



Suggested answers to 2015 COMBINED HUMANITIES (History) Paper 3 2204

SOURCE BASED QUESTION:

1a)

I can learn that industrialization in the Soviet Union used rewards to encourage the public to work hard and contribute to the growth of the country bringing out their competitive spirit. This can be seen in the source which says “my husband exceeds his targets and receives prizes every month. Your husband however does not fulfil his plan.” This shows how the act of rewarding workers for hardwork pushed the people to strive for more. It made them believe that this was the best way they could serve their country and thus their competitive spirit led to more productivity. This made industrialization a success as it encouraged people to produce results.

I can learn that industrialization was successful in convincing the family of Soviet Union’s rail transport workers that it is their duty to contribute to the nation. This is can be seen as the source says “work is a matter of honour, glory and heroism.” This shows how some of the Soviets viewed work as their duty to contribute to the growth of the nation and how industrialization gave them an opportunity to perform to their fullest extent.

1b)

The poster was published to portray how well received Stalin’s policy of industrialization was in the eyes of the public. This can be seen in the poster, which shows Stalin in the center of attraction waving to the public with a smile on his face, while people around him are looking at him in approval and awe. This shows that the people were pleased and happy with the policy of industrialization and Stalin’s plans for them. Thus showing us that the poster was published to show the success of industrialization in terms of how well received it was.

The poster was published to promote the policy of industrialization to the general public of Soviet Union. This can be seen with its tag line of “ Long Live the Stalinist Order of Heroes and Stakhanovites”. This shows us that the poster aimed to act as propaganda and promote Stalin’s policy such that more people will support and agree with the policy thus converting it into a success and work to hit given targets.



1c)

The source is useful as evidence about Stalin's industrialization policy as it tells me that the public played a part in improving and speeding industrialization. This can be seen in the source, which says "This movement began spontaneously from below, without any pressure whatsoever from the industry managers" and that "if people in our country lived badly or joylessly, we would have nothing like the Stakhanovite movement". This shows that the people of the Soviet society were trying to radically improve their contribution to the country. Cross referencing to source A which supports this idea as the source tells me that workers were motivated to achieve production goals. This can be seen by "talk to your husband and persuade him that he must work honourably and conscientiously". This shows us that the people were not forced to work but genuinely encouraged to increase contribution to the country. Since Source A supports Source C, source C is therefore useful as an evidence about Stalin's industrialization policy.

The source is not useful as evidence about Stalin's industrialization policy as it does not tell us whether or not industrialization was sustainable in the long run. Cross referencing to source F which tells me that the focus of industrialization was only on output thus faced a possibility of not sustaining economic growth. This can be seen by the source, which says "the plans always emphasized quantity over quality". This shows us that it may have been difficult to sustain the Soviet economy with low quality goods that were exported, as the demand for these goods would eventually stall. Thus the source is not useful as it does not show me information regarding the ineffectiveness of the industrialization policy.

The source is not useful as evidence about the industrialization policy as it is a speech by Stalin and hence could have a hidden agenda in promoting industrialization so that the citizens of Soviet Union would be encouraged support the policy and work harder. Thus since the source is may be biased it is unreliable and hence not useful as evidence about the industrialization policy.

1d)

No, what the German newspaper says (Source E) does not mean that Stalin must have been lying in Source D as Source E tells me that the perhaps the targets set for the Soviet industry in 1937 was not reached yet does not mention anything about targets in the previous years. This can be seen by source E which says "despite the Stakhanovites and other simulation measures, there must have been a considerable setback in 1937." This means that the reason for the decline in output must have been attributed to an event which occurred in 1937 and not earlier. This would be supported in Source D which tells me that output production was booming in the early 1930s. This can be seen by the source which says "The volume of production is now three times of what it was before the first World war and twice of what it was in 1928." This means that there was indeed a great improvement in output in the early 1930s. Thus showing that whether or not in the late 1930s there was a decline, in the early 1930's the industry was still booming. Thus what the German newspaper says



(Source E) does not mean that Stalin must have been lying in Source D due to the difference in time periods.

No, what the German newspaper says (Source E) does not mean that Stalin must have been lying in Source D as cross reference to Source F supports the view of Source D that industrial output was very high during that particular time period. This can be seen by source F which says “By 1937, total industrial production was probably four times higher than it had been in 1928”. This means that indeed it was true that output was very high before in the early 1930s. Thus meaning that what the German newspaper says (Source E) does not mean that Stalin must have been lying in Source D.

1e)

Sources A, B, C, D and F agree with the statement while Source E disagrees with the statement.

Source C agrees with the statement as it tells us that production improved with the industrialisation policy making lives of the people better. Source C says that “ Life has become more joyous” and because of that there were “high rates of output”. This shows that the industrialization policy was welcomed by the people and was even improved by them thus leading it to be success as it brought about joy and increased output. Similary source D tells us that the plan was so successful that they managed to achieve their initial target of suppressing the spread of capitalism in their country. Source D says “industrialization of country has led to the complete suppression of capitalist elements”. This clearly tells us how the industrialization played a key role in helping Soviet Union achieve its targets. This shows that both sources agree with the statement that industrialization was indeed an extreme success as it increased productivity and led to the suppression of capitalism.

Source E however, does not agree with the given statement as it tells us that the figures for industrialization in Soviet Union were not reliable. Source E says that “The Soviet government makes the astonishing claim that this is an increase of 15% over 1937.” before going on to explain how the given figures were not truly reflective of the situation. This shows how the source feels that since the figures were not reliable the policy must not have been extremely successful. From our contextual knowledge we also realize that there have been discoveries of Stalin overstating production figure thus proving that perhaps the policy was not as big of a success as it was made out to be. Thus Source E disagrees with the given statement.



STRUCTURED ESSAY QUESTIONS:

Question on Nazi Germany

2a)

After World War 1 and the humiliation of the Treaty of Versailles, Germans were extremely discontent with the rule of the Weimar republic. This eventually gave way to the rise of the Nazis, amongst other opposing groups, as they seemed to promise the best conditions to the unhappy Germans. The Nazis, enjoyed the benefits of the support they got, largely due to the charismatic leadership of Hitler. Hitler was very passionate about his cause and reinvented the Nazi ideology such that it aimed to garner maximum support of the people. The Nazis promised to abolish the hated Treaty of Versailles and restore national pride through restoration of land and military. They made it their goal to improve the lives of "True Germans" and gave them reasons to hate and blame outsiders for their problems. Not only was their ideology a drawing point, Hitler himself was revered by many, due to his charismatic and lengthy speeches which drew people to him as they felt that he was truly fighting for a cause on their behalf. There were also increased support due to the Nazis having the SS and SA to stamp down opposition and increase support through various groups like the Hitler Youth. These reasons led to the eventual rise of the Nazis because even though pre-existing factors like the weak government and its policies of having a constitutional government and economic factors of hyperinflation played a part in creating a space for opposition parties to gain support, the Nazis won because they offered the people a cause to fight for, a strong leader and a convincing ideology.

2b)

Germany under the Nazi rule underwent its fair share of ups and downs. It is fair to say that to a certain extent, for example the economic improvements, the Nazi rule did bring about improvements to the lives of the Germans. However, there were also other factors like the political repercussions of Nazi rule on the Germans and the social damage that the rule did, that can be said to have made the lives of the Germans far worse.

The Nazi rule did indeed bring about an improvement in the lives of the German people as they brought about an improvement to the dying economy. The economy under the Weimar republic was suffering but Hitler did his best to improve it under his rule. He discussed the reorganization of finances to provide new jobs, with President of Reichsbank, Dr Hjalmar Schacht. The latter also suggested to Hitler to build roads, motorways and public buildings to create jobs thus providing means of employment to people. The Nazi government also formed a close relationship with rising big businesses as Hitler aimed to let Germany become self-sufficient. He implemented the New Plan in 1934, in which imports were banned and production of oil, steel, coal and explosives increased leading to the rise of the economy. With this economic rise more jobs were created thus allowing people to escape poverty and improving their lives. A more concrete example would include the introduction of leisure time. People were



given set amounts of leisure time which allowed for low-cost entertainment and working conditions were improved as well. These policies were extremely popular as a result the Nazi rule was well received for improving conditions of the people's lives thus showing that indeed their rule brought about improvements.

However, this cannot be said for all aspects of their rule. The political control the Nazis had over the people cannot be said to have improved their lives. The Nazi party's political control was extremely oppressive to those who yearned for freedom of speech and thought. Hitler's party aimed to indoctrinate, even the young, with the idea that only the Nazi party was right and deserved the support of the Germans. The Nazi party established the One Party rule in 1933 making Hitler a legal dictator. Nazi officials took charge of local governments in the individual states of the German federation and the SA and SS were called upon to stamp out any opposition or those who dared to disobey. Most of Hitler's opponents were forced to flee or sent to concentration camps making it almost impossible to survive in Nazi Germany for anyone who did not fully believe in their ideology. As a result people would have been forced to support the Nazis as Hitler's dictatorship cost Germans their freedom and they were unable to replace him with another leader. In fact, they were prevented from being exposed to any other leaders and were kept unaware of the true horrors behind the Nazi regime that was to follow. Thus it cannot be said that the Nazi rule brought about an improvement in the lives of the German people.

It also cannot be said that the Nazi rule brought about an improvement in the lives of the German people in terms of social policies. The Nazi rule aimed to only improve the lives of the true Germans, the Aryans, and regarded every other ethnicity as a parasitical existence in German land. As a result various discriminatory policies were set up against these groups of people. The Jews in particular faced the worst amount of discrimination from the Nazis as they were seen to enjoy more wealth and status in comparison to true Germans. The Nazi anti-Semitism policies led to the Night of the Broken Glass in 1938 which resulted in a campaign of terror. The Holocaust, Final Solution, killed millions of Jews in concentration camps along with other minority groups. Not only did the non-Aryan race suffer, the extensive propaganda and fear of the Gestapo also led to Germans living in fear of opposing Nazi rule. As such because of the massive number of people who died under Hitler's rule and the fear his rule struck in hearts of people, it cannot be said that the Nazi rule brought about an improvement in the lives of the German people.

In conclusion, while there were both positive and negative aspects to the Nazi rule, due to the massive economic improvement the rule brought about to Germany, in comparison to the rule under the Weimar republic, the immense contribution of the Nazi rule can never be disregarded. However, due to the unpopular policies they made and their effects of on the lives of people, it can be said that to a certain extent, especially to the lives of those affected, that the Nazi rule brought about destruction.



Question on Cold War

3a)

As World War 2 ended, the reason for the two superpowers to continue to work together disappeared along with it. With their inherent differences it seemed impossible for the nations to not engage in minor conflicts of interests. Both nations continually competed for their extend of influence over Europe. America did not want Europe to become communist as it would mean a decrease in free markets available to itself. This in turn would cause a decline in its influence in the area. As Soviet Union sought to expand its sphere of influence by establishing satellite sates, it became clear to both nations that there was an inherent conflict between the two nations which could not be solved easily. Following George Kennan's Long Telegram and Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain speech, America decided to move away from its policy of isolationism eventually leading to the adoption of the Marshall plan. America planned to actively curb and contain communism as they viewed it as an increasing threat to their national interests. They started off with the Truman Doctrine, which was only extending help to Greece and Turkey, and moved to the Marshall plan, which involved provision of economic aid to reconstruct Europe. It aimed to make communism less appealing in war-torn Europe such that they would support America instead. In a way the Marshall plan was also made to undermine the Soviet Union's influence in Europe.

3b)

The Cuban Missile Crisis was the closest the world had come to a nuclear war. The Soviet placing of missiles in Cuba sparked it. Therefore due to the great risk it placed the entire world in, it would be fair to say that Khrushchev's decision to put nuclear missiles in Cuba was an error in his judgement. However, because of the possible benefits the missiles in Cuba could have presented Soviet Union, it cannot be said that his actions were fully erroneous as well.

It would be fair to say that Khrushchev's decision to put nuclear missiles in Cuba was an error in his judgement because of the possibility of nuclear war it caused. His placing of missiles in Cuba triggered the American response, even though it was not what he had anticipated. The Americans were horrified at the aspect of having missiles so close to home and Kennedy was under immense pressure to act. The deliberate lack of warning of the placement of missiles was perceived as an immediate nuclear threat. The missiles were deemed as offensive as they had the capability to strike the heart of the USA. With the looming threat of the "first-strike", Kennedy was forced to contemplate his options and finally decided on the naval blockade of Cuba. From there on things escalated. If Khrushchev had not put missiles in Cuba, there would have been no reason for the Americans to react so strongly. As such it was indeed an error of judgement as it caused an immediate escalation of the Cold war, one that was so severe that it nearly caused Mutually Assured Destruction.

However, when weighing the options Khrushchev was presented with, it cannot be said that he made a total error in his judgement as the missiles in Cuba presented him



with opportunities for political gains. The Soviet Union had always wanted control over West Berlin, and believed it should be integrated into communist East Germany. Khrushchev believed that the missiles would act as a political leverage for Soviet Union to gain West Berlin. Moreover, a successful defence of Cuba would also increase Soviet Union's status amongst the communist bloc, especially so with the rise of communist China competing for status. Thus to improve Soviet Union's political stance and status, Khrushchev believed it was necessary to place missiles in Cuba. As such it cannot be said to be merely an error in judgement as it was a matter of prestige and pride to the Soviets.

Also, the placement of missiles cannot be said to be an error of judgement as it offered the Soviets military and strategic gains. The Soviet Union with its decreasing economic power was not as capable as America in inventing missiles that could reach America from Soviet Union itself. As such it became necessary to have a nearer launch site to narrow the missile gap between the two superpowers. The placement of the missiles in Cuba also meant that the Soviet Union could counter the presence of the American Jupiter missiles in Turkey. The close presence of the missiles to US land meant that in any case of naval advancement, it would become easier to counter the threat. It was a means to achieve control over a strategic location from which to counter American attacks. As such with such great benefits waiting, it seems unsurprising that Khrushchev would have made such a decision. It was as a result, not an error in judgement as the benefits of placing the missiles promised more than Khrushchev's view of the American response.

In conclusion, it would be unfair to say that it was an error in his judgement to place the missiles as Khrushchev was not expecting such a violent reaction from USA. After all, the Soviet Union, and the rest of Europe, were also under constant threats of missiles, be it American or Soviet. It seems as though perhaps it was the initial placement of Jupiter missiles in Turkey and the strong reaction of the Americans that may have played a larger part in escalating the Cuban Missile Crisis. However, that being said, Khrushchev should have perhaps exercised more caution in his actions due to the sensitive nature of the conflict of ideologies.