)</p> <p><u>Outcome</u></p> <p>By discrediting / condemning the USSR's actions of installing nuclear missiles in Cuba, the cartoonist hoped to justify the USA's action of imposing a naval blockade on Cuba. The cartoon depicts a hand labelled "US" pulling on a mask with the face of Cuban leader Fidel Castro. It showed the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev behind the mask with him wearing a jacket labelled "Offensive missile bases in Cuba". The background also highlighted a fearful globe which represents the world and a shocked Latin America. Thus, it showed a manipulative Nikita Khrushchev in instigating the Cuban Missile Crisis by helping Cuba to fight against the Americans. The US government was wise enough to see through the cunning plans of the Soviets and stop them from making use of Cuba to attack the USA.</p>	3-4
L4	Both of L3 / L3 + L2 context	5

(b)	Study Source B. Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer.	[5]
L1	<p>Surprised / Not Surprised based on source content <i>Award 2m for developed answer</i></p> <p>I am surprised as the source shows that the USA was the one that caused the Cuban Missile Crisis. Source B states “Do you believe that you have the right to demand security for your country and the removal of such offensive weapons, while not recognizing this right for us? You have stationed devastating rocket weapons in Turkey literally right next to us.” Thus, this shows that the USA was the aggressor nation which surprised me as I did not expect the USA to provoke Cuba and the USSR.</p> <p>I am not surprised as the the source shows that the USA was the one that caused the Cuban Missile Crisis. Source B states “Do you believe that you have the right to demand security for your country and the removal of such offensive weapons, while not recognizing this right for us? You have stationed devastating rocket weapons in Turkey literally right next to us.” Thus, this shows that the USA was the aggressor nation.</p>	1-2
L2	<p>Surprised / Not Surprised based on cross-reference to other sources / contextual knowledge</p> <p>I am surprised as the source shows that the USA was the one that caused the Cuban Missile Crisis. Source B states “Do you believe that you have the right to demand security for your country and the removal of such offensive weapons, while not recognizing this right for us? You have stationed devastating rocket weapons in Turkey literally right next to us.” Thus, this shows that the USA was the aggressor. This is challenged by Source E which states “It is the Western Hemisphere countries and they alone that are subject to the threat that has produced the current crisis – the action of the Soviet Government in secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba.” This shows that the USSR was the one that caused the Cuban Missile Crisis with its installation of nuclear missiles on Cuba. Since Source E challenges Source B, I am surprised by Source B.</p> <p>I am not surprised as the source shows that the USA was the one that caused the Cuban Missile Crisis. Source B states “Do you believe that you have the right to demand security for your country and the removal of such offensive weapons, while not recognizing this right for us? You have stationed devastating rocket weapons in Turkey literally right next to us.” Thus, this shows that the USA was the aggressor nation. This can be supported by Source C which states “The imperialists, without regard for world, have blockaded the seas, and violated our air-space, while at the same time blocking any possibility of negotiation.” This shows that the USA was the one that caused the Cuban Missile Crisis as it</p>	3-4

	threatened Cuban national security. Since Source C supports Source B, I am not surprised by Source B.	
L3	<p>Not Surprised based on critical analysis of provenance, linking to contextual knowledge</p> <p>I am not surprised by Source B as it is biased. Source B is a letter from the Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to the US President John F. Kennedy. Therefore, Khrushchev would want to portray the USSR in a positive light by showing that it has no ill intentions in threatening the US national security. It only sought to help Cuba redress the injustice caused by the Americans. Source B states “Our purpose is to help Cuba, and no one can challenge our motives to help Cuba live peacefully and develop as its people desire. You want to relieve your country from danger and this is understandable. However, Cuba also wants this.” By displaying a peaceful, rational and empathetic image to the US President, Khrushchev hopes that the US would trust the USSR’s kind intentions of supporting Cuba. This would hopefully reduce the rising tensions between the USA and the USSR and suspicions the USA might have against the USSR. Ultimately, Khrushchev aims to justify the USSR’s decision in supplying missiles to Cuba based on defensive and not offensive considerations. Based on my contextual knowledge, Nikita Khrushchev has sent John F. Kennedy 2 letters to seek for resolution of the crisis. In the second letter, Khrushchev offered to remove the nuclear missiles on Cuba in exchange for a promise by the US leaders not to invade Cuba. Khrushchev mentioned the presence of US Jupiter missiles in Turkey as he wanted to make use of the missiles on Cuba as a bargaining chip for the Americans to remove their nuclear installations in Turkey which would effectively ensure the USSR’s national security.</p>	5

(c)	Study Sources C and D. How far does Source C prove that Source D is wrong? Explain your answer.	[6]
L1	Yes / No based on context / provenance / typicality / misinterpretation Yes, Source C proves that Source D is wrong as Source C was a letter from Fidel Castro to Nikita Khrushchev while Source D was from an American writer.	1
L2	Yes / No based on source content <i>Award 3m for developed answer</i> Yes, Source C does prove Source D is wrong as both sources differ on who should be responsible for the Cuban Missile Crisis. Source C states "I consider an attack coming within the next 24 to 72 hours. If the imperialists invade Cuba, the dangers of their aggressive policy are so great that after such an invasion the Soviet Union must never allow the imperialists to carry out a nuclear first strike against you." However, Source D states "At school, they instruct us to look up and watch the Cuban-cursed sky." Thus, Source C shows that the USA was at fault whereas Source D shows that Cuban should be responsible for the crisis. No, Source C does not prove Source D is wrong as both sources are similar in showing how dangerous the Cuban Missile Crisis has brought the world to. Source C states "If the imperialists invade Cuba, the dangers of their aggressive policy are so great that after such an invasion, the imperialists must never be allowed to carry out a nuclear first strike on the USSR." Similarly, Source D states "Teachers say it's the end of the world." This, this shows how the Crisis could bring about huge damages to the world. (Other similarities: countries were anticipating an incoming attacks)	2-3
L3	Both of L2	4
L4	Reliability of Source C / D, cross-reference to other sources / contextual knowledge Yes, Source C does prove Source D wrong as Source D is not reliable. Source D states "At school, they instruct us to look up and watch the Cuban-cursed sky." This shows that Cuba was the one responsible for causing the Cuban Missile Crisis. This is contradicted by Source B which states "You want to relieve your country from danger and this is understandable. However, Cuba also wants this. Your rockets are stationed in Britain, Italy and Turkey pointing at us." This shows that the USA was the one being aggressive in causing the crisis since Cuba's actions were based on self-defence. Yes, Source C does prove Source D wrong as Source C is reliable. Source C states "The imperialists' aggressiveness makes them extremely dangerous, and	5

	<p>that if they manage to carry out an invasion of Cuba—a brutal act in violation of universal and moral law—then that would be the moment to eliminate this danger forever, in an act of the most legitimate self-defence.” This shows that the USA was the one causing the Cuban Missile Crisis by being the aggressive one first. This is supported by Source B which states “You are worried over Cuba. You say that it worries you because it is 90 miles from your shores. However, Turkey lies next to us. Do you believe that you have the right to demand security for your country and the removal of such offensive weapons, while not recognizing this right for us?” This shows that the USA should be blamed for the crisis as it was the one installing nuclear weapons around the USSR first. Since Source C is supported by Source B, it is thus reliable.</p> <p>No, Source C does not prove Source D wrong as Source C is not reliable. Source C states “The imperialists’ aggressiveness makes them extremely dangerous, and that if they manage to carry out an invasion of Cuba—a brutal act in violation of universal and moral law—then that would be the moment to eliminate this danger forever, in an act of the most legitimate self-defence.” This shows that the USA was the one causing the Cuban Missile Crisis by being the aggressive one first. This is challenged by Source E which states “It is the Western Hemisphere countries and they alone that are subject to the threat that has produced the current crisis – the action of the Soviet Government in secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba.” This shows that the USSR was the aggressive one as it sought to threaten the USA’s national security with the installation of nuclear missiles on Cuba. Since Source C is contradicted by Source E, it is thus not reliable.</p>	
L5	<p>Reliability of Sources C & D, Critical Analysis of Provenance, supported by contextual knowledge</p> <p>No, Source C does not prove Source D wrong as Source C is not reliable. Source C was a letter from Fidel Castro to Nikita Khrushchev. Fidel Castro was hoping to convince Nikita Khrushchev to support Cuba in its fight against the USA. Source C states “The imperialists, without regard for world, have blockaded the seas, and violated our air-space, while at the same time blocking any possibility of negotiation.” Castro was portraying the Americans in a negative light by showing how aggressive they were. Cuba would thus appear to be a victim of American aggression. In doing so, Castro was appealing to Khrushchev’s sympathy by raising the urgency of a possible US attack on Cuba so that the USSR would continue to support Cuba. Based on my contextual knowledge, the USSR and Cuba became close allies as the US-Cuban relations worsened due to Castro’s anti-US rhetoric and radical policies like his land redistribution and nationalisation policies. Castro actually turned to the USSR for support with the signing of various trade and aid agreements. The USSR even promised to build nuclear missile bases throughout Cuba. As for Source D, it was from an American writer produced in 2015 which was many years after the crisis and also after the end of the Cold War. And the poem seemed to be a reflection of the daily school life in the USA as a way to prepare the students from possible</p>	6

	nuclear attacks from Cuba. Source D states “Listen for a piercing shriek, the whistle that will warn us as poisonous A-bombs zoom close.” Thus, Source D should be a more accurate portrayal of how the lives of Americans were like during the crisis.	
--	---	--

(d)	Study Sources E and F. Which source is more useful as evidence about the USSR's intentions in the Cuban Missile Crisis? Explain your answer.	[6]
L1	Answers based on provenance / misinterpretation Source E is more useful as it was from the American government . Source F is more useful as it was from Nikita Khrushchev.	1
L2	Answers based on source content <i>Award 3 marks for a well-supported answer</i> Source E is more useful as it showed that the USSR was responsible for causing the Cuban missile crisis. (2m) Source F is more useful as it showed that the USSR was not responsible for the Cuban missile crisis as the USA was the aggressive one. (2m) Source E is more useful as it showed that the USSR was responsible for causing the Cuban missile crisis. Source E states "It is the Western Hemisphere countries and they alone that are subject to the threat that has produced the current crisis – the action of the Soviet Government in secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba." This shows that the USSR should be blamed for causing the tensions between Cuba and the USA. (3m) Source F is more useful as it showed that the USSR was not responsible for the Cuban missile crisis as the USA was the aggressive one. Source F states "When they prepared their invasion of Cuba, the American belligerents* thought that the geographical remoteness of Cuba from the socialist countries would allow them to utilise their overwhelming military superiority and attack the Cubans to wipe out their revolutionary gains." This shows that the USA should be blamed for the crisis due to its aggression towards Cuba.	2-3
L3	Answer based on choice made - based on cross-reference to other sources / contextual knowledge Source E is more useful as it showed that the USSR was responsible for causing the Cuban missile crisis. Source E states "It is the Western Hemisphere countries and they alone that are subject to the threat that has produced the current crisis – the action of the Soviet Government in secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba." This shows that the USSR should be blamed for causing the tensions between Cuba and the USA. This is supported by Source A which shows a cartoon a hand labelled "US" pulling on a mask with the face of Cuban leader Fidel Castro. It showed the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev behind the mask with him wearing a jacket labelled "Offensive missile bases in Cuba". The background also highlighted a fearful globe which represents the world and a shocked Latin America. This thus shows that the USSR was the one instigating the crisis by making use of Cuba. Source F is more useful as it showed that the USSR was not responsible for the Cuban missile crisis as the USA was the aggressive one. Source F states "When they prepared their invasion of Cuba, the American belligerents* thought that the	4-5

	<p>geographical remoteness of Cuba from the socialist countries would allow them to utilise their overwhelming military superiority and attack the Cubans to wipe out their revolutionary gains.” This shows that the USA should be blamed for the crisis due to its aggression towards Cuba. This can be supported by Source B which states “You are worried over Cuba. You say that it worries you because it is 90 miles from your shores. However, Turkey lies next to us. Do you believe that you have the right to demand security for your country and the removal of such offensive weapons, while not recognizing this right for us?” This shows that the USA was the one that started with the installation of nuclear weapons that could threaten the USSR’s national security which only further proved its hostile intentions.</p> <p>*No mention of reliability → L2/3</p>	
L4	<p>Explain why one source is more useful based on its critical analysis of provenance (supported with contextual knowledge, linking to source content)</p> <p><i>Award 6m for more fully developed answers, which are supported by both sources.</i></p> <p>Source E is more useful as it is more reliable since it was from a White House Press Statement on 27 October 1962 on the dismantling of Soviet missiles that have been constructed in Cuba. This statement was made in the midst of the Cuban Missile Crisis whereby the American government was urging the Soviet government to stop its nuclear installation on Cuba as a prerequisite for any negotiations. Source E states “The first imperative must be to deal with this immediate threat, under which no sensible negotiation can proceed. It is therefore the position of the United States that any proposals to work on the Cuban bases must stop.” Despite displaying a firm stance towards the USSR in its demands to dismantle the nuclear missiles on Cuba, it also showed how the USA was rather open towards discussions and negotiations. Thus, this proves that the USA was rational and reasonable, unlike the aggressive image the USSR and Cuba tended to portray about the USA. Furthermore, this White House Statement would also reassure the American citizens that the USA would not condone the USSR’s actions that would threaten its national survival. Based on my contextual knowledge, the Cuban Missile Crisis has led to widespread fear that the world was on the brink of nuclear war. The US President even held a televised address on 22 October 1962 to inform the Americans about the discovery of the missiles and explained the government’s decision to enact a naval blockade around Cuba. Thus, the White House statement from Source E would only further highlight the USA’s resolve to use whatever means possible to neutralise the threat in Cuba. Such was a practice of brinkmanship in a way to make the USSR back down.</p> <p>Source F is less useful as it was not reliable. It was from a speech by Nikita Khrushchev during a Cuba-USSR Friendship Meeting on 23 May 1963. He portrayed the USA in a negative light by showing how the USA should be responsible for causing the Cuban Missile Crisis due to its aggressiveness and ambitions in take over Cuba. Source F states “The Cuban crisis was one of the sharpest clashes between socialism and imperialism. When they prepared their invasion of Cuba, the American belligerents* thought that the geographical remoteness of Cuba from the socialist countries would allow them to utilise their overwhelming military superiority and attack the Cubans to wipe out their revolutionary gains.” Khrushchev’s intentions was to assuage Castro that the USSR would remain committed to the Cuba-USSR relations and would always</p>	6

	<p>stand by Cuba against the Americans. This is especially when this source was produced after the crisis on 23 May 1963. Based on my contextual knowledge, the crisis ended with negotiations between Nikita Khrushchev and John F. Kennedy agreeing to remove their nuclear installations in Cuba and Turkey respectively. Khrushchev did not consult with Castro which made him felt betrayed as the USSR seemed to prioritise its relations with the USA over Cuba which was a fellow communist ally. Therefore, this speech was made in the aftermath of the crisis as a form of reassurance from the USSR that it would not abandon its Cuban ally. It was also obvious that Khrushchev was trying to push all the blame to the USA for causing the crisis and compliment the Cubans for their efforts in resisting the USA. This thus made the source biased and hence less useful.</p>	
--	--	--

(e)	<p>Use all the sources.</p> <p>‘The Cuban Missile Crisis was a product of Soviet aggression.’ How far do the sources support this judgement? Use the sources and knowledge to explain your answer.</p>	[8]
L1	<p>Unsupported discussion. No usage of sources</p> <p>Identify source(s) for or/and against the argument</p>	1
L2	<p>Yes (Source A, E)</p> <p>No (Source B, C, D, F) – Need to state the reasons for causing the Cuban Missile Crisis</p> <p>Source A supports the statement as the CMC caused by the USSR's manipulations. The cartoon depicts a hand labelled “US” pulling on a mask with the face of Cuban leader Fidel Castro. It showed the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev behind the mask with him wearing a jacket labelled “Offensive missile bases in Cuba”. The background also highlighted a fearful globe which represents the world and a shocked Latin America. Thus, it showed how scheming the USSR in making use of Cuba as a strategic pawn to fight against the Americans.</p> <p>Source B does not support the statement as the USA was the one causing the CMC. Source B states “Your rockets are stationed in Britain, Italy and Turkey pointing at us. You are worried over Cuba. You say that it worries you because it is 90 miles from your shores.” This shows that USA was the one that caused the Cuban Missile Crisis as it not only sought to dominate Cuba but also install nuclear missiles all around the world. This would bring the world closer to nuclear annihilation.</p> <p>Source C does not support the statement as the USA was the aggressor nation in causing the CMC. Source C states “The imperialists, without regard for world, have blockaded the seas, and violated our air-space, while at the same time blocking any possibility of negotiation.” This shows that the USA was the one causing the Cuban Missile Crisis by being the aggressive one first which prompted Castro to urgently appeal for the USSR’s help in order to survive a possible attack from the USA.</p> <p>Source D does not support the statement as it shows that Cuba was the one causing the CMC. Source D states “At school, they instruct us to look up and watch the Cuban-cursed sky.” This shows that Cuba was the aggressor nation in worsening the US-Cuba relations which led to the CMC. Cuba was the one the proactively threatened the US national security with its Soviet nuclear missiles.</p> <p>Source E supports the statement as it shows that the USSR’s aggression had resulted in the CMC. Source E states ““It is the Western Hemisphere countries and they alone that are subject to the threat that has produced the current crisis – the action of the Soviet Government in secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba.” This shows that the USSR should be blamed for causing the tensions between Cuba and the USA. By supplying nuclear missiles to Cuba, it would equip</p>	2-4

	<p>Cuba with the capability to destroy the USA and hence threaten its national survival.</p> <p>Source F does not support the statement as it shows that the USA should be responsible for the CMC. Source F states "Source F states "When they prepared their invasion of Cuba, the American belligerents* thought that the geographical remoteness of Cuba from the socialist countries would allow them to utilise their overwhelming military superiority and attack the Cubans to wipe out their revolutionary gains." This shows that the USA had been very hostile and greedy as it wanted to forcefully take over Cuba. Thus, the CMC should be a product of American aggression.</p>	
L3	<p>Both side of L2</p> <p><i>Award 5m for explaining 2 sources each from both perspectives.</i></p> <p><i>Award 7 marks for explaining at least 2 sources from both perspectives, award up to a maximum of 1 additional mark for details/ CK/ Critical evaluation of the sources.</i></p>	5-8

Section B: Structured Essay Questions

2a)	Explain why did the “Big Three” have different aims in the negotiations of the Treaty of Versailles (TOV).	[8]
L1	<p>Describes the aims of the Big Three <i>Award 1m for each detail, up to a maximum of 2m.</i></p> <p>The USA wanted to follow a policy of isolation as the Americans felt that the USA should not get itself involved in foreign entanglements in the future.</p> <p>France wanted to make Germany accept total blame for the war and to pay for the cost of the war.</p> <p>Britain wanted to prevent Germany from being a threat to British interests while at the same time ensure that German economy did not collapse.</p>	1-2
L2	<p>Describes factors <i>Award 3m for description of factors, 4m for detailed description.</i></p> <p><u>Different opinions on Germany</u></p> <p>The Big Three have different aims in the negotiation of the TOV as they all have different opinions on Germany. For France, it wanted revenge by making Germany accept total blame for the war and to pay for the cost of the war. They also wanted to regain lands they had lost, such as Alsace-Lorraine, which they had lost to Germany in earlier war. Thus, France wanted Germany’s reparations bill to be as large as possible. On the other hand, Britain was concerned over Germany’s rise as a naval and industrial power which threatened British interests just before the war. Britain wanted to ensure that Germany no longer threatened Britain’s positions in these areas after the war. Yet, Britain was also concerned that a weakened Germany would result in a weakened economy in Europe, which would affect British economy. Thus, British Prime Minister, David Lloyd-George also had to be answerable to the British public’s demands to make Germany pay for the war. As for the USA, it wanted a peace that was fair and would not cause the least resentment. The USA thought Germany should be punished but not too much.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><u>Different sufferings</u></p> <p>The Big Three have different aims in the negotiation of the TOV as they suffered differently in WWI. The war was fought essentially on French soil and France suffered more destruction than any other country. France also lost about 1.4 million lives. As for Britain, their sufferings were lesser as compared to France despite the high number of British casualties since the war was fought largely on mainland Europe. During WWI, the German submarines did fire and sink American merchant ships which they believed were carrying weapons to Britain across the Atlantic Ocean. The sinking of the US ship Lusitania, which resulted in the deaths of civilians</p>	3-4

	<p>resulted in the USA declaring war on Germany. Again, the Americans did not suffer as much as the French since the USA was located across the Atlantic Ocean.</p> <p>(Other accepted answers: Different expectations of the public on their leaders)</p>	
L3	<p>Explains factors <i>Award 5m for an explanation of one factor, an additional mark up to 6m. Award 7m for two factors explained, an additional mark up to 8m.</i></p> <p><u>Different opinions on Germany</u></p> <p>The Big Three have different aims in the negotiation of the TOV as they all have different opinions on Germany. For France, it wanted revenge by making Germany accept total blame for the war and to pay for the cost of the war. They also wanted to regain lands they had lost, such as Alsace-Lorraine, which they had lost to Germany in earlier war. Thus, France wanted Germany's reparations bill to be as large as possible. On the other hand, Britain was concerned over Germany's rise as a naval and industrial power which threatened British interests just before the war. Britain wanted to ensure that Germany no longer threatened Britain's positions in these areas after the war. Yet, Britain was also concerned that a weakened Germany would result in a weakened economy in Europe, which would affect British economy. Thus, British Prime Minister, David Lloyd-George also had to be answerable to the British public's demands to make Germany pay for the war. As for the USA, it wanted a peace that was fair and would not cause the least resentment. The USA thought Germany should be punished but not too much. Therefore, both France and Britain had different opinions on Germany. France saw Germany as a vanquished opponent that had caused much misery and destruction to France whereas Britain saw Germany as a crucial partner in ensuring the economic and political stability in Europe itself. France would make use of the terms set in the TOV as way to punish Germany as it saw Germany as the main instigator of WWI. On the other hand, Britain did not see the TOV as a means to an end in that it would teach Germany a lesson, given that Britain had to be moderate in its demands from Germany.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><u>Different sufferings</u></p> <p>The Big Three have different aims in the negotiation of the TOV as they suffered differently in WWI. The war was fought essentially on French soil and France suffered more destruction than any other country. France also lost about 1.4 million lives. As for Britain, their sufferings were lesser as compared to France despite the high number of British casualties since the war was fought largely on mainland Europe. During WWI, the German submarines did fire and sink American merchant ships which they believed were carrying weapons to Britain across the Atlantic Ocean. The sinking of the US ship Lusitania, which resulted in the deaths of civilians resulted in the USA declaring war on Germany. Again, the Americans did not suffer as much as the French since the USA was located across the Atlantic Ocean. This made the French leader, Georges Clemenceau, more determined to achieve</p>	5-8

	for France what the French public wanted most – to make Germany pay for the war. As France suffered the most from Germany in WWI, the TOV would serve as an opportunity for France to redress the injustices they had experienced during WWI. This posed a sharp contrast with the USA and Britain as they suffered way lesser as compared to France since the war was not fought on their home soil.	
--	---	--

2b	“The major powers were responsible for the failure of the League of Nations.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	12m
L1	Describes the League of Nations (LON) <i>Award one mark for each detail, up to a maximum of two.</i> The LON was an international organisation set up to maintain world peace.	1-2
L2	Explains Yes OR No <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation of 1 side, with further marks for additional supporting details, up to a maximum of 6 marks for a detailed and well-reasoned explanation.</i> Yes, I agree that the major powers is largely responsible for the failure of the LON. The post-war attitudes of the major powers were affected by the horrendous outcomes of the war. For instance, Britain suffered the following military casualties in WWI: approximately 658,700 dead, 2,032,150 wounded, 359,150 missing. Both France and Britain were war-weary and in a pacifist frame of mind. They also did not have sufficient military power to apply sanctions or to deal with military threats from an aggressor nation. In fact, both France and Britain chose a policy of appeasement in face of military threat from Hitler’s Germany in the 1930s. One example would be the Abyssinian Crisis from 1935 – 1936. When Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935, the LON’s sanctions on the sale of arms, rubber and metals to Italy were not very harsh. Britain and France entered into secret negotiations with Italy, thus effectively bypassing the LON’s authority. Despite multiple appeals from the Emperor of Abyssinia to the LON, Britain and France were reluctant to get involved militarily. In the end, Abyssinia was conquered by Italy and Italy left the LON in 1937. Furthermore, the USA retreated back into isolationism with regard to issues outside of Americas. Thus, the major powers viewed their own concerns and interests as more important than the LON’s goal of world peace and security. This meant that the LON was greatly weakened without the support and backing of the major powers. It did not have the credibility when dealing with international conflict since member states could effectively do what they wanted without any fear of actions been taken against them. Therefore, this led to the failure of the LON. OR	3-6

	<p>No, I disagree that the major power is largely responsible for the failure of the LON. The LON's structural weaknesses should be the main cause for its ineffectiveness. The various parts of the LON did not work well together, and it was hard to take effective action. The Secretariat was understaffed and disorganised. Authorisation for any action required both a unanimous vote by the Council and a two-third majority vote in the Assembly. With so many nations represented in the League, it was extremely difficult to obtain unanimous consent for any decision. Also, the LON was established by the LON and soon came to be seen as a league for the victorious nations. The LON's peacekeeping measures was also largely ineffective. For example, it relied on moral persuasion which was ineffective against strong offending nations, which ignored the criticisms and condemnations. The League did not have an army to enforce military sanctions since its members were not willing to get involved militarily. Also, economic sanctions tended to fail as members did not want their economy to be affected. One example would be the Manchurian Crisis in 1931 when Japan invaded Manchuria and established a puppet state called Manchukuo over there. The League refused to recognise Manchukuo and asked that it be returned to China. In response, Japan resigned from the LON and pushed further into China. In addition to that, the League's limited membership has only further exposed its inherent weaknesses. The USA, despite being the world's largest national economy at the time, did not join the LON. Because of the USA's non-interventionist policy, the LON lacked the necessary economic and military backup of the USA to enforce its will. Therefore, the LON's structural weaknesses had only proved its lack of authority and credibility among its member states. Its lack of authority can be seen by the fact that without its own army, it would be unable to enforce military or economic sanctions. It had to rely on major powers, who may not necessarily be interested in enforcing the LON resolutions if it threatened their national interests. Moral persuasion was often insufficient to deal with a military threat. Thus, this would lead to the eventual failure of the LON.</p>	
L3	<p>Explains Yes AND No <i>Award 7 marks for explanations of both sides, with further marks for additional supporting details, up to a maximum of 10 marks for detailed and well-reasoned explanations of both factors.</i></p>	7-10
L4	<p>L3 + Balanced conclusion based on a clear criteria of evaluation of "How far" <i>Award 12 marks for more developed answers.</i></p> <p>L3 + In conclusion, I disagree agree that the major powers were largely responsible for the failure of the League of Nations. Due to the indifferent attitudes of the major powers, it had made cooperation for collective security extremely difficult for the LON. The major powers, namely France and Britain, were reluctant to fully take on their roles as global leaders in supporting the LON's condemnations against aggressor nations had only sent a message to all the member states that the LON lacked authority and credibility. They only served to prove to the world that the national self-interests are way more important that the LON's aims in disarmament and collective security. Thus, the indifferent attitudes had only further worsened the structural weaknesses of the LON. Furthermore, the structural weaknesses of the</p>	11-12

	<p>LON could be easily resolved with the full commitment of the major powers and organisational restructuring as well. If the major powers had been willing to contribute their military forces and impose economic sanctions on countries like Germany, Italy and Japan, it would give the LON more power in deterring their aggression.</p>	
--	---	--

3a	Explain why was there an improvement in the US-Soviet relations during the period of détente in the 1960s.	8
L1	<p>Write about detente without answering the question</p> <p>The period of détente was a time of reduced tensions between the USA and the USSR.</p>	1-2
L2	<p>Describes factors <i>Award 3m for description of factors, 4m for detailed description.</i></p> <p><u>Fear of nuclear war</u></p> <p>There was an improvement in the US-Soviet relations during the period of détente in the 1960s due to the fear of nuclear war. Both superpowers were open towards arms control negotiations. For instance, the USA and the USSR held Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I) in May 1972 where they discussed about attempts to limit and later reduce the number of nuclear weapons that they possessed. They also signed the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in May 1972 in a bid to limit their possession of anti-ballistic missile sites to two for each superpower.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><u>Change of US leadership</u></p> <p>There was an improvement in the US-Soviet relations during the period of détente in the 1960s due to a change in the US leadership. The policy of détente was pioneered by President Richard Nixon's National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger. It marked a change of emphasis in American policy from that pursued by previous administrations such as Kennedy's. instead of focusing on containment and confrontation, détente held that the USA and the USSR had the right to exist side by side as sovereign states. Both superpowers accepted and respected each other's sphere of influence. Also, the USA sought Soviet cooperation in ending the Vietnam War. By the late 1960s, prolonged American involvement in the Vietnam War greatly damaged the prestige of the USA both within and outside the country. Thus, the USA needed the USSR's support to convince communist North Vietnam to negotiate a peace treaty with the USA to end the Vietnam War. Moreover, both superpowers entered into a series of trade negotiations. In 1972, Leonid Brezhnev agreed to repay WWII debts to the USA. In return, the USA granted the most-favoured nations status to the USSR, thus allowing it to purchase large supplies of grain from the USA.</p>	3-4
L3	<p>Explains factors <i>Award 5m for an explanation of one factor, an additional mark up to 6m. Award 7m for two factors explained, an additional mark up to 8m.</i></p> <p><u>Fear of nuclear war</u></p> <p>There was an improvement in the US-Soviet relations during the period of détente in the 1960s due to the fear of nuclear war. Both superpowers were open towards arms control negotiations. For instance, the USA and the USSR held Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I) in May 1972 where they discussed about attempts</p>	5-8

to limit and later reduce the number of nuclear weapons that they possessed. They also signed the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in May 1972 in a bid to limit their possession of anti-ballistic missile sites to two for each superpower. **Hence, both the USA and USSR leaders saw the détente as a means of managing superpower competition without risking Mutually Assured Destruction. With the continued hostility between the two superpowers, it would only lead to further build-up in their respective nuclear arsenal. Such nuclear arms race could only bring the world closer to nuclear doomsday as both sides might make use of their nuclear capabilities against each other that could wipe out the entire human civilisation. With such dangerous prospect, it prompted the USA and the USSR to be more prudent in their use of nuclear threat. They were more willing to deal with each other in such negotiations to reduce their nuclear arsenal.**

OR

Change of US leadership

There was an improvement in the US-Soviet relations during the period of détente in the 1960s due to a change in the US leadership. The policy of détente was pioneered by President Richard Nixon's National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger. It marked a change of emphasis in American policy from that pursued by previous administrations such as Kennedy's. instead of focusing on containment and confrontation, détente held that the USA and the USSR had the right to exist side by side as sovereign states. Both superpowers accepted and respected each other's sphere of influence. Also, the USA sought Soviet cooperation in ending the Vietnam War. By the late 1960s, prolonged American involvement in the Vietnam War greatly damaged the prestige of the USA both within and outside the country. Thus, the USA needed the USSR's support to convince communist North Vietnam to negotiate a peace treaty with the USA to end the Vietnam War. Moreover, both superpowers entered into a series of trade negotiations. In 1972, Leonid Brezhnev agreed to repay WWII debts to the USA. In return, the USA granted the most-favoured nations status to the USSR, thus allowing it to purchase large supplies of grain from the USA. **Therefore, President Richard Nixon has proved to be more open towards negotiations and discussions with the USSR. This provided the 2 superpowers more opportunity for exchanges as both attempted to limit the number of nuclear arms, as well as foster economic cooperation and improve political relations with one another. Both sides were less prone to misperceptions and suspicions with the increase in interactions.**

3b	“The USSR was responsible for the end of the Cold War.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	12
L1	<p>Describes the end of the Cold War without focus on the question</p> <p><i>Award 1m for each detail, up to a maximum of two.</i></p> <p>The Cold War ended on 26 December 1991 with the dissolution of the USSR and its various Soviet republics.</p>	1-2
L2	<p>Explains Yes OR No</p> <p><i>Award 3 marks for an explanation of 1 side, with further marks for additional supporting details, up to a maximum of 6 marks for a detailed and well-reasoned explanation.</i></p> <p>Yes I agree that the USSR is largely responsible for the end of the Cold War. There was a declining confidence in communist ideology and failure of the Soviet economy. The Soviet command economy has been underperforming as compared to the free-market economy that the USA and Western European states embraced. Under the Soviet command economy, the government owned and controlled all industries, decided how resources were distributed and fixed all production quotas. There was no freedom of information, enterprise and individual creativity since citizens were not allowed to start or own businesses. As a result, the quality of information available to the decision-makers was poor. There was an overemphasis on quantitative indicators, along with lack of innovation and creativity, led to poor quality of Soviet goods. The lack of checks and balances on the government had only encouraged officials to falsify statistics to meet quotas and engage in corrupt practices such as bribery. One-party state stifled debate and made reforms difficult. This made it challenging for the USSR to keep up with the USA’s economic growth. In order to keep up with the arms race with the USA, the USSR had to divert many resources to the production of military goods and weapons. This meant that fewer resources were devoted to the production of consumer goods. For example, at the height of the arms race, the USA spent 6% of its gross national product on defence, while the USSR, with an economy half the size of the USA, spent around 16% on defence. Furthermore, the USSR had many external commitments such as its annual oil subsidy to its Warsaw Pact allies amounting to about US\$3 billion and the Soviet-Afghan War had caused huge economic burdens. Because of the inherent flaws in the Soviet economic system, it has led to long-term inefficiencies which made it very difficult for the USSR to catch up with the USA. Due to the long-term financial strains on the USSR, the Soviet government was unable to promote economic growth and improve people’s standard of living. This would, in turn, result in increased frustrations against the government as people started losing faith in the Soviet leadership. Therefore, this led to the eventual collapse of the USSR and hence the end of the Cold War.</p> <p>(Students can also use the examples of Gorbachev’s Perestroika & Glasnost here)</p> <p>OR</p>	3–6

	<p>No I disagree that the USSR is largely responsible for the end of the Cold War. American economic and military superiority should be the main reason that led to the end of Cold War. US President Ronald Reagan initiated a process of economic liberalisation where individual enterprise was greatly encouraged. He also cut national budgets and sold off national assets such as phone companies, oil companies and airlines. His economic reforms had greatly stimulated economic growth and launched financial boom in the West in the 1980s. In addition, the economies of West Germany and Japan, allies of the USA, had been growing after the success of the Marshall Plan. Their economic partnerships with the USA also contributed to the growth of the US economy during the 1980s. Due to the USA's economic boom, Reagan was able to renew the arms race and exert pressure on the USSR's ability to keep up with military expenditure and production. For example, he supported the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) that aimed at developing new technologies, such as satellites deployed in orbit around the earth, to detect and destroy any potential nuclear attack by intercontinental missiles. The USA also held a 10-day joint military exercise, "Able Archer 83", with its NATO allies in Western Europe in November 1983. The exercise was so realistic that the USSR believed it preceded an actual nuclear first strike on the USSR by the USA and NATO. In response, the USSR prepared their nuclear forces and put their air force units in East Germany and Poland on alert. Therefore, this showed that the USA had overwhelming superiority over the USSR as it was able to win the USSR economically and militarily. Due to the US military and economic might, the USSR was unable to sustain its competition against the USA given the sheer amount of financial and manpower resources the USSR had to pour in. This eventually contributed to the decline of the USSR and thus the end of the Cold War</p>	
L3	<p>Explains Yes AND No <i>Award 7 marks for explanations of both sides, with further marks for additional supporting details, up to a maximum of 10 marks for detailed and well-reasoned explanations of both factors.</i></p>	7– 10
L4	<p>L3 + Balanced conclusion based on a clear criteria of evaluation of "How far" <i>Award 12 marks for more developed answers.</i></p> <p>L3 + In conclusion, I agree that the USSR is largely responsible for the end of the Cold War. This was because the dissolution of the USSR had clearly demonstrated long-term decline of the USSR, both internally and externally. It also highlighted the failure of the communist political and economic systems. While the USA was the economic and military powerhouse, it only served as a contributing factor that led to the Soviet decline as it only exposed the inherent weaknesses of the Soviet command economy and thus its inability to keep up with the arms race with the USA. Hence, the root cause of the end of Cold War was still due to the fall of the USSR since it failed to address the inherent problems from within that led to its long-term decay.</p>	11-12

