

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



CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL Preliminary Examination Secondary 4 (O-Level Programme)

HISTORY

2174/02

Paper 2: Developments in the post-WWII world: The Cold War and decolonisation in Southeast Asia, 1940s-1991

1 September 2025

1 hr 50 mins

Additional Materials: Answer Booklets

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

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

Write in dark blue or black pen.

You may use a soft pencil for any rough working.

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

DO NOT WRITE ON THE MARGINS.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **two** questions.

Write all answers on the Answer Booklets provided.

For examiner's use only:

Section A	/ 30 m
Section B	/ 20 m
Total	/ 50 marks

At the end of the examination, submit Section A and B separately.

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

This document consists of **5** printed pages.

[Turn over

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

1 (a) Study Source A.

Why was the cartoon published? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Source B.

How far can you trust what the Soviets are saying about the Berlin Crisis?
Explain your answer. [6]

(c) Study Sources C and D.

How far does Source C make you surprised by Source D? Explain your
answer. [6]

(d) Study Source E.

What is the message of the source? Explain your answer. [5]

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

'USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War tensions.' How far do
the sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain
your answer. [8]

Was the USSR responsible for deepening Cold War tensions surrounding the Berlin Crisis?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Berlin Crisis on 28 June 1948, was the first major crisis of the Cold War, setting the stage for decades of tensions that were to follow. The USSR had already disagreed with Britain and the USA at Potsdam (July 1945) about what should be done with Germany. The Western Allies and USSR had different aims for what they wanted to do to Germany. Stalin wanted to destroy Germany. On the other side, Britain, France, and the USA wanted to rebuild Germany's industries through economic reforms and not repeat the mistake of Versailles. These highlighted the stark differences between USA and USSR's policies towards Germany.

Was the USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis responsible for deepening Cold War tensions?

Source A: *A cartoon titled “The Bird Watcher” by British cartoonist E.H. Shepard, published in Punch magazine on 14 July, 1948.*



[Turn over

Source B: A Soviet commentary on the Berlin crisis, published in an international newspaper on 12 May 1949.

The Crisis was planned in Washington, behind a smokescreen of anti-Soviet propaganda. In 1948 there was danger of war. The conduct of the Western powers to strengthen the West German economy risked bloody incidents. However, in the Spring of 1949, the USA was forced to yield as their war plans had come to nothing because of the conduct of the USSR.

Source C: An extract from a memo written by Alexander Paniushkin, Soviet Ambassador to the USA, to George Marshall, 14 July 1948.

The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshall Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe. Moreover, the introduction of a separate monetary reform in West Germany, has placed Berlin and the whole Soviet zone of occupation in a predicament as it threatens to pour into Berlin and the Soviet zones of occupation. Hence, the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation.

Source D: President Truman, speaking to the American media in 1949.

When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and, a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin. However, we refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test our ability and our will to resist.

Source E: A historian writing in 1984.

The Berlin airlift was a considerable achievement but neither side gained anything from the confrontation. The USSR had not gained control of Berlin. The West had no guarantees that land communications would not be cut again. Above all, confrontation made both sides even more stubborn.

Source F: A US Government report, June 1948.

On 23 June, the Soviet authorities suspended all traffic into Berlin because of alleged technical difficulties. They also stopped *barge traffic on similar grounds. Shortly before midnight, the Soviet authorities issued orders to disrupt electric power from Soviet power plants to the Western sectors. Shortage of fuel was the reason given for this measure.

*barge: A long flat-bottomed boat for carrying freight on canals and rivers, either under its own power or towed by another.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2** 'The main reason the Malayan Union failed was because the Malays feared that they would be marginalised.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 3** 'The main aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 4** 'Gorbachev's reforms were a failure'. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

~ End of Paper ~

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A: <https://asaphistory.com/tag/berlin-blockade/>

Source B: Ben Welsh GCSE Modern World History, second edition (London: John Murray Publishers Ltd 2002).

Source C: <https://www.cia.gov/resources/csi/static/b25274f2d807c2a6e7aef7579a022335/On-the-Front-Lines-of-the-Cold-War-2-Part2-web.pdf>

Source D: Ben Welsh GCSE Modern World History, second edition (London: John Murray Publishers Ltd 2002).

Source E: Berlin 1948-9 & NATO Johnndclare https://www.johnndclare.net/cold_war9

Source F: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berlin_Blockade

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (CHS) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

Catholic High School is part of the Ministry of Education (Singapore)

Prelim Sec 4 Core History 2025
Section A SBQ Suggested Answer Scheme

1a) Study Source A

Why was the cartoon published?

L1	Sub-message <i>i.e. It is to tell that the West Berliners representing USA, British and France were being invaded by USSR who were occupying Eastern Berlin</i>	1m
L2	<i>Source A's historical context lies in the early Cold War tensions over Germany immediately after World War II, specifically the situation in Berlin in 1948, right before the outbreak of the Berlin Crisis (1948–1949). After World War II in 1945, Germany was divided into four occupation zones controlled by the U.S., U.K., France, and the Soviet Union. Berlin, located deep inside the Soviet zone of East Germany, was also divided into four sectors. Tensions began to rise from 1947–1948 as political differences between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union deepened. The West sought economic recovery in their zones, including introducing the Marshall Plan and a new German currency (the Deutsche Mark). The Soviets opposed these moves, seeing them as threats to their influence. Berlin was of strategic importance because West Berlin was a Western-controlled Island inside Soviet territory which was a symbolic and strategic foothold for the West in Eastern Europe. Thus, in retaliation, the USSR launched the Berlin Blockade on 24 June 1948 whereby they blocked all road, rail, and canal access from West Germany into West Berlin, cutting off 2.5 million residents from food, coal, and supplies. Stalin's aim was to force the Allies out of Berlin without direct military confrontation</i>	2m
L3	Main Message, supported <i>Source A was published to show that Stalin was helpless and could not stop the Allies from circumventing/ overcoming the Berlin blockade that Stalin had initiated. This is so as the British depicts the Allies as a strong united force (combined effort) as seen by the massive number of planes the airlift of food supplies of food and coal into Berlin by the massive number of planes which are drawn as storks who represent the giver of life. At the same time, the cartoon portrays Stalin as holding a rifle but pointing the rifle to the sky and not at the storks thus showing that the Soviets, despite their hostility, did not shoot down the planes as they wanted to avoid a direct war but hoping the airlift would fail. Further more the captions of "Bird Watcher" implies that Stalin was merely passive and was unable to take action. From my contextual knowledge, I know that the Western Allies responded with the Berlin Airlift, flying in supplies using the agreed-upon air corridors. At its peak, planes landed in West Berlin every 30 seconds, delivering over 2 million tons of goods and that the Soviets avoided a confrontation as they were behind USA in terms of the nuclear arms race at that point in time/ could not afford to engage in a nuclear war with the US.</i> <i>(The cartoon is symbolic of conveying the feeling of helplessness and uncertainty that people felt, aware that if a nuclear war broke out, it could lead to the end of humanity)</i>	3m

L4	<p>Purpose of the cartoon (explain motive of the author for drawing the cartoon -</p> <p><i>Award the 5th mark only if students have addressed the audience and intended outcome of the author's motive.</i></p> <p><i>The motive of the British cartoonist was to use the cartoon as a propaganda tool to praise/glorify the US, British and France combined military effort/actions for being able to circumvent/overcome the Berlin Blockade which Stalin had launched, while at the same time, mocking Stalin for being helpless and not being able to retaliate leading to the failure of the Berlin Blockade. I know this as the cartoon depicts storks, who represent givers of life, carrying coal and food to Berlin. Essentially, the storks are symbolic of the Allies taking action as a strong united force (combined effort), flying the massive number of planes towards Berlin as part of the airlift of supplies to the Berliners because of the road, rail and canal blockade that the Soviets had launched with the intention of starving the West Berliners in order to force them to leave their occupied zones. At the same time, the cartoon portrays Stalin as holding a rifle but pointing the rifle towards the sky and not at the storks, thus indicating that the Soviets, despite their hostility, could not shoot down the planes, as they needed to avoid a war because they could not afford to engage in a nuclear war with the US. This was so as the Soviets had not yet achieved nuclear parity with the US at that point in time. (5m). The British cartoonist wanted to convince the British public to continue to support the Allied effort so that the democratic Allies can eventually win the ideological conflict which they were facing with the Soviet Union.(6m)</i></p>	4-5 m
----	--	-------

- b) How far can you trust what the Soviets are saying about the Berlin Crisis? Explain your answer.

L1	Undeveloped Provenance <i>E.g. It can be trusted because it is Soviet commentary on the Berlin crisis, published in an international newspaper in 1949.</i>	1m
L2	Can trust based on reliability of content i.e. true information about the Berlin Crisis, supported. OR Cannot trust based on unreliability of content i.e. false information, about the Berlin Crisis, supported. <i>Award 2 marks for reliable <u>Or</u> not reliable in content, supported. Award 3 marks for reliable <u>And</u> not reliable in content, supported.</i>	2-3m
L3	Can trust based on reliability of content i.e. true information about the Berlin Crisis, supported. AND Cannot trust based on unreliability of content i.e. false information, about the Berlin Crisis, supported. <i>Award 4 marks for reliable <u>Or</u> not reliable in content supported + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge. Award 5 marks for Reliable <u>And</u> Not Reliable in content, supported + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge.</i> <u>Can trust because reliable + supported + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge</u> <i>E.g. <u>I can trust what the Soviets are saying in Source B as it is reliable to in providing factual information about the reasons why Stalin was provoked to implement the Berlin Blockade.</u> Source B states that, “The conduct of the Western powers to strengthen the West German economy risked bloody incidents.” This implied that because USA, with its Allies, Britain, France, had taken steps to strengthened West Germany by introducing economic reforms in their occupied zones in West Berlin, it indicated to Stalin that their main objective was geared towards eventually establishing West Germany/whole of Germany as a democratic country, thus indirectly challenging the communist ideology.</i>	4-5m

Cross-referencing

I know that this is true as from my contextual knowledge, Britain, USA and France decided to join their occupied zones in West Germany to call it Trizonia, and subsequently introduced economic reforms such as the Marshall Plan and a new currency which was indicative of introducing democratic elements, it created tensions with USSR who were occupying Eastern Germany and Eastern Berlin thus, provoking Stalin to implement the Berlin blockade from West Germany to West Berlin as a retaliation to force the Allies in West Berlin to leave by the West Berlin zones which fell within the perimeter of USSR's occupied zone. In turn, Stalin could introduce communist elements in his own occupied zones to ensure the allies did not have an upper hand in Cold War politics.

AND

Cannot trust based on unreliability of content as it contains false information + cross-reference to contextual knowledge/ other sources.

1) However, I cannot trust what the Soviets are saying about the Berlin Crisis because it is unreliable as it provides false information in terms of USA being the mastermind/chief manipulator behind the Berlin Crisis as Source A states that, "The Crisis was planned in Washington, behind a smokescreen of anti-Soviet propaganda. In 1948 there was danger of war". This implied that the Berlin Crisis was a deliberate ploy by USA to challenge USSR's communist ideology/to put communism in a bad light by provoking USSR which then led Stalin to impose the Blockade. Stalin perceived USA's proposal to the US Congress to introduce the Marshall Plan and a new currency in West Germany in March and June 1948 respectively as intentional. This was so as USA's proposed economic reforms would undermine communism in Eastern Germany because such reforms would strengthen West Germany economically which meant that politically, the USA and their allies wanted to turn West Germany into a democratic nation and subsequently, the whole of Germany.

OR

To Stalin, such actions was an attempt to crush communism in Eastern European because the Eastern Europeans were exchanging their currency for the new currency introduced in West Germany as it had a higher value compared to USSR's currency.

Cross-referencing to contextual knowledge

USSR's accusation that the USA was the mastermind behind the Berlin Crisis is contradicted by my contextual knowledge as I know that the Allies did not deliberately intend or plan to provoke USSR but were merely acting accordingly with regards to their occupational zones in West Germany. This was so because after W.WII, Germany's economy was in shambles thus based on circumstances, the Allies wanted to make political and economic reforms which would naturally be based on the principles of democracy. Thus, Stalin's accusations is false and therefore not useful about USA being the main culprit for the Berlin Crisis.

OR

2) I cannot trust what the Soviets are saying about the Berlin Crisis because it is unreliable as it provides false information in terms of the outcome of the Berlin Blockade. This is so as Source B states that, "In the Spring of 1949, the USA was forced to yield...their war plans had come to nothing, because of the conduct of the USSR." This implied that the Berlin Blockade imposed on road, rail, and canal with the aim of preventing the transportation of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin in order to force the Allies out of their occupational zones in West Berlin was a success.

Cross-referencing to contextual knowledge

This is contradicted by my contextual knowledge as I know that the Allies got around the Berlin Blockade of road, railway, and canal which Stalin imposed by airlifting food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin, thus eventually resulting in Stalin caving in and lifting the blockade, thus admitting defeat.

OR

Cross-referencing to Source C

I know that Source B is providing false information as it is contradicted by Source D which states that, "We refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. This implied that the Allies did not give in/was not pressured by the imposition of the blockade to vacate their zones in Berlin

OR

	<p>This implied that the Allies did not give in as the Allies got around the Berlin Blockade of road, railway, and canal which Stalin imposed in order to force the West Berliners (i.e. the Allies who had occupied zones in the West Berlin) by airlifting food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin thus eventually forcing Stalin to withdraw the blockade and admit defeat.</p>	
L5	<p>Purpose, supported. Explains unreliability based on motives of the author Students must be able to provide evidence of biasness e.g. loaded words/opinion/judgement/one-sidedness to get 5 marks. Award the 6th mark for intended outcome.</p> <p>E.g. (Answer the question on purpose+ author+ historical context) e.g. I cannot trust what the Soviets is saying in Source B <u>as it is biased in its motive/purpose.</u> (Historical Context) After the Allies introduced economic reforms in West Germany, Stalin retaliated by imposing a blockade on all road, rail, and canal with the aim of preventing the transportation of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin in order to force the Allies out of their occupational zones in West Berlin. The ultimate aim was to turn Eastern Germany into a communist bloc. However, the Allies managed to circumvent the blockade through the airlift of resources. As such Stalin had to admit defeat leading to an embarrassing situation. (Intention/Message+ evidence of biasness) Hence, Source B, which is Soviet commentary in 1949, a year after the Berlin Blockade, has a propaganda purpose in terms of wanting to cover up/do damage control for the failure of the Berlin Blockade by deflecting/pushing the blame to USA for the Berlin Crisis. *Essentially USSR accuses the USA of planning to turn Germany into a democratic nation through their actions/economic reforms as it states that, "The conduct of the Western powers to strengthen the West German economy risked bloody incidents," thus implying that the introduction of Trizonia, the Marshall Plan and a new currency into Allied occupied zones of West German was a deliberate move to provoke USSR to impose the Berlin Blockade <u>and make them out to be the aggressors, subsequently putting communism in a bad light.</u> Source B continues to state that, "The Crisis was planned in Washington, behind a smokescreen of anti-Soviet propaganda. In 1948 there was danger of war." <u>Such statements has negative connotations as it portrays a distorted/inflated/ inaccurate version of the truth as it only a one-side view.</u> Basically, it omits the fact that it was Stalin who had initially created tensions over Germany when he demanded \$10million more as compensation for USSR's war efforts, as opposed to taking only 25% of industrial goods that was originally specified in the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, hence creating tensions with the allies, who then responded with their economic reforms. *(Target Audience + Intended Outcome) This was done in order to convince the international community that USSR was the innocent party and that they should support communist parties who want to come into power/continue to support the spread of communism/give them their support to communist regimes in helping to spread communism and not to put their trust in superpowers like USA and their Allies based on their scheming actions/containment policy.</p>	5-6m

1c) Study Sources C and D.

How far does Source C make you surprised by Source D? Explain your answer. [6]

L1	Yes/No: Identifies content in Source C and D which is /is not surprising but no reason given	1m
L2	<p>Not surprised/surprised based on provenance.</p> <p><i>E.g. I am not surprised that Source C and D are different because Source C is a from a memo written by Alexander Panushkin, Soviet Ambassador to the USA, to George Marshall, 14 July 1948, Soviet Union memo while Source D is a statement from President Truman speaking to the US media in 1949</i></p>	2m
L3	<p>Not Surprised And Surprised based on similarity/differences in content, supported.</p> <p>Award 3 m for valid surprised <u>OR</u> not surprised, supported and explained.</p> <p>Award 4 marks for valid surprised <u>AND</u> Not surprised, supported and explained.</p> <p><u>Not Surprised based on similarity of factual evidence + explained</u></p> <p><u>Source C does not make me surprise by what Source D says as both share similar facts about the economic and political competition leading to the Berlin Crisis /the economic issues leading to the Berlin Crisis because it had political implications.</u> This is so as Source C states that, “The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe.” Similarly, Source D states that, “When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin”. Hence both sources imply that economic strategies like the Marshall Plan and monetary reforms were central to the Berlin Crisis conflict as it provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Crisis as he felt that the Allies were implementing these economic reforms to politically make Germany democratic in nature</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions.</u> This is so as Source C states that, “Moreover, the introduction of a separate monetary reform in West Germany, has placed Berlin and the whole Soviet zone of occupation in a predicament as it threatens to pour into Berlin and the Soviet zones of occupation. Hence, the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation.”, This implied that Stalin saw the economic reforms such as the introduction of the new currency by the Allies as trying to introduce democratic reforms which would mean restricting Stalin’s attempts to make Germany a communist state. This is because by introducing a new, strong currency in the Allied zones in West Germany, it would also mean introducing it in West Berlin Allied occupied zones and since Berlin fell within the parameters of</p>	3-4m

*the Soviet zone in East Germany, the new currency would affect the Soviet zone which / they had competing ideologies and as such, the aim of the Allies was to have the upper hand in the ideological conflict in order to tilt the strategic balance of power in the Allies favour. Similarly, Source D states that, "When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin". This implied that Truman acknowledged that the economic reforms introduced by US had provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Blockade. Make the Link Back→ **Thus, Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions***

OR

Soviet Concern Over Western Moves:

Source C highlights Soviet anxiety over the economic implications of the West's actions leading to the Berlin Crisis. Similarly, Source D indirectly acknowledges this concern, stating that Stalin reacted because he couldn't prevent Western initiatives such as the economic policies, leading to the Berlin Crisis

And

Surprised based on differences in content, supported by evidence and explained.

Note In this instance, even though both are saying different things they are still both providing facts, hence there is no contradiction/false information and as such there is no reason/logic to cross-reference i.e. cannot try to prove there is a contradiction as such students cannot proceed to level 3 to gain marks for cross-referencing.*

E.g.

Source C does make me surprised by what Source D says because they are **different** about the **main focus of the Berlin Crisis** **This is so as Source C focuses on the actions of the Allies i.e. the economic disruptions caused by Western actions before the Berlin Crisis and the subsequently reaction of the Soviets** as Source C states that, "the Soviet Command has been forced therefore to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation." Thus Source C emphasizes on the Soviet need to protect East Berlin and the Soviet zone by launching the Berlin Blockade in order to pressure the West to leave their occupied West Berlin zones to ensure that the Allies don't take over the whole of Berlin and turn it into a democratic zone as opposed to Stalin's wish to take over Berlin and ensure it will become communist as it fell within the Soviet occupied zone of Eastern Germany.

However, Source D focusses on the outcome of the Berlin Crisis as Truman states that, "However, we refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test our ability and our will to resist." Hence Source D focuses on Western

	<p>unity and resolve, frames the crisis as a test of American strength, and highlights the positive political impact that it had on Western Europe in terms of drawing it closer to the U.S. based on the Marshall Plan</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Source C makes me surprised by what Source D says as they are different about the <u>nature of Soviet action in terms of launching the Berlin blockade</u> as it states that because the US was going to implement economic reforms, “the Soviet Command has been forced therefore to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation”. Thus, Source C presents the Soviet actions as defensive and necessary to maintain order as they saw the economic measures taken by the Allies in their zones as a means of destabilising communism by spreading democracy through economic means.</p> <p>However, Source D describes Soviet actions as an aggressive test of Western resolve to overcome the Berlin blockade as it states that, “When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin. However, we refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin.” This implied that USA was able to overcome the blockade of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin through an airlift mission carried out by the Allied forces because the blockade meant not only starving women and children in the West Berlin zones but a expansionist strategy by Stalin to force the West Berliners out of their zones so that the Soviet Union could turn it into a communist bloc hence, hence intensifying Cold War tensions.</p>	
L4	<p>Not Surprised based on similarity/ in content, fully developed explanation and evidence + Cross-reference to contextual knowledge/other sources</p> <p>Award 5 marks for valid Not surprised, supported by evidence + cross-reference to contextual knowledge/other sources.</p> <p><u>Similarities between the sources based on reliability/ facts</u></p> <p>E.g. Source C does not make me by what Source D says as both share similar facts/reliable about:</p> <p><u>Source C does not make me surprise by what Source D says as both share similar facts about the economic and political competition leading to the Berlin Crisis /the economic issues leading to the Berlin Crisis because it had political implications.</u> This is so as Source C states that, “The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe.” Similarly, Source D states that, “When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin”. Hence both sources imply that economic strategies like the Marshall Plan and monetary reforms were central to the Berlin Crisis conflict as it provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Crisis as he felt that the Allies were implementing these economic reforms to politically make Germany democratic in nature</p>	5m

OR

Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions. This is so as Source C states that, “Moreover, the introduction of a separate monetary reform in West Germany, has placed Berlin and the whole Soviet zone of occupation in a predicament as it threatens to pour into Berlin and the Soviet zones of occupation. Hence, the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation.”, This implied that Stalin saw the economic reforms such as the introduction of the new currency by the Allies as trying to introduce democratic reforms which would mean restricting Stalin’s attempts to make Germany a communist state. This is because by introducing a new, strong currency in the Allied zones in West Germany, it would also mean introducing it in West Berlin Allied occupied zones and since Berlin fell within the parameters of the Soviet zone in East Germany, the new currency would affect the Soviet zone which / they had competing ideologies and as such, the aim of the Allies was to have the upper hand in the ideological conflict in order to tilt the strategic balance of power in the Allies favour. Similarly, Source D states that, “When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin”. This implied that Truman acknowledged that the economic reforms introduced by US had provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Blockade. Make the Link Back→ **Thus, Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions**

OR**Soviet Concern Over Western Moves:**

Source C highlights Soviet anxiety over the economic implications of the West's actions leading to the Berlin Crisis. Similarly, Source D indirectly acknowledges this concern, stating that Stalin reacted because he couldn't prevent Western initiatives such as the economic policies, leading to the Berlin Crisis

Cross-Referencing to contextual knowledge to:

1. **Currency Reform** (June 1948): West introduced the Deutsche Mark in their zones and West Berlin. The Soviets saw this as a breach of four-power agreements. This reform triggered the Soviet blockade, as they feared economic isolation of East Germany and Berlin.

OR

2. **Marshall Plan** (1948 Onward): Aimed at rebuilding Europe but excluded the Soviet bloc. The Soviets viewed it as an attempt to economically and politically dominate Europe. Paniushkin's concerns

	<p>reflect the Soviet perspective of being encircled or undermined economically.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>3. Berlin Blockade and Airlift: From June 1948 to May 1949, Soviets blocked rail and road access to West Berlin. The U.S. and its allies launched a massive airlift to supply the city, reinforcing their commitment as Truman claims in Source D</p>	
L5	<p><i>Not Surprised because of Different Perspective based on different historical context + intention of author, explained using contextual knowledge [i.e. when and *why/in what context was it said in during that particular time period]</i></p> <p><i>Though there are differences between Sources C and D in terms of their main focus of the Berlin Crisis or how USSR perceives their actions as defensive while USA sees it as aggressive, I am not surprised based on historical context because of the different perspective based on different time periods.</i></p> <p>This was so as Source C was a Soviet Memo written by Alexander Paniushkin, Soviet Ambassador to the USA, to George Marshall, 14 July 1948, one month after the Soviet Union launched the Berlin Blockade preventing the Western zones in Germany from sending aid to the West Berlin zones. This was in retaliation to the USA had implemented the Marshall Plan in order to not only give economic aid to Western European war-torn states but as part of their policy of containing the spread of communism from Eastern Europe to Western Europe as USSR had made the Eastern European countries communists satellite states. Subsequently, economic reforms such a introduction of a new currency and the Marshall Plan was also introduced into the allied zones of Western Germany and West Berlin. Hence, since this was written during escalating Cold War tensions, just after the West introduced the Deutsche Mark in their zones making USSR feeling sidelined by Western decisions and fearing economic dominance in Europe through the Marshall Plan, it is not surprising that Source C was used as a propaganda tool with the intention of justifying the Berlin Blockade by framing the Western economic reforms as a provocation and a destabilizing act. Essentially, USSR blames Western monetary reform and Marshall Plan for creating economic chaos and necessitating Soviet action hence USSR's attempts to justifies Soviet actions as defensive, protecting Berliners and their economy from Western destabilization by launching the Berlin blockade. This is evident as Source C states that, "The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe," and as such "the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation."</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>Moreover, the introduction of a separate monetary reform in West Germany, has placed Berlin and the whole Soviet zone of occupation in a predicament as it threatens to pour into Berlin and the Soviet zones of occupation. Hence, the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to</p>	5-6m

adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation. **Hence, I am not surprised as** Source C represents the official Soviet diplomatic stance, written to convince an American audience in this instance, George Marshall, aiming to deflect blame and present the Soviet side as reasonable based on American's action in 1948.

On the other hand, though Source D portrays Soviet actions as aggressive and a test of Western resolve **I am also not surprised**. This was so as it was a statement by American President Truman in 1949, after USA's subsequent victory in overcoming the Blockade. Hence, spoken after the successful end of the Berlin Airlift and the lifting of the blockade, it **is not surprising that** it reflects the American Cold War propaganda in terms of US being the defender of freedom, facing down Soviet oppression as it portrays Stalin is portrayed as the aggressor, using the blockade as a tool of coercion.

Hence, President Truman's intention was to portray Soviet's actions as aggressive and thus criticises Soviet response of the Berlin Blockade to their economic challenge and an attempt to force the West out of Berlin, while simultaneously glorifies Western response of an airlift of resources/food/coal from West Germany to West Berlin (as morally and politically righteous) in order to justify/legitimize their actions/wants to emphasize the moral high ground of the West and the effectiveness of American resistance through the Berlin Airlift. This is evident when Truman states, “, “we refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test our ability and our will to resist.”

Thus, I am not surprised that Truman speaks in a tone of determination and vindication, highlighting American strength and ideological superiority as the states that

(Intended Outcome) Thus Truman's statement aims to convince the American public that America had the upper hand in the ideological conflict in order to consolidate public and political support by framing the U.S. response as a victory for democracy as the speech would help to solidify America's ideological position in the emerging East-West divide.

Thus, based on the different perspective because of the different time period, Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says.

(Summary)

- ◆ Difference in Perspective:

In essence, the difference in tone and perspective is rooted in each source's political purpose and intended audience. The Soviet memo seeks justification and understanding; Truman speech seeks unity and ideological clarity. This contrast is symbolic of the Cold War's early propaganda battles.

Study Source E.

1d) What is the message of the source? Explain your answer 5m

L1	Describes/Lifts evidence	1m
L2	Identifies sub-messages <i>i.e. Makes valid inferences/ comments interpreting the cartoon but misses the main message of the source. (2m) Award the 3rd mark if sub-message is fully developed, supported.</i> <i>E.g. The message of Source E is that neither USA or USSR emerged victorious based on the Berlin Crisis. I know this as the source states that, "The Berlin airlift was a considerable achievement but neither side gained anything from the confrontation. The USSR had not gained control of Berlin. The West had no guarantees that land communications would not be cut again." This implied that on the one hand, USSR had not achieved the aim of attempting to block road, rail and canal access from West Germany to West Berlin in order to force the Allied to evacuate/leave their zones in Berlin because the West/Allied powers had responded to the blockade by airlifting coal and fuel/resources from West Germany to West Berlin thus ending with Stalin admitting defeat. On the other hand, USSR still managed to hold on to Eastern Germany and subsequently turn it into a communist state so West Germany which would become democratic after the Berlin Crisis would still be under threat from USSR based on the ongoing ideological conflict.</i>	2-3m
L3	Identifies the main message of the cartoon. <i>Award the higher mark in the level for fully developed answers.</i> <i>i.e. Explain <u>main inference</u> fully developed with the use of contextual knowledge), supported with evidence)</i> <i>The main message of Source E is that though the Allies managed to overcome the Berlin Blockade through the airlift of food and coal, and that Stalin had to admit defeat, it did not diffuse Cold War tensions but instead deepened it. This is because the Berlin Crisis itself was a reflection of the ideological conflict between USA and USSR. As such, after the Berlin Crisis, this ideological conflict continued as there was no solution in terms of what type of government Germany should embrace but instead Germany was split into two whereby East Germany came under communist rule and West Germany became a democratic nation.</i> <i>From my contextual knowledge, the long-term effect of the Berlin Crisis led to the acceleration of the Cold War as there were many instances of tit for tat actions on both sides of the divide namely the democratic Allies versus Communist countries. E.g. the acceleration of the arms race such as building of nuclear weapons to use it as threats against each other, the emergence of proxy wars e.g. Korean War, OR the subsequent formation of NATO by the Allies in 1949, as they realized that during the Berlin Crisis, they did not have the presence of an army readily available to confront any aggressive action undertaken by communist Russia which then led to USSR retaliating with the Warsaw Pact in 1955/ Industrial Espionage etc. (Accept ANY ONE EXAMPLE)</i>	4-5m

1e) Study all sources.

'The USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War tensions.' How far do the sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1m
L2	<p>Yes Or No, supported by valid source use i.e. Finds evidence that USA's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions OR Finds evidence that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions</p> <p>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge), and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.</p>	2-4m
L3	<p>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use i.e. Finds evidence that USA's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions AND Finds evidence that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions</p> <p><i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and NO supported by valid source use use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge) and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use with explanation up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i></p> <p>Source A- Yes</p> <p><i>Source A does support the view that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War tensions because by showing that Stalin is holding a gun at the chimney, intending to shoot the storks, /symbolic of/ representing the Allied planes, it implied that Stalin was the aggressor. Essentially, it portrays Stalin in a threatening position as he attempts to retaliate against the Allies solution of airlifting coal and food from West Germany to West Berlin in order to overcome the road, railway and canal blockade imposed by Stalin whose intention was to force out the allies from their occupied zones in West Berlin so that he could establish communism in Eastern Germany. (Note:**If you only show one side, then you question) E.g. However, overall, this Source cannot be trusted as the cartoon is a one-sided view drawn by a British and it is obviously for propaganda purposes as the cartoonist intention is to put Stalin in a bad light by portraying him as the aggressor standing on the top of a chimney with a gun but fails to show that the Allies had also provoked Stalin by indicating through their actions that they were planning to make West Germany a democratic nation through their economic policies, Thus we cannot say that Stalin is totally to be blamed for heightening Cold War tensions.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Source A - Yes and NO</p> <p><i>Source A shows only to a certain extent that USSR was responsible for heightening tensions because *on the one hand, by showing that Stalin is holding a gun at the chimney, intending to shoot the stalks who were representatives of the Allies, it implied that Stalin was the aggressor as it shows him in a threatening position by wanting to retaliate the Allies airlift of coal and food from West Germany to West Berlin. *On the other hand, it also shows that the Allies actions in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War heightened Cold War tensions. This can be seen whereby the birds which represent the giver of life bringing in food into Berlin and defying Stalin's</i></p>	5-8m

blockade. This implied that the airlift of food supplies into Berlin is a dangerous mission (venture) and could provoke a war with the Soviet Union. (Note if you show both sides, you cannot question the source)

Source B- No but questions reliability/limitations of source.

Source B does not support the view that USSR's action in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War tensions but rather it was USA's actions. This is so as the source states that, "The conduct of the Western powers to strengthen the West German economy risked bloody incidents. However, in the Spring of 1949, the USA was forced to yield...their war plans had come to nothing, because of the conduct of the USSR." This implied that because USA, with its Allies, Britain, France, had taken steps to strengthened West Germany by introducing economic reforms in their occupied zones in West Berlin, it indicated to Stalin that their main objective was geared towards eventually establishing West Germany/whole of Germany as a democratic country, thus indirectly challenging the communist ideology. This then angered and provoked Stalin to impose the Berlin Blockade. Thus, the Berlin Crisis showed that USA's actions triggered the Berlin Blockade as they wanted to have a upper hand in the ideological conflict, creating further hostile reactions by USSR, and hence deepening Cold War tensions because the Berlin Crisis became one of the first major confrontations of the Cold War. It deepened mistrust, accelerated the creation of NATO (1949), and entrenched the division of Germany into East and West.

Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source

However, this source cannot be taken at face value as this source has a propaganda purpose and thus biased in terms of limitations because firstly Source A accuses USA of being the mastermind behind the Berlin Crisis as USA deliberately wanted to provoke Stalin into taking aggressive actions through their economic policies in order to make it look as though the Russians/Soviets were the bad guys and they did this "through a smokescreen of Soviet propaganda". However, this is a one-sided view as it did not show that before the Crisis, Stalin had created tension with the Allies but demanding more money from its zone in Eastern Germany in order to weaken it so that the zone would succumb to Communist ideology which the Allies viewed with suspicion thus responding with the economic reforms in their own zones

OR

It paints a false/inaccurate/ picture/distorted version in terms of the outcome of the Berlin Crisis by stating that the Allies were not victorious when USSR launched the Blockade as Source A states that, "However, in the Spring of 1949, the USA was forced to yield. Their war plans had come to nothing, because of the conduct of the USSR". This was not the case as the allies had circumvented the Blockade through the airlift of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin, thus forcing Stalin to admit defeat and eventually lift the blockade.

Source C – No

Source C does not support the view that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis had deepened Cold War tensions but rather it was USA's actions. I know this as Source C states that, "The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe. Moreover,

the introduction of a separate monetary reform" and as such, "the Soviet Command has been forced therefore to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation." This clearly implies that USSR blames the USA's actions as provocative as the introduction of a separate currency and Marshall Plan in the Western zones created economic chaos in the Soviet Zone, subsequently escalating tensions and thus justifying/necessitating Soviet action/retaliation by launching the Berlin Blockade in order to force the Western Zones out of Berlin so that USSR could have total control over Berlin as Berlin fell within the perimeters of USSR zone in East Germany.

Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source

However, Source C cannot be trusted as it is not reliable as the Soviets provides a one-sided view in terms of pushing the blame of the USA for escalating Cold War tensions when they too had contributed to this tension. This is so as they had omitted the fact that they had the intentions of turning the Soviet Zone in Germany into a communist satellite State just as how they had done so to Eastern Europe. This was evident because instead of the original clause of taking 25% of resources and goods from their zone as compensation for helping the Allies to defeat Germany during World War II as stipulated by the Yalta/Potsdam Conference, USSR demanded \$10 million more from their Eastern zone in order to weaken it so that it could fall to communism. (accept any other valid actions taken by USSR to show they too was responsible for escalating Cold War tensions)

Source D- Yes but questions the reliability of the source

Source D- Yes but can questions reliability of the source

Source D does support the view USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis had deepened Cold War tensions. This is so as Source D states that, "**We refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened.**" This implied that USSR had risked a war and thus deepened Cold War tensions with USA and their Allies as they had imposed the Berlin Blockade by closing all railway, road, and canal links from West Germany to West Berlin, cutting off food and coal supplies from reaching the Allied occupied zones in West Berlin. This deepened Cold War tensions because Stalin's aim was to starve the Berliners out of their zones which fell within the perimeters of the USSR's occupied zone in East Germany, in order to eventually take total control of his occupied zones and turn it into a communist regime. As a result, it forced USA to respond in order to overcome the blockade through the airlift of resources from West Germany to West Berlin as the Berliners were being starved by USSR's actions. Moreover, Truman by stating in Source B that, "**Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test our ability and our will to resist**", implied that because of USSR's actions, it made USA more determined to further tighten their grip over Western democratic countries in Europe through their Marshall Plan based on the Truman doctrine/containment policy in order to further ensure those countries did not succumb to communist ideals. **This ultimately permanently sealed Cold War tensions as it accelerated the arms race**, and established Allied military readiness from 1949 onwards through the formation of NATO with the Soviets retaliating with the establishment of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 thus establishing a tense balance between the rival superpowers hence creating a permanent divide between democracy and communism in Germany,

	<p><i>Europe and subsequently which to Asia for the next 41 years. (Accept any one example)</i></p> <p><u>Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source</u></p> <p>However, since Source D cannot be taken at face values as it is a statement made by President Truman to the American press in 1949, the source would obviously be biased and thus cannot be taken at face value as it paints a one-sided view of the USSR as being the chief culprits by omitting the fact that the Allies, through their economic policies (Trizonia, Marshall Plan & introducing a new currency) had also provoked Stalin into imposing the Berlin Blockade because such reforms, based on democratic elements, was indicative to Stalin that they were in indeed gravitating/moving towards political reforms, to eventually make Germany into a democratic country. This indirectly meant that the Allies were attempting to contain the spread of Communism in Germany.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>Source D-To a certain extent</u></p> <p>Source D supports the view that the Berlin Crisis showed that USSR's actions deepened Cold War tensions only to a certain extent, as it also showed that USA's actions was also to be blamed. This is so as <u>on the one hand</u>, USSR was to be blamed because Source C states that, "We refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. This implied that USSR had risked a war and thus heightened Cold War tensions with USA and their Allies as they had imposed the Berlin Blockade by closing all railway, road, and canal links from West Germany to West Berlin, cutting off food and coal supplies from reaching West Berlin. As a result, it forced USA to respond to the to overcome the blockade through the airlift of resources from West Germany to West Berlin as the Berliners were being starved by USSR's actions. On the other hand, it also shows that USA was to be blamed because the Allies and USA were determined to counter/retaliate Stalin's blockade <u>not through negotiations but through a confrontational approach, their airlift mission was a risky venture, risking a possible war with USSR.</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>USA was also to be blamed because Truman by stating in Source D that, "Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test out ability and our will to resist", implied that because of USSR's actions, it made USA retaliate/ more determined to further tighten their grip over Western democratic countries in Europe by continuing with their Marshall Plan giving economic aid based on the Truman doctrine/containment policy in order in order to strengthen these countries to further ensure those countries did not succumb to communist ideals. Such actions merely sealed Cold War tensions as it accelerated the arms race, and established Allied military readiness from 1949 onwards through the formation of NATO; with the Soviets retaliating with the establishment of the Warsaw Pact in 1955, ultimately establishing a tense balance between the rival superpowers hence creating a permanent divide between democracy and communism in Germany, Europe and subsequently which to Asia for the next 41 years. (Accept any one example)</p>	
--	--	--

Source E- To a certain extent

Source E supports the view that the Berlin Crisis showed that USSR's actions had deepened Cold War tensions only to a certain extent as it also reflected the view that USA's actions had also deepened Cold War tensions. This is so as Source E states that, “**The Berlin airlift was a considerable achievement but neither side gained anything from the confrontation. Above all, confrontation made both sides even more stubborn.**” This implied that though the Allies managed to overcome the Berlin Blockade through the airlift of food and coal, and that Stalin had to admit defeat, **it did not diffuse Cold War tensions but instead deepened it.** This is so because the Berlin Crisis itself reflected the ideological conflict between USA and USSR. As such, after the Berlin Crisis, this ideological conflict continued as there was no solution in terms of what type of government Germany should embrace but instead Germany was split into two whereby East Germany came under communist rule and West Germany became a democratic nation. The long-term effect of the Berlin Crisis was that it led to the acceleration of the arms race and the subsequent formation of NATO by the Allies in 1949, as they realized that during the Berlin Crisis, they did not have the presence of an army readily available to confront any aggressive action undertaken by communist Russia. In retaliation, USSR set up the Warsaw Pact in 1955 whereby all the Eastern European countries pledged military support and immediate readiness to confront the NATO forces, hence deepening Cold War tensions/ Also led to proxy wars such as the Korean and Vietnam War whereby each side used 3rd parties to try to outdo each other in terms of gaining the strategic balance of power in their favour. (Note: Students should be awarded the mark for any one example of long term impact of the Berlin Crisis showing deepening/heightening of Cold War tensions)

Source F- Yes

Source E does support the view that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis had deepened Cold War tensions. This is so as Source F states that, “**On 23 June, the Soviet authorities suspended all traffic into Berlin because of alleged technical difficulties.... Shortly before midnight, the Soviet authorities issued orders to ...disrupt electric power from Soviet power plants to the Western sectors. Shortage of fuel was given for this measure.**” Source E which is a “**US Government report in June 1948**”, is insinuating/implying that the Soviets were lying about the reasons for the blockade, which is, that food and coal could not be transported through road, rail, and canal links from West Germany to West Berlin as there was a problem with the transportation and communication lines, as well as insufficient fuel to be distributed to the Berliners, and that real motive for the Berlin Blockade was a deliberate move by Stalin to try to starve the Berliners, which included women and children, with the aim/goal of forcing the Allies out of their occupied zones in Berlin. This was so as Stalin ultimately wanted to make Eastern Germany a communist regime. Thus, Stalin’s unjustified actions heightened Cold War tensions as it pushed the allies to a corner with the possibility of an outbreak of war/a face off/confrontation with the Soviets.

For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark must not exceed 8

Notes:

- To score L2/L3 there must be source use, i.e. direct reference to source content.
- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote.
- Simply writing about the issues in the sources is not enough.
- Higher marks in L2/L3 to award on number of sources used

Section B (SEQ) Suggested Answer Scheme

2. 'The main reason the Malayan Union failed was because the Malays feared that they would be marginalized.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10m]

L1 Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree that one reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the methods used by the British to implement it AND	1-3
L2 Explains Yes or No	<i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3 Explains Yes and No <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of Given And other reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i> <i>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i> The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).	Agree: I agree one reason why the Malayan Union failed was because the Malays feared that they would be marginalized based on the <u>clauses/features/terms of the Malayan Union Constitution such as:</u> a) Positions of the Sultans was threatened According to the terms stated in the Malayan Union Constitution, there would be complete centralization of power at K.L with the British Governor having full control of the administration. Laws were to be passed by the Central Legislative Council and the consent of the Sultans would no longer be required. The Sultans would thus become mere figureheads without authority or power. Thus the Sultans and the State Councils would have no more political power. They would be left in charge of religious matters only. The Sultans were to become only advisers on the Council if Rulers.	6-8m

(Elaboration)**b) Criticisms Over Citizenship**

The Malays criticized the Malayan Union clauses because one of the main features of the Malayan Constitution was the granting of equal citizenship rights to all. This meant that the immigrant races, who had never pledged their loyalty to Malaya, would enjoy the same privileges as the Malays, the native people of the country. The Malays thus objected to the liberal citizenship qualifications, especially when those born or residing in Singapore could also qualify for citizenship. This meant that a large number of Chinese from Singapore would qualify for citizenship, thus the Malays would be outnumbered and Malaya would cease to be a Malay country. **Make the Link**→ **Thus the Malayan Union failed because**, their special rights and privileges as the native people of the country was threatened both in the economic and political sphere.

Disagree and explains other factors:**AND**

Another reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the **methods used by the British to implement the Malayan Union**. The Malays opposed the high-handed manner in which the British introduced the Malayan Union. They did not consult local opinion of the opinions of the Sultans over such an important issue as the Malayan Union which would greatly change their position and status. Sir Harold Mc Michael was criticized for the way in which he obtained the agreement of the Sultans. He did not give time for the Sultans to discuss the Malayan Union proposals among themselves or with the State Councils. (4m) **(Elaboration)** Moreover, he was accused of threatening to depose the Sultans, labelling them as collaborators with the Japanese if they refused to sign the agreement accepting the Malayan Union. (5m) **Make the Link**→ **Thus, the Malayan Union failed because of the underhanded methods used by the British to implement the new constitution.**

OR/AND

Another reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the protests from former British Administrators. Essentially, there were also criticisms in England against the Malayan Union. Malay opposition was encouraged by a group of retired, ex-Malayan government officials, including Sir Frank Swettenham and Sir George Maxwell who protested the Malayan Union. They wrote to the British newspapers, deplored the **unjust way constitutional changes were being imposed in Malaya.**

(Elaboration) They also felt that the Malayan Union went against the principle of the **Atlantic Charter** which recognize that all peoples had the right of self-determination, thus pressuring the British to abolish the Malayan Union. **Make the Link**→ **Thus the Malayan Union failed because of the pressure put on the British colonial government by some former British administrators to do away with the unconstitutional changes based on the Malayan Union.**

OR/AND

Another reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the nationwide movement of non-cooperation by UMNO. The formation of UMNO marked the first united stand of Malay leadership and mass Malay support whereby they demanded the withdrawal of the Malayan Union. They encouraged supporters to wear white bands around their heads for a week as

<p>a sign of protest and mourning for the loss of Sultan's rights. There were numerous rallies and demonstrations.</p> <p>(Elaboration) Malays appointed as officials on the Councils or Government Boards refused to attend the installation ceremonies of Sir Edward Gent as Governor of the Union and Sir Malcolm MacDonald as Governor-General. They also refused to attend meetings of the Advisory Council. <u>Make the Link</u>→ Thus, the Malayan Union failed because of the movement of non-cooperation by UMNO pressured the British into abolishing the Malayan Union.</p> <p>Suggested Conclusion</p> <p>Although there were several reasons why the Malayan Union failed, I agree that the fear among the Malay rulers that they would be marginalized was the main reason as it was the root cause. The terms of the Malayan Union Constitution would have stripped the Sultans of their political power, reducing them to symbolic roles. This threatened not only their authority but also the special position of the Malays as the native people of the land, especially with the introduction of equal citizenship rights for non-Malays. Moreover, British methods of using high handed ways to get the Sultans to sign the Malayan Union proposal cannot be the main reason as this was just a process in ensuring that the Malayan Union became official. Hence it was a secondary reason as it merely further fueled the anger of the Malays</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>While the British use of high-handed methods, such as forcing the Sultans to sign agreements under pressure, did provoke anger, it was the actual content of the Malayan Union that caused the greatest concern and resistance. Additionally, even though protests by former British administrators and the mass non-cooperation campaign led by UMNO added significant pressure on the British, these were merely reactions to the threat posed by the Union's terms and the potential marginalization of the Malays and thus an offshoot of the root cause. Without the deep fear of losing their rights and identity, these movements would not have gained such strong support. Therefore, the root cause of the Malayan Union's failure was the fear of marginalization among the Malay rulers and people, making it the most decisive factor compared to the others.</p> <p>E.g. I disagree that the Malayan Union failed because of the British methods of using high handed ways to get the Sultans to sign the Malayan Union proposal as this was just a process in ensuring that the Malayan Union became official. Hence it was a secondary reason as it merely further fueled the anger of the Malays. However, the main reason was due to the clauses of the Malayan Union which would not only strip the Malay rulers of their powers but threaten their very existence in terms of their rights and privileges based on the granting of equal citizenship rights to all immigrant races. This was the root cause and had the greatest impact on the Malay population because as it triggered the movement. Moreover, the protest from former British Administrators in England merely highlighted the Malayan Union as being unjustified/ illegal which further added pressure on the British colonial government to do away with the Malayan Union. Similarly, the nationwide movement of non-cooperation by UMNO was not the main reason as it was the trigger factor/acted as a catalyst in pressuring the British colonial government to abolish the Malayan Union proposal.</p>	
---	--

*Accept any plausible answer.

4. 'The main aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions.' 'How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10m]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	1-3m
	EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree that one aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions. EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: I agree that one aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions. The failure of the Vietnam War greatly affected future US policies towards communists' states. Fundamentally, demonstrated that ideologies could not be imposed through unpopular governments and if there was enough will to resist those governments and if the resisters had sufficient support.	
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u> , and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u> , to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason). <i>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i> <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).</i> Agree: I agree that one aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions. The failure of the Vietnam War greatly affected future US policies towards communists states. Fundamentally, it demonstrated that ideologies could not be imposed through unpopular governments and if there was enough will to resist those governments and if the resisters had sufficient support. The cost of the Vietnam War led to the pursuit of co-existence between the two superpowers and as such, USA sought greater understanding with USSR known as détente/ reduction of tensions. This is evident from the Strategic Arms Limitations Talk and the signing of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (1972) that sought to reduce nuclear weapons. (Elaboration) Talks continued in Helsinki (1975) to discuss borders and human rights. At the same time, USA ended its block on the issue of China's representation in UN and Nixon made visits in China to improve relations. (Make the Link→) The cost of the Vietnam War led to the pursuit of mutual co-existence between the superpowers, marked by treaties limiting nuclear weapons, and the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the communist states and America.	6-8m

AND**Disagree and explains other factors e.g.**

Another aftermath of the Vietnam war was the **impact it had on US domestic and foreign policies**. The Vietnam War had devastating consequences for 1a) American society and 1b) the confidence of the US managing international relations. **This domestic doubt was mirrored by an international decline in American prestige**. This was so as the campaign against communism was portrayed by US as a moral crusade. However, the atrocities by US soldiers and use of chemical weapons damaged the US reputation and challenged perceptions of US moral superiority.

Moreover, Vietnam was evidence of the **failure of containment** as US had failed to stop the spread of communism in SEA despite its military strength. 1iii) Furthermore, the domino theory which the US had feared became reality as the fall of South Vietnam had a ripple effect of impacting Laos and Cambodia who also turned communist by 1975.

(Elaboration) The Vietnam War also saw the weakening of US Presidency powers. This was so as the United States Congress had traditionally supported the Presidential actions. However, towards the end of the Vietnam War, Congress exercised greater oversight of presidential actions. For instance, Congress had forbidden US military aid to Cambodia (1970) and introduced the War Powers Act (1973) limiting ability of the President to go to war.

OR/And

Another aftermath of the Vietnam war was the impact it had within South East Asia. Within SEA, the inability of the US to win the Vietnam War and contain communism stoked fears of a widespread communism. This fear contributed the formation of ASEAN (1967) and ASEAN declared SEA as a Zone of Peace, Friendship and Neutrality (1971), with the goal of keeping ASEAN free from interference of outside powers. **Make the Link→** Thus the aftermath of the Vietnam War made many Southeast countries less dependent on Western/Superpowers such as USA in terms of foreign policy influence and more co-operative with one another.

Another aftermath of the Vietnam war was that it. It had a heavy human cost in Vietnam. It was estimated that over 2 million Vietnamese perished in the war and another 3 million were wounded. The use of chemical weapons by the United States also created health problems for subsequent generations of Vietnamese. Moreover, the defeat of South Vietnam triggered a refugee crisis in 1975, in which an estimate 800,000 Vietnamese fled Vietnam by small boats. These refugees were through grave suffering as they braved hunger, disease and pirates at sea in order to reach safely to other neighbouring countries. **Make the Link→** Thus the aftermath of the Vietnam war was socially disastrous causing great misery and suffering among the Vietnamese people as it affected innocent lives in the long term (e.g Agent Orange had long term side effects on crops and humans) because in reality the local Vietnamese were not the main aggressors but were proxies in this Cold War ideological conflict

Suggested Conclusion

E.g. *Accept any plausible answer.

5. 'Gorbachev's reforms was a failure.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. 10m

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons	<p>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</p>	1-3
	<p>EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree that Gorbachev's reforms failed because of opposition from the hardliners.</p> <p>EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: Gorbachev's reforms failed because of opposition from the hardliners. The hardliners were upset with the introduction of a free market economy under Perestroika as well as glasnost reforms like the introduction of elections in parliament. The communist hardliners felt that Gorbachev was compromising communist ideals which had governed the country for 70 years.</p>		
L2	Explains Yes or No	<p>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</p>	4-5m
L3	<p>Explains Yes and No</p> <p>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</p> <p>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).</p> <p>Agree: Failure to a certain extent because:</p> <p>Speed of reforms and expectations of the people</p> <p>Gorbachev's reforms failed because of the speed with which he introduced the reforms and the high expectations the people had for quick results. Gorbachev tried to introduce economic and political reforms all at one go but the machinery of government could not cope with so many changes so quickly. For example, there were insufficient funds and raw material to support the economic reforms. This led to higher prices. The government rationed goods like meat and sugar and people had to travel thousands of miles to purchase foodstuffs. The situation led to increase in wages for employees and the government printed more money which in turn led to inflation. Though workers received higher wages, they could not buy the basic necessities which were in short supply. This caused greater economic hardship. The fact that the people had high hopes of Gorbachev's reforms and that they did not see immediate results caused them to be even more disappointed. The increased opposition to Gorbachev's reforms thus caused his reforms to fall flat.</p> <p>(Elaboration) The Russian people could not adapt to the new ideas that were introduced as they were used to a system where they were told what to</p>	6-8m	

do and what to say and could not adjust to the reforms that were being implemented quickly by Gorbachev in order to salvage the current economic situation. Thus the ideas of being involved in the process of government was foreign to them. Gorbachev also did not deliver what he had promised in terms of economic reforms. The economy didn't improve. Thus they did not support Gorbachev's reforms.

Opposition from Communists Hardliners

Gorbachev's reforms failed because of opposition from the hardliners. The hardliners were **upset with** the introduction of a free market economy under **Perestroika as well as glasnost reforms** like the introduction of elections in parliament. The communist hardliners felt that Gorbachev was compromising communist ideals which had governed the country for 70 years. As a result, they opposed his policies by sabotaging his economic reforms. For instance, many hardliners threatened the managers of factories not to implement innovative ideas and to continue to take orders from the hardliners. **(Elaboration)**The hardliners also believed that Gorbachev was **endangering the security of the country by reducing expenditure on the military**. The hardliners were **upset Gorbachev did nothing to stop East European communist states from breaking away from Moscow's control**. Thus the hardliners **did not co-operate with Gorbachev** and constantly opposed his reforms .His reforms thus did not take off and thus **failed to produce the desired results**.

Failure of glasnost

Gorbachev introduced glasnost as a means to reform the political structure in order to remove the corrupt practices of the hardliners as to allow the political process to be more flexible such that Perestroika could take place. However, Glasnost made the government more open and subsequently exposed the political weaknesses to the people. They began to oppose communism. Thus people's faith in communism was ruined and there were mass demonstrations. This weakened the USSR government.

(Elaboration) Glasnost also resulted in East European satellite states demanding similar economic and political freedom. Gorbachev had wanted to reduce military spending in E Europe in order to focus on economic growth. Moreover, improved relations with the West in the late 1980s reduced Moscow's need to hold onto the Eastern Europe satellite states as a buffer zone. Gorbachev's announcement not to interfere in the domestic affairs of the communist governments in Eastern Europe and the withdrawal of military troops from E.E thus inspired demands for more democracy and greater opposition to communist rule in E Europe.

Make the Link→ One by one, communist governments in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and East Germany collapsed in 1989. The communist hardliners blamed Gorbachev for the USSR's loss of control of these communist satellite states. Subsequently, Glasnost also resulted in growing nationalism in the Soviet republics. The Soviet republics like **Armenia and Azerbaijan** (many of Soviet Unions southern states have large Muslim majorities) wanted the right to control their own economy and state/ethnic identity. Resenting control from the Soviet central government in Moscow, these republics were increasing their calls for independence and separation from Moscow's control. This loss of control and prestige contributed to the last days of USSR and Soviet communist influence.

AND

Success to a certain extent:

However, he was successful in several areas. **Perestroika was a success to a certain extent as it 1) introduced Market Economy** which replaced the Command Economy. 1a) This opened up the economy to foreign companies and investors which helped to a small degree to boost economic growth. **Glasnost (Openness)** was also a success. Glasnost removed oppression and gave them freedom of speech. **(Elaboration)** Russians were allowed to criticize the government in order to remove corruption and make it more efficient and dynamic. **(Elaboration)** Leading political dissidents like Andrei Sakharov was released. A new law in 1988 which prevented dissidents from being sent to mental institutions was a significant move to win the trust of the Russians and ease tension with Western democratic countries who believed in Human Rights.

(Elaboration) Glasnost also made the Russian government more credible. It introduced 2/3 elected government instead of nomination. 1a) This made sure there was some form of electoral process whereby efficient and capable officials were chosen to replace those corrupt officials. It was one step towards establishing a fair and transparent political system. **(Elaboration)** It also loosened media control by relaxing censorship and allowing foreign media like CNN to be televised. This opened up a whole wealth of knowledge and information. For instance, reports of the Chernobyl disaster allowed to surface openly and the Gulag Archipelago which was banned during Stalin's time was allowed to be released for sale.

(Elaboration) Externally, Glasnost was also a success. Glasnost had loosened tight and oppressive control over the satellite states in Eastern Europe and gave them more freedom to run their own government. **For example, Gorbachev gave them a choice of whether to remain in the Warsaw Pact or not. (Elaboration) Gorbachev had also promoted World Peace, reduced building of nuclear weapons by signing two treaties in 1987 & 1989.** This won him the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts in making the world a safer place. Thus, Gorbachev's reforms was a success as it ultimately led to better relations with the West, hence thawing Cold War tensions leading to the end of the Cold War.

Suggested Conclusion

E.g. **From one perspective**, Gorbachev's reforms of Perestroika and Glasnost was a failure because it backfired as the communist hardliners within his own country were so steeped in the pure form of communism established by Lenin and Stalin, that they could not accept his reforms because it questioned the very fundamentals of Soviet society. **However, from another perspective**, Gorbachev reforms was a success as it did introduce human rights in Russia which ended the oppression of the people. Moreover, **he was responsible for easing Cold War tensions**. Ironically, his reforms did contribute to the downfall of Communism which in turn led to the end of the Cold War, **which from the perspective of Western democratic countries, was a good thing**. **Yet on the other hand, many commentators see the return of Vladimir Putin in the current era as returning Russia too its previous 'Communists' state.** The Control of the media, glorification of Nationalism and resurrection of Stalin has been viewed as a National Icon.

*Accept any plausible answer.