

SEPTEMBER MOCK PAPER ANSWERS

SBQ

- a) The poster was published to convince the Soviet people of the successes of Communism, thereby reinforcing their faith in the Communist Party. Source A reads, “Victory of the 5 Year Plan - a blow to Capitalism”. This message is further reinforced by the image of a capitalist being crushed by the weight of the 5-Year Plan. This tells me that the 5 Year Plan was a massive success, far beyond the expectations of the capitalists. In fact, the Communist’s plans were so successful that they literally crushed the capitalists’ expectations of it. The fact that the poster was published by the Soviets tells me that they wanted to tell their people of the successes of their 5 Year Plan and reinvigorate the peoples’ belief in the success of the Communist Party. This would affirm the Soviet peoples’ loyalty to Communism, due to the party’s ability to improve the lives of the Soviet people through their well-thought out 5 Year Plans. Thus, the purpose of this poster is to convince the people of the successes of Communism and reaffirm the people’s faith in the Communist Party.
- b) Source C and D are similar in highlighting how the West had expected Stalin’s Five-Year Plan to fail. Source C states, “Jokes have been made about the Five-Year Plan, and its failure has been predicted”. This tells me that the English businessman had initially made light of Stalin’s 5-year plan and had expected it to fail miserably. Similarly, Source D shows the “World Depression” ruining Stalin’s plan, by messing up his supposedly elaborately planned Five-Year Plan. This tells me that the Americans had expected the Great Depression to mess up Stalin’s centrally planned economy, by introducing a global economic disaster. Evidently, both sources are similar in highlighting how the West had expected Stalin’s Five-Year Plan to fail miserably.

However, Source C and D differ in demonstrating the actual outcomes of Stalin’s Five-Year Plan. While Source D supposedly affirms that the Soviet’s Five-Year Plan had failed, Source C concedes that Stalin’s Five-Year Plan had been wildly successful. Source C writes, “However, much more has been accomplished than was ever expected. New cities are growing up, modern houses, schools, hospital...”. This tells me that Stalin’s 5-Year Plan was actually extremely

successful, because it had helped to modernize Russia both economically and socially. On the other hand, Source D portrays Stalin's 5-Year plan as having failed miserably due to the "World Depression". Despite Source D also being from 1931, it portrays a very different outcome from that of Source C, telling me that the Soviet 5-year Plan had failed miserably. Thus, both sources differ in portraying the actual outcome of the successes of Stalin's 5-Year Plan.

The reason for the difference can be attributed to the provenance of Source D. Source D is a poster which is targeted at the American public, whereas Source C is from the recount of an English businessman and his honest assessment of the modernization of Russia. It is expected that the American cartoon would want to portray the impact of the 5-Year Plan in this light, because it would intentionally want to persuade the American public that capitalism was more effective than communism. It is thus expected that the sources would differ in their portrayal of the successes of the Soviet 5-Year Plan, given that Source D has a vested interest in ensuring that Communism would be portrayed in a negative light.

- c) Source B's claim about the success of Stalin's 5-Year Plan is reliable. In Source B, the capitalist first claims that the Communists' 5-Year Plan is 'Fantasy, Delirium, Utopia'. The capitalist is later rudely shocked by the success of this supposedly unachievable situation. The source is clearly making the claim that the Five-Year Plan will wildly exceed the expectations of the capitalists, who all thought that it would fail.

Source B's claim is reliable because it is corroborated by a similar claim made in Source C. Source C is derived from the anecdotes of an English businessman who had visited Russia in 1931. The English businessman states that despite people having expected the failure of the five-year plan, "New cities are growing up, modern houses, schools, hospitals...". This corroborates with the claim made in Source B, that the 5-Year Plan had far exceeded the expectations of the West and had succeeded where everyone else thought it would fail. The fact that this anecdote comes from an English businessman further contributes to the reliability of Source B's claim, as it indeed affirms the cartoon's image of a capitalist (the English businessman) being forced to acknowledge the successes of the Five-Year Plan, despite their initial expectations that it would fail. Thus, Source B's claim is

indeed reliable, given that it is corroborated in both content and context by Source C.

- d) I am not surprised by what source D says. Source D is a cartoon published by an American, which depicts Stalin's great five-year plan being ruined by the Great Depression. This is evidenced, where it shows the black ink of the Great Depression spilling all over Stalin's carefully planned five-year plan, resulting in Stalin being upset and angry. The cartoon tells the reader that Stalin's five-year plan had effectively failed to fruition, due to the abrupt consequences of the Great Depression. I am not surprised that the author, an American cartoonist, would convey this message to the audience. Given the animosity that the American has towards communism, it is not unexpected that he would want to portray Communism in a negative light. More specifically, I am not surprised that the American cartoonist would want to portray Stalin's centrally planned economy as a widespread failure in order to exalt the relative successes of capitalism. This would persuade the reader of the failures of communism and result in the reader being more inclined to supporting capitalism over communism. Thus, given the context of the source and the author's anti-communist, pro capitalist leanings, I am not surprised by what the source says.
- e) Sources A and B show that Stalin's first five-year plan was success. In Source A, the source reads, "Victory of the 5 Year Plan - a blow to Capitalism". This tells me that Soviets believed the five-year plan to be successful, thereby disproving the critics of the West who believed that Stalin's centrally planned economy would fail. Similarly, Source B shows the shocked reactions of capitalists in the face of the USSR's successful five-year plan. The capitalists' belief that communism was a "Fantasy, Delirium, Utopia" was disproved in the face the USSR's overwhelming success. This tells me that the five-year plan was extremely successful, to the extent that it was able to prove its capitalist naysayers wrong. Thus, both sources demonstrate the success of Stalin's five-year plan.

Source C likewise, supports the view that the five-year plan was a success. In Source C, an English businessman states, "However, much more has been accomplished than was ever expected. New cities are growing up, modern houses, schools, hospitals...". This further affirms the claims made by the communists in sources A and B that the first five-year plan was indeed a success. In fact, it was so successful that it far exceeded the expectations of the capitalists, in this case, the

English businessman. Thus, source C affirms that the first five-year plan was a success.

However, source D negates the claim that the first five-year plan was a success. This is evidenced in the picture, where the American cartoonist claims that the Great Depression had ruined Stalin's carefully planned five-year plan, to his dismay. This tells me that the five-year plan was not a success, given that it was ruined by the abrupt negative consequences of the Great Depression.

Similarly, source E negates that the five-year plan was entirely a success, by highlighting the areas in which the five-year plan had failed some citizens of the USSR. In source E, the communist American journalist writes that the five-year plan was a not a success "for the individual worker, who was terrorized by brutal laws, who had lost control of his own life" and the "Soviet people who were crushed by cruelties of such a scale". This tells me that the five-year plan was limited in its success, given that it had made living conditions much worse for the average Soviet worker.

Overall, the sources do prove that Stalin's five-year plan was a success, albeit that it had some negative implications. While source D refutes this claim, it is notable that source D was published by an American cartoonist, who has a vested interest in portraying communism in a negative light. Source D is thus unreliable in its claim that the Soviet five-year plan was categorically a failure. Similarly, while source E sheds light on the negative consequences of Stalin's five-year plan, it is still notable that the author concedes that "foundations were laid for a new industrial empire". This tells me that on a larger scale, while there were some negative aspects of the five-year plan, the five-year plan was still able to achieve widespread economic success in the USSR. As such, the sources prove that in spite of some trade-offs to the average Soviet worker, Stalin's five-year plan was a tremendous economic success.

Question 1

- a) In the immediate post-war years, aggressive American expansion of influence in Europe resulted in worsening tensions between the US and USSR, thereby contributing to the Cold War. To secure their own economic interests and to combat communism, the US provided significant amount of economic aid to Europe through the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. More specifically, the US provided with Europe with more than \$13 billion in economic aid. The USSR perceived this expansionism into Europe as an act of aggression, as this directly threatened the security of the USSR. This was because the expansionism of American influence into Europe directly crept into the USSR's sphere of influence, thereby threatening the USSR's security. Thus, in expanding their influence into Europe economically and militarily, the US worsened tensions between the two superpowers and contributed to the outbreak of the Cold War.

Similarly, the US insistence on a recovered Germany resulted in worsened tensions between the superpowers, and likewise contributed to the outbreak of the Cold War. Despite resistance from the USSR, the US, UK and France created Trizonia in West Berlin, which allowed for the economic recovery of West Germany. This greatly upset the USSR, who wanted Germany weakened, given that the USSR was historically vulnerable to invasion from a strong German republic. The resurgence of Germany at the helm of the US posed a direct threat to the USSR's security interests and resulted in greater tensions between the US and USSR. Thus, US actions in Germany post-war contributed to the outbreak of the Cold War.

- a) The US was primarily to be blamed for starting the Cold War, because it antagonized the USSR with its aggressive foreign policy in Europe. American intervention in Europe directly threatened the USSR's security interests, thereby resulting in increased tensions and the outbreak of the Cold War. For example, the US gave Western Europe significant foreign aid through the Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine, which resulted in many European states being friendly and partial towards the US. This directly threatened the security interests of the USSR, as there were now many US allies in its backyard. This was taken further when the US spearheaded the formation of NATO, which was a military alliance of Western European countries targeted at countering potential Soviet military strength. This crystallized the antagonistic stance that the US posed towards the USSR, which necessitated an equivalent response from the Soviets. Effectively, it is clear how

the aggressive American foreign policy in Western Europe served to undermine Soviet security interests, which ultimately worsened relations between the superpowers and culminated in the Cold War. Thus, from this perspective, the USA was indeed to be blamed for the Cold War.

On the other hand, it is arguable that the USSR was more responsible for the outbreak of the Cold War. The USSR, and its brand of communism, was focused on the importance of “worldwide revolution” and spreading communism around the world. This inherently posed a constant threat to American ideals of democracy, freedom and capitalism. The US’s fear was later affirmed when the USSR took aggressive expansionist acts in Eastern Europe, commonly known as ‘Salami Tactics’, which saw the establishment of satellite states of the USSR. These aggressive actions undermined the freedom of sovereign Eastern European countries and confirmed American fears that the USSR was bent on establishing global communism. Thus, the Americans were justified in their reactionary response to the Soviets in Europe, and it was the USSR who was more responsible in starting the Cold War.

In conclusion, this essay argues that the USSR was more responsible in starting the Cold War. While the US did antagonize and undermine the USSR, it was fundamentally the ideological framework of communism and the actions of the USSR which justified the aggressive American intervention in Europe. As such, the USSR was more responsible for starting the Cold War, because it provided the impetus for the US to act in such a way that would worsen tensions between the superpowers.

Question 2

- a) American involvement in WWII placed Germany in a war of attrition which Germany could not win, leading to the eventual demise of Germany. The US was an industrial powerhouse and was able to quickly and effectively produce large amounts of materials needed for the Allies in the war effort. The US's industrial capacity was instrumental in helping the Allies overcome military shortages, especially in the light of the fact that much of the Allies' industrial capabilities were destroyed by the Germans in the earlier part of the war. This meant that the average Allied soldier was far better equipped than the average Germany soldier, which resulted in the reduced military capability of the German army. Thus, the industrial capacity of the US placed the Germany at a disadvantage during the war, which contributed to their eventual loss in WWII.

In a similar vein, US involvement in the war placed Germany at a military disadvantage, in the terms of manpower. In the US's entrance into the war, it was able to contribute significant amounts of manpower towards the war effort, making up for the shortfall of Allied troops in Western Europe. This tipped the scales in the favor of the Allies, who now had significantly more fighting troops compared to Germany. Ultimately, this contributed to the military disadvantage of Germany relative to the Allies and resulted in Germany's loss in WWII.

- b) The entry of the US escalated Germany's defeat in WWII by providing significant material help towards the Allies in the war, in the form of industrial output. At the entry of the war, the US was a major industrial powerhouse. The US was able to quickly and effectively produce large amounts of materials needed for the war effort. They were essentially able to rapidly expand the Allies' air force and navy, providing the Allies with much needed aerial and naval support in their campaigns. The US also proved instrumental in helping the Allies overcome military shortages, especially in the light of the fact that much of the Allies' industrial capabilities were destroyed by the Germans in the earlier part of the war. In contrast, Germany had much of its industrial output halted due to the war and was far less capable in being able to provide resources for its troops. This meant that Allied troops were far better supported and far better prepared for the war at the inclusion of the US, which resulted in the reduction of overall capabilities of the German armed forces.

This contributed to the eventual downfall of Germany, who was unable to last in a war of attrition against the Allies.

However, the blunders of Hitler in escalating the downfall of Germany should not be overlooked. Towards the end of the war, Hitler insisted on making all military decisions, instead of leaving these decisions to the hands of his more capable and experienced generals. This resulted in Germany committing many blunders and mistakes in the latter part of the war. An example of Hitler's tactical mistake was his decision to not take over Britain in the first wave of his invasion, enabling Britain to build up their forces again for the Allied counter-offensive. Thus, Hitler's own military failures served to escalate the downfall of the USSR, as Hitler consistently undermined the past successes of the German army.

Overall, this essay concludes that the entry of the US was the most critical factor in escalating Germany's defeat in WWII. While Hitler's military mistakes did undermine the success of the Germany army, it was the entry of the US which was most fundamental in turning the tides of the war for the Allies. Prior to the US's entry, much of Western Europe had been conquered by Germany, even in spite of Hitler's blunders. It was therefore the inclusion of the US which was the fundamental in contributing to the escalation of Germany's defeat, as it provided the most important push for the Allies' success.