



TEMASEK JUNIOR COLLEGE
JC2 Preliminary Examinations
HIGHER 2



HISTORY

Paper 1 Shaping the International Order (1945-2000)

9752/01
28 August 2019
3 hours

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

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

Start each answer on a fresh piece of writing paper.

You may use an HB pencil for any diagrams, graphs or rough working.

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

Section A

Answer **Question 1**.

Section B

Answer **two** questions.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together with the cover sheet on top.

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

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.

SECTION A

You **must** answer Question 1.

THE END OF THE COLD WAR

1 Read the sources and then answer the questions which follow.

Source A

What held the two sides back from a 'hot' war throughout the Cold War, was the certain knowledge that the enemy had the weapons to mount a devastating counteroffensive. ... Yet, no serious attempt was made to end the Cold War. At best, the leaders strove to lessen the dangers. ... The Cold War therefore seemed a permanent feature of global politics, and pacifists and anti-nuclear campaigners seemed entirely lacking in realism.

Things changed sharply in March 1985 when Mikhail Gorbachev became Soviet General Secretary and formed a partnership for peace with Ronald Reagan. Not long before becoming President in January 1981, Reagan was shocked to hear that America had no defence against a nuclear attack. Wanting to end the arms race, he called for a reduction in the stocks of atomic weapons held by both superpowers. Gorbachev echoed his appeals to eliminate all nuclear weaponry. ... A serious meeting of minds occurred as General Secretary and President directed their administrations towards cooperation in reducing the number of nuclear missiles. As a result, in 1987 – 1990 alone, against every expectation, the superpowers signed agreements on intermediate-range and strategic nuclear weapons, on Afghanistan, on conventional forces and on German reunification.

From a book published in 2015.

Source B

Students, your parents and grandparents have lived through a world war and helped America to rebuild the world. They witnessed the drama of post-war nations divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift. Wise men – Truman and Eisenhower, [...], Marshall, Acheson and Kennan – crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansion, would turn inward and address the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system.

And they were right. The Soviet Union is now publicly facing this hard reality. Containment worked. Containment worked because our democratic principles, institutions and values are sound, and always have been. It worked because our alliances were and are strong; and because the superiority of free societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is undeniable.

From US president George Bush's address to a graduating class at an American University in May 1989.

Source C

For 45 years we succeeded in preventing a major war. This fact alone shows that in the past all was not bad. But all the same, the conclusion is obvious--the emphasis on force, on military superiority, and along with it the arms race, has not justified itself. Both our countries apparently understand this better than any of the others. The emphasis on ideological confrontation did not justify itself either and resulted only in our continual criticism of each other. We reached a dangerous line. And it is good that we knew enough to stop. It is good that a mutual understanding has arisen between our countries. ...

On the strategic level, Cold War methods and confrontations have suffered defeat. ... Therefore we – in the USSR and in the US – can do a lot together at this stage to alter radically our old approaches. We were aware of this in our dealings with the Reagan administration. The process is continuing now. And look at how we have opened up to each other.

Gorbachev's remarks to Bush during the Malta Summit, 2 December 1989.

Source D

The meetings show that the centre of the disarmament dialogue is shifting more and more to the question of reducing the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe. This is the result of progress in nuclear issues and our own initiatives regarding Europe. Some people want to seize our initiative. Others, headed by Thatcher, want to show that our initiatives are only rhetoric; ... They accuse us of propaganda and suggest that we are happy with the "superiority" and essentially do not want to change anything. We have already agreed to release data jointly with the Americans. But this is only half the battle.

If we want to keep the dynamic and the trust in our initiatives, we have to seriously consider the proposals coming from different NATO circles, such as the social-democrats, and of course the American senators. They are not amateurs; these proposals have been developed by specialists, scientists, and people who wield a great deal of influence in the disarmament process.

Gorbachev, during a conference with Politburo Members, March 10, 1988, on the meeting with American Senators and the US Minister of Defence.

Source E



A cartoon published in an American newspaper, 29 November 1987.

Source F

Fate had it that when I found myself at the head of the state it was already clear that all was not well in the country. There is plenty of everything: land, oil and gas, other natural riches ... yet we lived much worse than developed countries and keep falling behind them more and more.

The reason could already be seen: The society was suffocating in the vice of the command-bureaucratic system, doomed to serve ideology and bear the terrible burden of the arms race. It had reached the limit of its possibilities. All attempts at partial reform, and there had been many, had suffered defeat, one after another. The country was losing perspective. We could not go on living like that. Everything had to be changed radically. ...

We [now] live in a new world. The Cold War has ended, the arms race has stopped, as has the insane militarization which mutilated our economy, public psyche and morals. The threat of a world war has been removed. Once again I want to stress that on my part everything was done during the transition period to preserve reliable control of the nuclear weapons.

We opened ourselves to the world, gave up interference into other people's affairs, the use of troops beyond the borders of the country, and trust, solidarity and respect came in response.

From Gorbachev's farewell speech to the Soviet Union, December 1991.

Now answer the following questions:

- a) Compare and contrast the evidence provided in Sources C and D about the Soviet Union's relations with the West.
[10]
- b) How far do sources A – F support the assertion that the end of the Cold War was mainly a result of long-term developments?
[30]

SECTION B

You must answer **two** questions from this section.

EITHER

- 2 Assess the impact of the actions of the United States on the development of the global economy from 1945 to 2000. [30]

OR

- 3 How crucial were international circumstances in explaining the economic transformation of Taiwan and South Korea from the 1970s to 1990? [30]

AND EITHER

- 4 Evaluate the claim that the maintenance of international peace and security from 1945 to 2000 depended primarily on the United Nations Secretary General. [30]

OR

- 5 'The permanent five members of the Security Council were more of a hindrance than a help to United Nations peace efforts from 1945 to 2000.' How far do you agree? [30]

End of Paper

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

