

**TKGS SECONDARY 4 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS 2023**  
**MARK SCHEME FOR HISTORY ELECTIVE**

**Section A: Source-Based Case Study**

**1(a) Study Source A.**

**Why do you think Khrushchev wrote this letter? Explain your answer.**

**[5]**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Describes the Source / Misinterpretation of the Source</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Based on Message</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Award 2 marks for valid message, unsupported.</i></li> <li><i>Award 3 marks for valid message, supported.</i></li> </ul> <p>Khrushchev wrote this letter to show that the US actions were provocative. [2]  From the source, he wrote that Kennedy had threatened to “use force” if the Soviet Union did “not obey (the US) orders.” Thus, Khrushchev wrote this letter to show Kennedy that he was being escalating the tensions between them. [3]</p>	<b>2-3</b>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Based on Purpose</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Award 5 marks for purpose linked to context.</i></li> </ul> <p>Khrushchev wrote this letter to convince Kennedy that the US actions were provocative so that Kennedy would understand that the Soviet Union was in a difficult position. From the source, Khrushchev wrote that Kennedy was “not appealing to reason” and “want to intimidate (the Soviet Union)” instead. As such he appealed to Kennedy that if “(Kennedy) was in (Khrushchev)’s place, (he) would do the same” and to “weigh the present situation with a cool head without giving way to passion.” [4] The letter was written on 24 October after Kennedy had announced the quarantine against Cuba and had demanded the removal of the missiles in Cuba. As such, by appealing to Kennedy, Khrushchev would have wanted him to withdraw his demands. [5]</p>	<b>4-5</b>

**1(b) Study Source B.**

**How useful is this source to a historian studying the reasons why the Soviet Union assisted Cuba? Explain your answer. [5]**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Useful / Not Useful Based on Provenance</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Useful / Not Useful Based on Content</b> • <i>Award 2 marks for unsupported explanation.</i> • <i>Award 3 marks for supported explanation.</i>  Source B is useful as it shows that the Soviet Union had assisted Cuba for noble reasons which was to help Cuba's defence. [2] From the source, Gromyko stated that "Soviet specialists were training Cubans in handling certain types of armaments which were only defensive" and that "if it were otherwise the Soviet Union would never have agreed to render such assistance." Thus, it shows how the Soviet Union had no intention of escalating tensions between the US and the Soviet Union and had only assisted Cuba purely for noble intentions. [3]	<b>2-3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>L2 + Useful / Not Useful Based on Based on Cross-Reference / Contextual Knowledge</b>  Source B is useful as it is supported by my contextual knowledge. Based on my contextual knowledge, the Soviet Union had only come to Cuba's aid after Castro had publicly announced that Cuba would adopt communism. He had done so after the invasion of the Bay of Pigs. Feeling threatened, it was Castro who seek Khrushchev's help to strengthen Cuba's defence. Therefore, as my contextual knowledge supports Source B, it is reliable and thus, useful. [4]  OR  Source B is not useful as it is challenged by my contextual knowledge. Based on my contextual knowledge, the armaments that was in Cuba was not entirely defensive in nature. By October 1962, the first nuclear warheads had arrived in Cuba and the construction of launch sites and military bases had begun. Therefore, as my contextual knowledge challenges Source B, it is unreliable and thus, limited in its utility. [4]	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>L2 + Not Useful Based on Motive</b>  Source B is not useful as it has a self-serving agenda. Source B is a memorandum of a conversation between President Kennedy and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on 18 October 1962. At that time, the tensions between the two countries were at its peak. As such, Gromyko would have wanted to reassure President Kennedy that the Soviet presence in Cuba was not a threat to US security so that President Kennedy would not take offensive measures that might worsened the tensions further. [5]	<b>5</b>

1(c) Study Sources C and D.

How are the two sources similar? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	<b>Similarity based on Source Type / Provenance / Topic</b>	1
2	<p><b>Similarity in Content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award 3 marks for one valid similarity, unsupported.</li> <li>• Award 4 marks for one valid similarity, supported.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources C and D are similar in highlighting that the Soviet Union's actions had threatened the US security interests.</b> [2] From Source C, there was a label on Khrushchev's shirt that stated, "offensive missile bases in Cuba". This shows how the US security was threatened due to the placement of nuclear weapons that could decimate the country. Similarly in Source D, Khrushchev was portrayed as a knife thrower and Kennedy was seen with many knives around his silhouette. The cartoon is implying that Khrushchev is endangering the USA. [3]</p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Sources C and D are similar in highlighting that Cuba was being made use of by the Soviet Union.</b> [2] From Source C, the cartoon shows that Khrushchev was actually the mastermind behind the placement of missiles in Cuba. This is seen from the reveal of Khrushchev's face after the US had pulled Castro's beard. This suggests that Cuba was being made use of by the Soviet Union to further the Soviet Union's agenda. Similarly, in Source D, Khrushchev was seen holding a knife labelled "Cuba" and he looked like he was getting ready to throw it at Kennedy. This also shows how the Soviet Union is using Cuba to hurt the USA. [3]</p>	2-3
3	<p><b>Two Similarity in Content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award 4 marks for two similarities, unsupported.</li> <li>• Award 5 marks for two similarities, supported.</li> </ul>	4-5
4	<p><b>L2 + Similarity Based on Intention of Sources</b></p> <p><b>Sources C and D are similar in their intentions.</b> Both sources are trying to justify the US implementation of the quarantine against Cuba by showing how the Soviet Union was making use of Cuba to endanger US security. Both sources are produced in October 1962 after the US had discovered the missiles in Cuba and had announced the quarantine against Cuba, demanding the removal of the missiles. In Source C, there is a paper labelled "the Quarantine" on the table with the US pulling at Castro's beard to expose the Soviet Union as the mastermind behind the offensive missiles in Cuba. Thus, this is meant to explain why the US imposed the Quarantine as a defensive measure. Similarly, in Source D, Kennedy was portrayed as having said, "Okay, that's enough!" to the countless of knives that the Soviet Union had thrown at the USA. While all of the knives had missed Kennedy, it is trying to show that the USA had had enough of the Soviet Union's provocative actions and hence imposing the quarantine. [6]</p>	6

(d) Study Sources E and F.

Does Source F make you surprised by Source E? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptor	Mark
1	<b>Yes / No. Based on Provenance</b>	1
2	<b>Yes / No, Based on Source Content, Supported</b>  • Award 2 marks for details from one source • Award 3 marks for details from both sources  Yes, Source F makes me surprised by Source E <b>as they differ on the security threat that the Soviet Union posed.</b> In Source E, Kennedy was dismissing the Soviet as a threat by stating that the “Russians are sufficiently experienced people to understand that the military equipment which they are supplying to Cuba, or can supply in the future, would make little difference if the USA were to consider itself forced to take military action against it.” [2] However, in Source F, Kennedy portrayed the Soviet Union as a big security threat. He stated that the “missiles in Cuba add to an already clear and present danger.” Hence, Source F makes me surprised by Source E. [3]	2-3
3	<b>L2 + Yes / No, Based on Cross-Referenced to Other Sources And / Or Contextual Knowledge</b>  I’m not surprised by Source E as it can be supported by my contextual knowledge. From what I know, it is true that the Soviet did not pose much threat at that time as the US had more nuclear warheads than the Soviet Union and had more missiles with longer range attack than the Soviet Union. This was one of the reasons why the Soviet Union chose to place missiles in Cuba which was to close the missile gap between the US and the Soviet Union. Thus, Kennedy’s sentiment in Source E is not surprising. [4]	4
4	<b>L2 + Yes / No, Based on Purpose / Context</b>  Source F does not make me surprised by Source E as it has an agenda. Source F is an extract of Kennedy’s speech to the American public, announcing the quarantine against Cuba. Thus, in order to convince the Americans to support the quarantine, he would have needed to play up on the seriousness of the Soviet threat. Thus, Source F does not make me surprised by Source E as even though they disagree on the threat that the Soviet Union posed, I understand why Source F would paint the Soviet Union as a big security threat. [5]  OR  Source E does not make me surprised due to its context. Source E was an extract from Kennedy’s speech at a closed press conference where only selected press members were invited. In addition, they were not allowed to publish what was being said. As such, Kennedy could afford to be more candid and voice his true opinions on the situation. [6]	5-6

1(e) Study all the sources.

'The Soviet Union is responsible for escalating tensions leading to the Cuban Missile Crisis.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
1	<b>Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use</b>	1
2	<b>Yes OR No, Supported by Valid Source Use</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use, and additional mark for each subsequent valid source use to a maximum of 4 marks.</li> </ul>	2-4
3	<b>Yes AND No, Supported by Valid Source Use</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Award 5 marks for one Yes and No supported by valid source use, and additional mark for each subsequent valid source use to a maximum of 7 marks.</li> </ul> <p><u>YES</u></p> <p><b>Source C supports the view as it shows that the Soviet Union was the mastermind behind the placement of the missiles in Cuba.</b> From the source, it shows how when the US “pulled Castro’s beard” it revealed Khrushchev’s face with him wearing a shirt with a label, “Offensive missiles in Cuba.” On the table, there was also a piece of paper with the word “Quarantine.” As such, it is implying that the Soviet Union’s actions had escalated tensions as it led to the US response of imposing a naval blockade.</p> <p><b>Source D supports the view as it shows how the Soviet Union had been the one to constantly provoke the US, escalating tensions.</b> From the source, it shows how Khrushchev was portrayed as a knife thrower, throwing knives at Kennedy. Kennedy was seen to have a few near misses. The cartoon caption, “okay, that’s enough!” shows how Kennedy finally burst after tolerating the Soviet Union multiple provocations. Thus, the source blames the Soviet Union for escalating tensions.</p> <p><b>Source F supports the view as it shows how the Soviet Union’s actions caused Kennedy to announce the quarantine against Cuba.</b> From the source, Kennedy declared the Soviet Union’s “sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil” as a “deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country.” This shows that the Soviet Union had an ulterior motive as they were assembling the missiles in Cuba secretly, meaning that they knew that this would provoke the US. By doing it anyway, this supports that the Soviet Union was responsible for escalating tensions leading to the Cuban Missile Crisis.</p> <p><u>NO</u></p> <p><b>Source A does not support the view and instead shows how the US was responsible for escalating tensions leading to the Cuban Missile Crisis.</b> From the source, Khrushchev accused Kennedy that the “reason behind (Kennedy)’s demands is due to (his) hatred for the Cuban people and their government.” He added that that was “not justifiable.” Thus, this shows that the US was the one responsible for escalating tensions by making unreasonable demands based on personal agenda.</p>	5-8

Level	Descriptor	Marks
	<p><b>Source B does not support the view and instead shows how the Soviet Union was the one trying to de-escalate the tensions.</b> From Source B, it shows the Soviet Foreign Minister, Gromyko, reassuring Kennedy that the Cuban's training by Soviet specialists were "only defensive" and that "if it were otherwise, the Soviet Union would never have agreed to render such assistance." As such, it shows how the Soviet Union was trying to de-escalate tensions by emphasising that they had no intention of attacking USA through Cuba.</p> <p><b>Source E does not support the view as it shows how the Soviet Union was not even seen as threat.</b> From the source, it is highlighted how the "military equipment which (the Russians) are supplying to Cuba, or can supply in the future would make little difference if the USA were to consider itself forced to take military action against it." This shows how the US did not even view the Soviet Union as a threat and as such implied that the Soviet Union's actions would not increase any tension.</p> <p><b>For L2 and L3, award a bonus mark for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability and utility. The total mark must not exceed 8.</b></p> <p><i>* Suggested Evaluation of Source Reliability</i></p> <p>Source E can be supported by my contextual knowledge, making it reliable. In Source E, Kennedy had dismissed the Soviet Union as a threat and implied that the US is stronger than the Soviet Union and could take it down if "forced to take military action". This is true as at that time, the US had more nuclear warheads than the Soviet Union and had more missiles with longer attack range than the Soviet Union. This was one of the reasons why the Soviet Union chose to place the missiles in Cuba which was to close the missile gap between the US and the Soviet Union. Thus, as my contextual knowledge supports Source E, it makes Source E more reliable and a strong source to challenge the view.</p>	

## Section B: Structured–Essay Questions

2. (a) Explain why the Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles.

[8]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	<b>Describes the Treaty of Versailles, but without focus on the question.</b> <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i>	1-2
2	<b>Identifies or describes reason(s) why the Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles.</b> <i>Award 3 marks for identification without description. Award 4 marks for detailed description.</i>	3-4
3	<p><b>Explain reason(s) why the Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles.</b> <i>Award 5-6 marks for one explained factor, award 7-8 marks for two explained factors.</i></p> <p><u>Reason 1:</u> The Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles <b>as it had crippled Germany's economy.</b> The Treaty had not only made Germany pay a huge amount of reparations but at the same time had deprived Germany of its ability to earn money. The War Guilt Clause dictated that the Germany would take full responsibility for World War I. As a result, Germany would have to pay 6600 million pounds. This placed a significant burden on its economy. [5] In addition, Germany was forced to relinquish all its colonies and resource-rich lands which hindered its economic recovery. The Treaty of Versailles saw Germany losing 10% of its land, 16% of its coalfields, half of its iron and steel and all of its colonial possessions. Loss of land included important industrial areas such as the Saar coalfields and Upper Silesia. This meant that industrialization was disrupted and made it difficult for the German economy to recover. Loss of colonial possessions also meant that Germany could no longer tap on the cheap raw materials from their colonies which would have aided in their industrialization. Thus, the Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles as it brought about economic hardship. [6]</p> <p><u>Reason 2:</u> The Germans also hated the Treaty of Versailles <b>as it stripped Germany of its ability to defend itself and thus was humiliating.</b> The terms of the Treaty was aimed to prevent Germany from being able to launch an attack again but in doing so, it also left Germany vulnerable to attacks. Germany's army was limited to 100 000 men and Germany was not allowed to have an air force, tanks or submarines. This made it insufficient for Germany to defend themselves. As the military was one of the sources of German pride, the emasculation of the German army made the Germans hate the Treaty. [5] In addition, the Rhineland was demilitarised. As Rhineland was a buffer zone between France and Germany, this meant that Germany was now more susceptible to attacks from France. This incensed the Germans further. [6]</p>	5-8

2. (b) 'Post-war attitudes of the major powers was the main reason for the failure of the League of Nations.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [12]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	<b>Describes post-war attitudes of the major powers / League of Nations, but without focus on the question.</b> <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i>	1-2
2	<b>Explains Yes OR No</b> <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</i>	3-6
3	<b>Explains Yes AND No</b> <i>Award 7 marks for an explanation of Yes AND No, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks.</i> <p><u>Yes</u></p> <p>Post-war attitudes of the major powers was indeed the main reason for the failure of the League of Nations. After World War I, the major powers adopted a pacifist attitude due to the disastrous outcomes of the war. Britain and France were war-weary and adopted a pacifist frame of mind as they embarked on rebuilding their own country's defence and economy. This led to both countries preferring to adopt a policy of appeasement to avoid conflict. [3] As both Britain and France were the only countries strong enough to deal with a military threat, their unwillingness to be involved in military conflicts meant that the League's capability to enforce collective security would be weakened. [4] Moreover, there were general feelings of distrust where members were unwilling to disarm as they were afraid that that they may not be able to protect their own interests. Hence, post-war attitudes of the major power led to them viewing their own concerns and interests as more important than the League's goal of world peace and security. [5] This in turn made the League unable to enforce decisions or contain aggressive countries leading to its failure. [6]</p> <p><u>No</u></p> <p>However, the failure of the League of Nations was also due to its limited membership. The League suffered from limited membership as the USA which had the richest economy and was one of the strongest military power at that time refused to join the League due to its policy of isolationism. This meant that the League did not have the necessary economic and military backup of the USA to enforce its will. [3] In addition, the Soviet Union was also not part of the League as it was seen as a threat due to its communist ideology. Germany was also not allowed to join the League until 1926 due to its involvement in World War I. This meant that three major world powers were not in the League. This weakened the League greatly because it lacked influence and resources to enforce sanctions effectively. [4]</p> <p>In addition, the League lacked authority and credibility as its peacekeeping measures were inadequate. The League's peacekeeping measures included moral persuasion, military and economic sanctions. There was no army to enforce military sanctions and trade sanctions often did not work. Moral persuasion was also ineffective against strong offending nations which ignored the criticisms and condemnations. For example, when Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935, the League was unable to chase Italy out due to the lack of military force. While the League had decided to impose economic sanctions on Italy in the end, it was half-hearted as Britain and France were afraid of taking a strong</p>	7-10



Level	Descriptors	Marks
	<p>action in case Mussolini became an ally of Hitler. This led to Italy's successful invasion and Italy even left the League after the League's condemnation. This shows how the League was powerless to enforce any rules or decision. [5] Offending nations being allowed to leave the League without any consequence undermined the League's authority, leading to its failure. [6]</p>	
4	<p><b>L3 + Reaches a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of 'How far...'</b>  <i>Award 12 marks for fully developed answers.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, I agree with the statement. Post-war attitudes of the major powers was indeed the main reason for the failure of the League as it was the underlying factor for the League's failure. [11] This is because it played a great role in shaping the League's decision making and peacekeeping measures. For example, Britain and France did not want to take a stronger action against Mussolini due to their own economic self-interest also. Its limited membership was also due to post-war attitudes of the major powers with the USA retreating back into isolationism and with the exclusion of Germany as France wanted to contain Germany and keep it weak. Thus, the post-war attitudes of the major power was the main reason for the League's failure. [12]</p>	11-12

3. (a) Explain why the relationship between the USA and the USSR soured after World War II.

[8]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	<p><b>Describes the relationship between the USA and the USSR, but without focus on the question.</b></p> <p><i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i></p>	1-2
2	<p><b>Identifies or describes reason(s) why the relationship between the USA and the USSR soured after World War II.</b></p> <p><i>Award 3 marks for identification without description. Award 4 marks for detailed description.</i></p>	3-4
3	<p><b>Explain reason(s) why the relationship between the USA and the USSR soured after World War II.</b></p> <p><i>Award 5-6 marks for one explained factor, award 7-8 marks for two explained factors.</i></p> <p><u>Reason 1:</u>  The relationship between the USA and the USSR soured after WWII <b>as there was no longer a common enemy that could unite the two superpowers.</b> Once Germany had been defeated, the common objective that had bound USA and the USSR had gone. When this happened, both sides started to fulfil their own objectives that served their own national interests and in trying to do so, encroached into each other's interests. [5] For the USSR, their objective was to secure those areas that could form a buffer between Germany and USSR as Germany had attacked them twice in 30 years. This led to the establishment of pro-Soviet governments in Eastern Europe. However, this was perceived by the US as a form of aggression and as such introduced measures to contain it. This led to the introduction of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan which targeted Communism as it committed the US to assist countries fighting against Communism. These policies were in turn viewed as a threat by the Soviet Union leading to the formation of COMINFORM and COMECON. As such, once there was no need to work together against a common enemy, the USA and USSR strategic moves to secure their national interests would lead to the deterioration of their relationship. [6]</p> <p><u>Reason 2:</u>  The relationship between the USA and the USSR also soured after WWII <b>as they had differing visions for the world, post-World War II.</b> USA and the Western powers wanted to revive Germany's economy as they believed that it was important for Europe's recovery. On the other hand, the USSR wanted a weak Germany that could no longer pose a threat to the Soviet Union. As such, many unimportant issues remained unsettled at Potsdam such as how much reparations Germany had to pay. Their disagreement on the development of post-war Germany would serve to bring out their differences in their ideologies and goals, souring their relationship. [5] In addition, US wanted to further their influence in Europe through the economic revitalisation of the European countries and wanted to prevent the spread of communist influence in Europe. However, The Soviet Union wanted to build and secure its own influence in Eastern Europe for their own security issues. Thus, this difference deepened their distrust for each other as both sought to spread their influence. [6]</p>	5-8

3. (b) 'Gorbachev's reforms was the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

[12]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	<b>Describes Gorbachev's reforms, but without focus on the question.</b> <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i>	1-2
2	<b>Explains Yes OR No</b> <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</i>	3-6
3	<b>Explains Yes AND No</b> <i>Award 7 marks for an explanation of Yes AND No, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks.</i> <p><u>Yes</u></p> <p>Gorbachev's reforms did contribute to the collapse of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev had wanted to revive the Soviet Union and implemented a series of reforms, notably Glasnost and Perestroika. Glasnost was implemented for greater transparency and freedom of speech as Gorbachev believed that the changes he envisioned for the Soviet Union could only happen if the economic and social problems of the country were allowed to be discussed openly. As such he launched a series of public debates in 1986. He also instructed the Soviet censors to relax the censorship of books, journals and newspapers. However, the relaxation of censorship adversely affected how Soviet and Eastern European citizens viewed their governments. For many years, the Soviet government had denied the existence of problems such as poor housing and food shortages. These problems were now gradually made public. As a result, the positive picture of Soviet life that the government had previously presented to the public fell apart and they lost confidence in the vision and rule of the communist governments. [3] Glasnost had created a platform of where criticism of communist rule could not be controlled leading to the citizens increase resistance in the Soviet bloc as they wanted independence. This would pave the way for the collapse of the Soviet Union. [4]</p> <p>In addition, Gorbachev's reform of Perestroika also led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. Perestroika was a programme of economic and political reforms. Economically, it had aimed to encourage greater productivity among Soviet workers and private ownership was allowed in several sectors. Prices of goods and services were now set by the enterprises and there was a relaxation of central control over wages. However, in spite of its good intentions, Perestroika failed. This was because the government still retained control over the means of productions such as trucks and tractors which business owners had to pay high taxes for. Agricultural infrastructure remained inadequate. This led to many Soviet citizens losing interest in wanting to start their own businesses and shortages of food and basic necessities persisted. [5] As a result, Perestroika had failed to revive the Soviet economy. This resulted in more unhappiness and dissatisfaction with the Soviet government, laying the foundations for political revolutions in both the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellite states which would eventually lead to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. [6]</p> <p><u>No</u></p> <p>However, the structural weakness of the Soviet Union was the fundamental reason for its collapse in 1991. The Soviet command economy had begun to stagnate from the 1970s. This was because of the inherent flaws of the Soviet</p>	7-10

Level	Descriptors	Marks
	<p>command economy as compared to the free market economy that the West had embraced. Their main difference lies in how resource allocation was decided. In a command economy, the government owns and controls all industries. In contrast, the free market economy allows individuals to decide on the amount of resources to produce and competition is encouraged to stimulate growth. Hence, the USSR's command economy resulted in a lack of innovation and creativity which led to poor quality of Soviet goods as compared to the West. [3] The poor living standards increased dissent against the Soviet government and led to its eventual collapse. [4]</p> <p>In addition, the collapse of the Soviet Union can also be attributed to the US policies, specifically Reagan's. For instance, Reagan began a process of economic liberalisation which managed to improve US economy by the 1980s. It also enabled him to renew the arms race. For example, Reagan supported the SDI to counter potential nuclear attack by intercontinental missiles. Reagan's aggressive policies only aggravated Soviet Union's economic problems as it struggled to keep up with the economic expenditure. Later, US improved relations with USSR as seen in the INF Treaty and START 1. which alarmed hardliners in the Soviet Union. Hence, Reagan contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union because his aggressive policies in the early 1980s further aggravated existing economic problems in the Soviet Union as it struggled to keep up with military expenditure and production. [5] At the same time, Reagan's policies to improve superpower relations with Gorbachev made Gorbachev lose credibility in the eyes of the hardliners in the government who saw his actions in the nuclear disarmament talks as conceding defeat to the US. This would therefore lead to the attempted coup in 1991 later on, and thus the dissolution of the Soviet Union. [6]</p>	
4	<p><b>L3 + Reaches a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of 'How far...'</b>  <i>Award 12 marks for fully developed answers.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, I disagree that the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union was due to Gorbachev's reforms. Yes, Gorbachev's reforms did serve to escalate the collapse of the Soviet Union but it was not the main reason. Instead, the structural weakness of the Soviet command economy was the fundamental reason for its collapse. [11] Firstly, Gorbachev's policies was an attempt to rectify the problems caused by the long-term structural problems of the command economy but the rot was too far along for Gorbachev's policies to make any meaningful changes. Secondly, the weakness of the command economy made the Soviet Union unable to compete with the US economic strength leading to Gorbachev having to work on maintaining friendly ties with the US leading to him losing credibility in the eyes of the hardliners in his government. As such, the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union was the long-term structural weakness of the Soviet command economy. [12]</p>	11-12