

Grading Standards
World History 3201 / Histoire mondiale 3231
June 2009

Pre-marking Appraisal

The marking board was generally pleased with the examination. The selected response and constructed response were considered to be a good sampling of the curriculum outcomes. The length of the exam was reasonable and required students to analyze information from the documents and provide their own historical knowledge to support their answers.

Marking Standard and Consistency

An answer key/scoring key was distributed to all markers on the first day of the marking board. The key was examined, discussed and minor modifications were made. A final key was agreed upon. Marker reliability and consistency were checked by a random sample of 30 papers that went through the marking panel. Marks were recorded on a separate sheet of paper. These papers were then placed back into circulation and corrected again. If there were changes to the marks, they were discussed with the individual marker. Throughout the marking process there were statistical analysis and item data compiled to enhance the reliability, ensure consistency of marking and to identify potential problem areas. Areas of concern were addressed during the first two days of marking.

Commentary on Responses

Generally, the board felt that many students used the sources. It was apparent, however, that some students were not fully reading the questions and ignored some sources.

- In many cases questions 55 and 56 were left out by many students.
- When asked to “assess” (as in Questions 53, 54, 56), many students either rewrote the sources or gave more of a description than an assessment.

Marking Scales

All questions for Part II were marked using one of the following scales:

5 point questions:

Use of Document: 2%		
2%	Superior	2 references with little extension or 1 reference with considerable extension
1%	Limited	1 reference with little extension
0%		Inappropriate or no reference to the document
Use of Own Knowledge: 3%		
3%	Superior	3 references with little extension or 2 with adequate extension or 1 reference with considerable extension
2%	Adequate	2 references with little extension or 1 with adequate extension
1%	Limited	1 reference with little extension
0%		Inappropriate or no reference to own knowledge

10 point questions:

Use of Document: 5%		
5%	Superior	2 references with considerable extension – one from each source
4%	Adequate	4 references with little extension – two from each source or 1 reference with little extension from a source and 1 reference with considerable extension from a source
3%	Average	1 reference with considerable extension from a source or 3 references with little extension
2%	Limited	2 references with little extension – one from each source
1%	Minimal	1 reference with little extension from a source
0%		Inappropriate or no reference to the document
Use of Knowledge: 5%		
5%	Superior	2 references with considerable extension
4%	Adequate	4 references with little extension or 1 reference with little extension and 1 reference with considerable extension
3%	Average	3 references with little extension or 1 reference with considerable extension
2%	Limited	2 references with little extension
1%	Minimal	1 reference with little extension from own knowledge
0%		Inappropriate or no reference to own knowledge

Part II

Total Value 50%

Question 51 (Value 5%)

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the origins of the First World War.



Use of Source

This source had several elements that students could use:

- The title is “Chain of Friendship”.
- Serbia is smaller, in the front, and trying to protect itself.
- The next three larger figures/countries are Austria-Hungary, Russia and Germany. They seem to be stepping in front of the other.
- France and Britain are in the background.
- They each claim “if you hit...”, the other will step in.

Points from the source that a student could reference include:

- System of alliances/chain of friendship was a key factor in outbreak of the First World War.
- Russia is threatening to protect Serbia from Austria-Hungary.
- Germany is telling Russia that if Russia strikes Austria-Hungary, Germany will do something in response.
- France and Britain are doing the same.

Use of Knowledge

- The origins of the First World War refer to nationalism, economic rivalry (imperialism), the arms race and military alliances.
- By 1907 Europe was split into two armed camps. This started under Bismarck of Germany, who had earlier feared the French desire for revenge after the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. He wanted to isolate France.
- The main alliances were Britain, France and Russia (the Triple Entente) and Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy (the Triple Alliance).
- Alliance systems meant that a dispute between one member of each camp could easily involve the others, thus a war between two countries involves all six.
- Serbia provided the “spark”; Archduke Ferdinand’s assassination by Gavrilo Princip, a Bosnian Serb.

Students

- Most students answered this question fairly well overall, and wrote a great deal about the alliance system as prompted by the source.
- Some did not mention the other causes of the First World War as asked in the stem of the question.
- Many seemed to have lots of knowledge about the “spark” or the incident that started the First World War.
- Some students demonstrated good knowledge but rambled, not editing the answer to address the question.

Value

5% 51.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the origins of the First World War.

The Chain of Friendship



Source: GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh. (7)

5

The source above is in direct reference to the Alliance system that was a root cause of World War One. The littlest man with the Serbia banner represents the Tensions in the Balkans that were occurring under Austria-Hungary's vast rule, as the many ethnic groups waged wars, clamoring for autonomy and greater independence. Austria-Hungary viewed Serbia's nationalistic battles with extreme unease, while Russia, who had interests in the area support Serbia in a movement called Pan-Slavism. Germany was allied with Austria-Hungary and thus found itself an enemy of Russia. Britain had sought alliance with Russia when feeling threatened by the increase of German power through its increasing industrialization and weaponry. France was also allied with Britain, and had sought an alliance with Russia against its bitter enemy of Germany also. As France and Britain were allied to Russia, they were thus allied to Serbia and foe to Austria-Hungary and Russia. As the source depicts, all countries were connected through the alliance system, and aggression toward one nation would result in that aggressor being "hit" or "strike(d)" by that nation's allies. All that was waiting was a spark to lit up this chain and pull all the allies into the war. That spark occurred when Gavrilo Princip, a member of the Serbian Black Hand nationalist shot Franz Ferdinand heir to the Austria-Hungarian throne and his pregnant wife. When Serbia began to mass its army in response to Austria-Hungary's ultimatum, Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia and the chain of allies pictured in the above source found themselves pulled into war through the alliance system.

World History 3201 June 2009 Page 12 of 22

Part II
Total Value: 50%

Instructions: Complete ALL questions as indicated, answering in the space provided.

Value
5% 51. Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the origins of the First World War.

The Chain of Friendship



Source: GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh. (7)

The out break of the first world war came from Alliances with countries. Germany was picking on Serbia which was much smaller and trying to over throw it. Other countries would not stand by and let this happen. After Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated, Austria gave Serbia an ultimatum, to which they did not accept. Germany then invaded Belgium, causing Britain to declare war on Germany. As the source shows once one country got involved others slowly began to become involved standing up for their friend countries.

S o K i

Partie II
Valeur totale : 50 %

Instructions : Répondez à TOUTES les questions dans l'espace réservé à cet effet.

Valeur

5 % 51. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les origines de la Première Guerre mondiale.

La chaîne de l'amitié



Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (7) [traduction libre]

5 Dans ce document on voit un fil d'hommes qui dit des choses comme "Si tu frappes ce petit, je..." et "Si tu donnes un coup à mon ami je...". Chaque homme a un nom des pays qui son membres de la Triple Alliance ou la Triple Entente. Ceci représente que si deux membres entre en conflit, tous les autres membres de l'alliance va courir pour aider, ou plus brièvement, la Système d'Alliances. En 1877, Otto von Bismarck, ^{le} ~~the~~ chancelier de Allemagne, a accueilli l'idée d'isoler la France en formant une alliance avec l'Autriche-Hongrie. En 1879 ils ont formé la Double Alliance et en 1884, l'Italie a rejoint pour former la Triple Alliance. Allemagne a aussi signé la Traité de Réassurance avec Russie en 1887, mais le kaiser Guillaume II a décidé de ne pas le renouveler l'année prochaine. Ceci a causé la peur des Russes qui ont courus vers la France pour former une alliance en 1894. La Grande Bretagne était confus ^{pour le monde} pourquoi ~~was~~ formé des alliances et en 1907 il a joint la France et la Russie pour former la Triple Entente. Chaque membre des alliances allé aidé leurs amis si ils entraient dans des conflits. Les autres origines de la Première Guerre Mondiale étoient le nationalisme (loyauté à l'égard du pays qui causé des tensions) la rivalité économique (lutta entre la Grande Bretagne et l'Allemagne pour acquerir des économie plus puissante) et la course aux armements (lutta entre Allemagne et Grande Bretagne pour la marine et la militaire plus puissante). Dans le cas du document, on parle de la Système d'Alliances qui allé forcé les membres des alliances de supporté leurs amis, comme ils font dans le caricature, ou si un frappe leurs amis il vont "..." pour les aider.

Partie II
Valeur totale : 50 %

Instructions : Répondez à TOUTES les questions dans l'espace réservé à cet effet.

Valeur

5 % 51. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les origines de la Première Guerre mondiale.

La chaîne de l'amitié



Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (7) [traduction libre]

4.5

P1 Ce document illustre le miroir de tension entre les pays d'Europe avant le déclenchement de la Première Guerre mondiale. Les positions et menaces fait par les gens représentant tous les différents pays démontre ~~comment~~ comment il y avait autant de rivalités et alliances entre les pays européens qu'une éruption de ces hostilités sous forme de la guerre était inévitable. Comme le document illustre, il y avait des alliances militaires entre l'Allemagne, et l'Autriche-Hongrie (en plus qu'Italie) et entre la Grande-Bretagne, la France et la Russie. Comme la Russie ~~se~~ défendait la Serbie, les tensions ~~étaient~~ aux Balkans et l'ultimatum donné au Serbie par l'Autriche-Hongrie après l'assassinat de l'archiduc François Ferdinand par un Serbe du Main Noire était autant d'une étincelle de violence qu'il a mené à la déclaration de guerre complet entre les deux camps. Les autres origines du conflit entre ses forces sont le nationalisme, la course aux armements et la rivalité économique. Tous les pays ont participé dans ces événements, en particulier la Grande-Bretagne et l'Allemagne. L'Allemagne été frustré par son manque de colonies et pouvoir et a industrialisé et augmenté son pouvoir naval & militaire, en faveur de la guerre. La Grande-Bretagne, le plus grande puissance navale & impériale a ~~se~~ ressenti menacé et a répondu avec son propre augmente d'armements. Tous les pays ont senti le nationalisme de soi & non la communauté globale.

Page 13 de 23 Histoire mondiale 3231, juin 2009

Question 52 (Value 5%)

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the impact the Treaty of Versailles had upon German stability during the post-war period.



Use of Source

The visual shows:

- The Treaty of Versailles on the floor or ground.
- To the left of the wall or pillar, Germany is portrayed as a small child – alone, naked, and from the back view, labeled the “Class of 1939”.
- To the right, the members of the Big 3 (or Big 4) are standing. Clemenceau is in front, saying it’s curious that he hears a child weeping.

Points from the source that a student could reference include:

- Germany, the child, is weeping because of its treatment due to the clauses of the Treaty of Versailles authored by the victorious allies pictured. The year 1939 marks the beginning of The Second World War, with Hitler leading Germany.
- The Big Three leaders (Orlando of Italy = Big Four)
- Clauses in the treaty that Germans felt were harsh.

Use of Knowledge

Economic Stability:

- Economically, the reparations Germany had to pay were excessive. Extra money was printed, which led to hyper-inflation, and subsequently, economic collapse.
- Germany lost ten percent of its land, all overseas colonies, 12.5% of its population, 16% of its coalfields in the Saar Valley and its iron also.
- Germany’s inability to pay reparations led to an occupation of industrial Germany (the Ruhr) by France and Belgium from 1922 to 1923. This led Germans to further resent the Allies and the inability of their own Weimar government to stop the Allied occupation.
- Germany’s economic situation was relieved in 1924 by the American sponsored Dawe’s Plan which adjusted reparations payments and provided Germany with loans to help stabilize their economy. This plan was very successful and from 1924-1929 the economic situation in Germany was much better.

- With this economic stability came political stability until 1929 when the Dawe's Plan eventually failed as it was entirely dependent on the strength of the American economy. This made Germany the hardest-hit European country during the early stages of the Great Depression.

Political Stability:

- Overall, the unfavorable economic and political terms as dictated by the Big 3 (or Big 4) infuriated and humiliated many Germans. Hitler later used it to seek revenge as it provided fertile ground for propaganda against the Allies.
- Germany's army was reduced to 100,000 men; it had no air force and a very small navy.
- The hated 'War Guilt Clause' was even more humiliating. Many turned to right-wing political groups, hence the rise of the Nazis.
- Too many political parties in the Reichstag meant that any government in Germany was unstable. This often left Weimar governments at the mercy of extremist parties like the National Socialist Party (Nazis).
- The Treaty did not bring resolution, but rather encouraged revenge.
- Germany was initially not allowed to join the League of Nations.
- German violations of the treaty grew bolder until Hitler and the Nazis killed the Treaty in 1933.

Students

- Most students discussed the reparations payments and military restrictions placed on Germany well.
- Many simply listed the clauses of the Treaty and did not extend their answers to discuss the clauses' effects during the post-war period. These answers were rather descriptive of the Treaty and did not address the impact of the Treaty.
- Some answered the question in relation to the Treaty's fairness (as in S.C.O. 1.3.4) and thus did not answer the question being asked.
- Many discussed reparations, territorial losses and military restrictions but could not link these elements to problems in the post-war period.
- Most listed the names of the leaders in the picture, however, they did not mention their significance as the Big 3 or 4.
- A few students did not understand the significance of "The Class of 1939". Some of these students incorrectly referenced this as the year the Treaty was signed.
- Most students did not mention Vittorio Orlando of Italy but still accurately identified the other leaders.
- In Histoire mondiale, many students used the word « répercussions » to mean « réparations ».

Excellent 5 / 5
Example # 1

Value
5% 52. Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the impact the Treaty of Versailles had upon German stability during the post-war period.

The Treaty of Versailles had a large impact on German stability during the post-war period. The Treaty ultimately left Germany both economically and politically crippled, as they were forced to agree to paying impossibly high reparations and accept responsibility for the outbreak of war (and consequently the harsh damages it caused). As depicted in the document, the Treaty was drafted by the Allied Powers, represented by the four men labelled, "Woodrow", "Orlando", "Clemenceau", and "Wilson", who were the leaders of



Source: The Twentieth Century World, (27)

Britain, Italy, France and the United States respectively. Germany was not invited to the Peace Conference, and was therefore unable to defend the already crippled nation due to the horrors of war. This is shown in the source as the "child" labelled Germany is isolated from the leaders by the pillar in the cartoon. The state of Germany is also depicted in the source as where the child stands, a dark shadow has been casted, portraying the crippled nation. The Treaty of Versailles included several clauses that were meant to completely pulverize the already weak nation. France Prime Minister, Clemenceau, was largely responsible for these clauses as his goal was to weaken the country to a point where their ability to grow as a nation was impossible. Germany was forced to agree to paying Billions in reparations that would cover the financial burden of the war. As well, Germany's army was drastically reduced to ensure they posed no military threat. This is shown in the source as the text, "Clemenceau: 'Curious! I seem to hear a child weeping!'" conveys Clemenceau's complete disregard to the state (both economically and physically) Germany suffered due to the horrors of war. As well, it depicts their lack of ability to grow, through the child labelled Germany. The reparations forced upon Germany would result in an economically unstable country. As well, the German people blamed the Weimar Republic for signing the Treaty, as it brought shame and poverty to the country. This decline of support allowed for new political parties, such as the fascist World History 3201 June 2009 page 13 of 22 as to fascist to gain popularity, which led to political turmoil, and would later lead to Germany as a fascist state led solely by Hitler. The Treaty of Versailles had several impacts upon German stability after the First World War.

Value

5% 52.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the impact the Treaty of Versailles had upon German stability during the post-war period.

The Treaty of Versailles threw a knife in the back of the long suffering Germany. The people were mortified and humiliated as they lost their military, land and were forced to pay huge reparation debts. The worst for the German people was the war guilt clause which stated Germany as having sole responsibility for the war.

The source pictures the key leaders that developed the Treaty of Versailles: US President Wilson, British Lloyd George

French Clemenceau and Orlando. They look pompous and large as they gained much from the treaty (especially France who took back their much prized territory Alsace Lorraine and placed huge reparation debts on Germany.)

They glare down toward the other side of the treaty where Germany, stripped of dignity and wealth and honour is depicted as a naked child, "weeping" as stated by Clemenceau over the loss of its honour.

The Treaty of Versailles had grave effects on German stability during the post war period. The Weimar Republic was forever tainted with the signing of the Treaty, and looked at with great distrust and seen to be a "democracy without democrats." Governments rose & fell with depressing regularity, and the citizens of Germany grew confused with the new voting process as new leaders sprang up claiming to know what was best for Germany - but lead only to corruption and greater despair. Germany suffered high super inflation as a result of huge reparation bills that they were unable to pay. Children made kites out of the worthless Deutschmarks, and persons resorted to the barter system to avoid paying with a literal truckload of paper marks to buy a bottle of milk. Health care and investments crumbled. Persons of many, including former soldiers ceased to exist. Many Germans were left in poverty, without hope and disenchanted with their fate. This all led to great hatred of the Weimar regime, a deep hatred that fueled the

oppressive leader Adolf Hitler to take power, as he promised to smash the treaty. Through the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was reduced from a strong and mighty, prospering nation to the naked, humiliated baby depicted in the source.



Clemenceau: "Curious! I seem to hear a child weeping!"

Source: *The Twentieth Century World*, (27)

Value
5%

52.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the impact the Treaty of Versailles had upon German stability during the post-war period.

The Treaty of Versailles had a devastating effect on Germany both economically and socially. The war guilt clause which was included in the treaty forced Germany to accept sole responsibility for the start of the war and the damages it caused. Also Germany had to return territories it had gained during the war. But



Clemenceau: "Curious! I seem to hear a child weeping!"

Source: *The Twentieth Century World*, (27)

the most damaging part of the treaty economically was the reparation payments Germany was forced to pay through the signing of the treaty. Germany was already under strained economic conditions after the loss of the war and these reparation payments only magnified their struggling economic. As can be seen in source, Germany is seen as a crying child, this is because the treaty of Versailles left them poor and without any thing, the source also shows figures in power such as Wilson and Clemenceau, members of the victorious Allies who designed the treaties ignoring Germany's cries for help "Curious! I seem to hear a child weeping!", this was very much the case as Germany suffered hyperinflation and were unable to make such high reparation payments. This attitude of revenge on Germany rather than peace through the treaties of Versailles was particularly strong if France as they wanted to make sure Germany was never a threat to them again. The treaty also called for the reduction of military in Germany to almost nothing but these terms were not followed for too long as Hitler began his rise to power in Germany.

Value
5%

52.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the impact the Treaty of Versailles had upon German stability during the post-war period.

The Treaty of Versailles was suppose to be a peace treaty to protect France, Britain and Russia as well as the rest of their colonies through out the world from Germany and its alliances. This treaty was suppose to bring justice to end world wars between these countries.

This treaty was very unfair to ~~the~~ Germany

tho. This Treaty of Versailles was killing Germany after the war. It blamed them for everything that had happened, and said that they had to rebuild all damages. This almost ruined the country and made it vulnerable ~~to~~ and easy for a single leader to now take command. This is where Hitler comes to play. He realized Germany couldn't keep up with this treaty so he started his own party, the Nazi party. They put all the blame on the Jewish people. Really this treaty was the cause of the second world war. Once Hitler came to power the holocaust began. This was dehumanizing a full race of people to try and make the country strong again and it did become strong once more.

During this war 6,000,000 ~~to~~ Jewish people alone were killed. This treaty drained Germany, it took ~~to~~ one third of their supply of money, military power, whatever valuables that they had this Treaty affected it, that's why people were so vulnerable to a man like Adolf Hitler. This man was known as the most evil man during the ~~twentieth~~ 20th century.



Source: *The Twentieth Century World*, (27)

Valeur 5 % 52. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les répercussions du traité de Versailles sur la stabilité de l'Allemagne au cours de l'après-guerre.

5

Les hommes reprisent les pouvoirs qui a été le traité. Comme France, G.B. et les E.U.

D'après la source, on voit un exemple de l'honte nationale qu'Allemagne (le bébé qui pleure dans la coin) sent après le traité ^{severe} et injuste de Versailles. Clemenceau dit qu'il y a un enfant qui pleure comme il va lui attaquer, ça montre la sévérité de la traité. Puis sur la tête de l'enfant qui symbolise l'Allemagne il y a le texte qui dit "classe de 1939" cela signifie que l'enfant va se réveiller en 1939 (en référence d'Hitler et le parti Nazi et).

Source: The Twentieth Century World (27) [traduction libre]

Il a aussi l'instabilité politique après le République de Weimar a signé le traité. Il y avait une élection presque chaque année et chaque fois un autre gouvernement minoritaire. Il y avait aussi des groupes extrémistes comme les Nazis et les situations comme son putsch de la brasserie de Munich. C'est noter que l'instabilité politique va mener toujours à l'instabilité économique, l'Allemagne fut en combat avec le paiement de leurs réparations au France et Belgique. Puis quand France et Belgique n'a reçu pas leurs argent, ils avaient occupés le Ruhr et les travailleurs allemands ont quitté ou ils étaient en grève. Ces instabilités a mener au hyperinflation, et éventuellement leur économie était un des plus pire au monde. Par exemple, c'était moins cher d'utiliser l'argent pour un feu que d'acheter le bois. Aussi, l'instabilité économique fut causé par la perd des territoires riches en ressources comme Alsace Lorraine. Les autres perd des territoires étaient plus militaires, et l'Allemagne a souffert aussi avec les instabilités militaires. L'Allemagne n'a aucun force militaire pour défendre eux-mêmes. Dernièrement, l'instabilité provoque toujours un change et puis le change qu'Allemagne va faire en cause d'honte va être un change au foris.


Situation politique & économique instable

Histoire mondiale 3231, juin 2009 Page 14 de 23

Histoire mondiale
Excellent 5 / 5
Exemple # 2

Valeur 5 % 52. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les répercussions du traité de Versailles sur la stabilité de l'Allemagne au cours de l'après-guerre.

Au cours de l'Après -
Guerre, les répercussions du Traité
de Versailles a dévasté l'Allemagne.
Dans la source, on peut voir les
"grand quatre" les chefs de la
France, l'Italie, la Grande-Bretagne
et les EU. On peut aussi voir
l'Allemagne, qui est un enfant, sans
réseaux, qui pleure. Ceci
représent bien ce qui a passé après
que l'Allemagne a signé le Traité
de Versailles. Clemenceau était
le personne à la conférence qui
voulait punir l'Allemagne beaucoup, et maintenant il est content
que l'Allemagne est misérable. Dans le Traité de Versailles, il a
dit que l'Allemagne devait payer 134 milliard de en réparations.
L'Allemagne n'avait pas de l'argent pour payer les réparations.
Quand la France et la Belgique a vu que l'Allemagne ne
payait pas les réparations, elles ont décidé d'occuper la Ruhr,
la partie d'Allemagne où il y avait beaucoup de usines. Quand
la Ruhr devient occupé, les gens cessait de travailler. Le
petit peu d'argent qu'il a produit était pris immédiatement par
la France et la Belgique. Alors, les pays étaient très pauvres et
les gens n'avaient pas assez à manger. Le plan Dawes
a aidé en Allemagne, par lui donnant de l'argent
immédiat. Mais, quand les EU était entré dans la
Grande-Dépression, le plan a arrêté. Alors, la gouvernement
Allemand a décidé d'imprimer plus d'argent pour payer les dettes. Ceci a
causé l'hyperinflation, où les prix des choses dépassent les salaires. Alors
l'économie n'a pas amélioré jusqu'à la dictature de Hitler.
La situation politique était aussi très instable. Beaucoup de
gens ont blâmé la République de Weimar pour signer le Traité. Aussi,
il y avait trop de parties politiques et les parties
en contrôle a changé beaucoup a cause de la représentation proportionnelle.
Les situations instables mènent souvent à des mesures extrêmes. Ceci
n'était pas différent, et les gens ont élu un gouvernement fasciste.



Source: The Twentieth Century World (27) (traduction libre)

Histoire mondiale 3231, juin 2009 Page 14 de 23

7 minutes
Valeur
5 %

52. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les répercussions du traité de Versailles sur la stabilité de l'Allemagne au cours de l'après-guerre.

Après que le traité de Versailles est mis en place en 1919 par les puissances alliées, l'Allemagne était humiliée. La clause de la culpabilité a été mise sur eux, et le Reichstag a dû payer des réparations sur les dommages de la guerre. Le fait que ce traité qui a été forcé sur le peuple allemand n'était pas juste, et les



Source: The Twentieth Century World (27) [traduction libre]

gens le savait. Dans la source fournie, les premiers ministres et présidents de la Grande-Bretagne, la France et les États-Unis regardent l'Allemagne dans le coin, gardé par le traité de Versailles, pendant qu'il pleure. Clemenceau "croit" entendre les cris de l'Allemagne, mais ces hommes se souvenaient de la Première Guerre mondiale et étaient en train de souffrir de la Grande Dépression, alors ils ne voulaient pas que l'Allemagne ait la chance de se reconstruire.

À cause du fait que l'Allemagne avait dû repayer les dommages de la guerre, ils sont allés en dette. La valeur du Mark plummait, et des gens apportaient de l'argent par le baril pour acheter des choses simples comme le pain. L'Allemagne ne pouvait pas avoir des troupes militaires, et pouvait avoir une armée terrestre de seulement 100 000 hommes. Ce traité avait des effets désastreux sur la morale du peuple allemand et avait créé des sentiments d'humilité et de l'injustice.

Question 53 (Value 10%)

Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the impact of Stalin's Five Year Plans on the Soviet people.

Source 1

"In order to turn a peasant society into an industrialized country, countless material and human sacrifices were necessary. The people had to accept this, but it would not be achieved by enthusiasm alone.... If a few million people had to perish in the process, history would forgive Comrade Stalin.... The great aim demanded great energy that could be drawn from a backward people only by great harshness."

- Anatoli Rybakov (Representing Stalin's viewpoint)

Source: GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh. (133)

Source 2

"Yet despite the problems of the early 1930s, collectivization was ultimately a success at enormous cost to the Soviet people. By 1937 over 90% of peasant farms had been collectivized and the Kulaks had been destroyed. From 1933 Soviet agricultural production improved; by 1937 output was significantly higher."

Source: Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly. (34-35)

Use of Source

Source 1

- Sacrifice, both material and human, was necessary to industrialize.
- "Backward" people needed "harshness".
- A "few million" people "perished" under Stalin.

Source 2

- "Enormous cost" of collectivization for the Soviet people
- By 1937, kulaks were destroyed.
- By 1937, output was much higher.

*NOTE: This question asks the student to *assess*, or to examine the validity of the statement, to make an informed judgment or weigh the merit of two different points of view.

Use of Knowledge

- The Five Year Plans began in 1928. Private enterprise was abolished, private use of land eliminated, and dictatorial controls were enforced to meet the goals of collectivization.
- Began program to industrialize and modernize the U.S.S.R. (expansion of factories; oil and electricity; grain and tractors)
- Opposed foreign intervention; attempted to strengthen military
- Standard of living was allowed to fall and food rationing was introduced.
- Production of consumer goods was curtailed.
- Soviet agriculture collapsed as kulaks were eliminated.
- Famine in 1933. Forced collectivization shattered the Ukraine; 6-7 million dead
- Recovered in the late 1930s due to improved technology and strict control

- Enabled investment in industrial development, science, education, and military. There were more trained and educated professionals
- In 12 years, the U.S.S.R. became an industrial power; this was key to its survival when Hitler invaded in 1941 and for the Second World War in general.
- Stalin's purges – Was the cost of human life worth the industrial development?
- Unemployment was almost non-existent. Education was free and compulsory.
- Life was very harsh under Stalin. Factory discipline was strict and punishments were severe.
- Conditions on major projects (dams, canals) were appalling. As a result, many died.
- Concentration on heavy industry meant that there were few consumer goods (e.g. clothes, radios) which many people wanted to buy.

*NOTE: The student should conclude with his or her assessment.

Students

- Students discussed collectivization, purges, gulags, famine and the N.E.P. very well. They identified kulaks and their relationship with Stalin's Five-Year Plans.
- Most students who did address the impact noted that the industrial progress was significant despite the human cost.
- Some students poorly referenced the sources and simply rewrote them with little extension.
- Students seemed to have little knowledge about examples of industrial changes in Russia, such as increases in steel, iron, oil production; power plants; modernization of farms; education.

Value

10%

53.

Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the impact of Stalin's Five Year Plans on the Soviet people.

Source 1

"In order to turn a peasant society into an industrialized country, countless material and human sacrifices were necessary. The people had to accept this, but it would not be achieved by enthusiasm alone.... If a few million people had to perish in the process, history would forgive Comrade Stalin.... The great aim demanded great energy that could be drawn from a backward people only by great harshness."

- Anatoli Rybakov (Representing Stalin's viewpoint)

Source: GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh. (133)

Source 2

"Yet despite the problems of the early 1930s, collectivization was ultimately a success at enormous cost to the Soviet people. By 1937 over 90% of peasant farms had been collectivized and the Kulaks had been destroyed. From 1933 Soviet agricultural production improved; by 1937 output was significantly higher."

Source: Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly. (34-35)

During Stalin's time as dictator of the communist nation, the USSR, he implemented two Five Year Plans, with the intention of industrializing the agriculturally dominant nation, to motivate and improve the economy. These plans proved to be successful, as the USSR emerged as a leading industrial nation, however, the success came at a considerable cost to the population of the nation led by a cruel, ruthless dictator.

The population of the USSR consisted mainly of peasants. Lenin had introduced the "New Economic Policy," with partial success in stimulating the weak economy, before his death. This policy created a mixed society, combining both communist and capitalist aspects. As farms were allowed to be privately owned, a new class of citizens emerged, the kulaks, who were wealthy, successful farmers who benefitted from the elements of capitalism. However, as Stalin came into power, his plans to lead a completely communist nation depended on the removal of Lenin's policy, as well as those he saw as potential threats, which included the kulaks. The Five Year Plans incorporated a policy which would put all farms under state control, collectivization. In order to do so effectively, Stalin murdered countless kulaks, to ensure he had little opposition in implementing his policies. As well, Stalin ordered the murders of anyone he viewed as a threat to his power over the country, including members of

other existing political powers, intellectuals and the wealthy. This reign of terror became known as "Stalin's purges." His purges also eliminated the weak, who he felt would have no contribution in the work necessary to ensure his plans were successful. As described in the first source, "countless material and human sacrifices were necessary... If a few million people had to perish in the process, history would forgive comrade Stalin." This quote directly shows Stalin's ruthless methods as dictator in order to ensure his plans were successful, and to "turn a peasant society into an industrialized country," as stated in source one. Source two alludes to Stalin's collectivization policy which were incorporated into his Five Year Plans, as it states "By 1937 over 90% of peasant farms had been collectivized and the kulaks had been destroyed," showing both his seizure of farms as well as his ruthless measures the Soviets experienced.

In order to further guarantee the success of his plans, which were implemented for one main reason, to industrialize the nation, Stalin created work camps, and forced all Soviets to contribute in changing the economy. Soviets were harshly forced to work, in building factories, on the new government controlled farms, ^{and} working in harsh conditions for impossibly long shifts, or the consequences were cruel. As stated in the first source, "The people had to accept this, but it would not be achieved by enthusiasm alone... The great aim demanded great energy that could be drawn from a backward people only by great harshness." This quote represents Stalin's viewpoint, in which forced labour and harshness was necessary to industrialize the USSR.

Stalin's five year plans were considered to be "ultimately a success at enormous cost to the Soviet People," as stated in source two. Although he accomplished his goal, and the USSR emerged as a leading industrialized nation with a booming economy, while other countries still faced the consequences of the Great Depression, he used unforgivable tactics to do so. Agriculture improved, as did the living conditions of many citizens as a result, however, not without sacrifices that affected all classes of Soviets.

Excellent 10 / 10
Example # 2

Value
10% 53. Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the impact of Stalin's Five Year Plans on the Soviet people.

Source 1

"In order to turn a peasant society into an industrialized country, countless material and human sacrifices were necessary. The people had to accept this, but it would not be achieved by enthusiasm alone.... If a few million people had to perish in the process, history would forgive Comrade Stalin.... The great aim demanded great energy that could be drawn from a backward people only by great harshness."

- Anatoli Rybakov (Representing Stalin's viewpoint)

Source: GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh. (133)

Source 2

"Yet despite the problems of the early 1930s, collectivization was ultimately a success at enormous cost to the Soviet people. By 1937 over 90% of peasant farms had been collectivized and the Kulaks had been destroyed. From 1933 Soviet agricultural production improved; by 1937 output was significantly higher."

Source: Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly. (34-35)

In Source 1, Anatoli Rybakov represents Stalin's viewpoint on his 5 year plans. Before Stalin's leadership Russia was a poor country mirrored by corrupt regimes and war, although somewhat helped by communist leader Lenin's New Economic Policy. Stalin believed Russia to be, as stated in the above source a "Peasant society". He also believed that to turn Russia into a more developed nation he would have to increase industrial productivity. The line in the source "to turn a peasant society into an industrialized country, countless material and human sacrifices were necessary" echoes Stalin's communist belief that industrialization was necessary in a nation's development, his Five Year plans sought to increase industrialization and were successful in increasing industrial output. However the "great harshness" of Stalin's regime resulted in the "human sacrifices" mentioned by Anatoli Rybakov. Although the 5 year plans helped build Russia industrially, many Russian people suffered under Stalin's overbearing, violent, tyrannical regime. The line "If a few million people had to perish in the process, history would forgive Comrade Stalin" refers to Stalin's Purges. Stalin killed, exiled and threw in prison any opposition to his 5 years plan.

and any one who was a competitor for the leadership of Russia. Although the 5 year plans helped Russia's industrial development, the Russian people lived in fear and terror under Stalin's regime.

Sl. } The second source by Mr. Nigel Kelly from his book Russia and the USSR speaks of the collectivization aspect of Stalin's 5 year plans. The opening line "yet despite the problems of the early 1930s" refers to the great depressions and series of famines that tormented the Soviet people. Collectivization — or the forcing of single person or family owned farms to be part of huge collective government owned farms had an "enormous cost to the Soviet people." Lenin's New Economic Policy resulted in the creation of kulaks — very wealthy farmers who benefitted from the experience of capitalism in Lenin's plan. When Stalin seized power, these farmers were victims to Stalin's purges as he eradicated the individual and collectivized their farms. Stalin's eradication of the kulaks is referenced in source 2's line: "By 1937 over 90% of peasant farms had been collectivized and the kulaks had been destroyed." The source states that from 1933 Soviet agricultural production improved; by 1937 output was significantly higher. However, many of the collectivized farms were managed by government officials who knew very little about farming. With little benefits and the pain of losing their independent farm, the farmers had little inspiration to care for their crops as best they could. Stalin's purges of the kulaks led to a huge drop in capable farmers, while famines and droughts irritated the situation more fully.

Stalin's Five Year Plans helped to modernize Soviet Russia. However his violent and oppressive regime also caused fear and pain for a long suffering people.

Value
10%

53. Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the impact of Stalin's Five Year Plans on the Soviet people.

Source 1

"In order to turn a peasant society into an industrialized country, countless material and human sacrifices were necessary. The people had to accept this, but it would not be achieved by enthusiasm alone.... If a few million people had to perish in the process, history would forgive Comrade Stalin.... The great aim demanded great energy that could be drawn from a backward people only by great harshness."

- Anatoli Rybakov (Representing Stalin's viewpoint)

Source: GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh. (133)

Source 2

"Yet despite the problems of the early 1930s, collectivization was ultimately a success at enormous cost to the Soviet people. By 1937 over 90% of peasant farms had been collectivized and the Kulaks had been destroyed. From 1933 Soviet agricultural production improved; by 1937 output was significantly higher."

Source: Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly. (34-35)

K1
K1
K1

Joseph Stalin took major industrial steps to bring Russia up from what he said to be one hundred years behind the rest of the world in industry. He introduced Five Year Plans, in which he told his people they would be caught up to the rest of the world. The people were thrilled that he was determined and positive, and they supported him. He began with collectivization, where no one would own their own businesses or farms any longer, and there would be state controlled farms where the government would be in control. This proved to be unfair to the rich Kulaks who were in control of their own farms, so they burned everything they owned and slaughtered their animals so Stalin could not gain from it. They were in turn murdered along with millions of other Russian people, those who rebelled against Stalin, those who could not work, and anyone unable to meet the requirements for their limit of production in their

K1 place of work. Stalin's purges were devastating, and millions of Russian people were slaughtered by the Red army during this time. As stated in Source #2, "Yet despite the problems of the early 1930's, collectivization was ultimately a success at enormous cost to the Soviet people," showing that although human lives were demolished, Stalin's Five year plans proved to benefit the country's agricultural and industrial production, and their production was basically caught up to the rest of the world. A man representing the view of Stalin states "...The great aim demanded great energy that could be drawn from a backward people only by great harshness," and yes, Stalin destroyed his people, but his ideas were correct in stating that his plans would move them up in the world, and his determination and positive attitude let him achieve that, with major casualties of his people.

Value
10%

53. Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the impact of Stalin's Five Year Plans on the Soviet people.

Source 1

"In order to turn a peasant society into an industrialized country, countless material and human sacrifices were necessary. The people had to accept this, but it would not be achieved by enthusiasm alone.... If a few million people had to perish in the process, history would forgive Comrade Stalin.... The great aim demanded great energy that could be drawn from a backward people only by great harshness."

- Anatoli Rybakov (Representing Stalin's viewpoint)

Source: GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh. (133)

Source 2

"Yet despite the problems of the early 1930s, collectivization was ultimately a success at enormous cost to the Soviet people. By 1937 over 90% of peasant farms had been collectivized and the Kulaks had been destroyed. From 1933 Soviet agricultural production improved; by 1937 output was significantly higher."

Source: Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly. (34-35)

Based on the sources and history the impact of Stalin's two five year plans on the Soviet people actually increased the standard living of the Soviet population

The First Five year plan was put in place to lower the military budget so he could spend more on the economic budget. To do this Stalin would have to get up peace reforms to stop the armistices with the Americans and get in a era of détente. Stalin gradually got the Americans to agree to this so he eventually lowered the defense/military budget and began the whole purpose of the five year plans was to modernize Russia and bring them to new grounds of industrialization. He wanted Russia to be caught up with the rest of the world.

In source one it talks about how Stalin believed that for him to turn Russia from a peasant agriculture society to a industrialized one hard work

SI

and sacrifice was needed. They needed to work hard for many hours and low wages. He talked about how it was up to the people of Russia to turn the society into a industrialized one, with there enthusiasm alone.

KI

Stalin's second 'Five year plan was used more or actually starting to build more factories and employing more people. He started using all his resources to advance in technology and build more factories. Stalin moved away from state owned kulaks and more toward a more collectivized society. He used the policy 2 steps forward 1 step back. He allowed some personal gain off farms which made the life of the people a little bit better than it had been before.

2

In source two it talks about how collectivization was a success in a high cost. It talks about how the farms were being collectivized and the kulaks destroyed and how it increased the production of agricultural output significantly. It talks about how Stalin's policy worked.

KI

The 'two steps forward refers to communism as the one step back refers to capitalism. He thought that some aspects of capitalism had to be introduced to help the society become better for living and all Stalin's five year plans did accomplish what he set out to do which was industrialize Russia and increase the living conditions of the people.

Valeur 10 % 53. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez l'impact des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique.

Source 1

« Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains et matériels pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé. Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité, mais l'enthousiasme ne suffit pas... Si plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route, l'histoire saura pardonner au camarade Staline... Pour atteindre ce grand objectif, il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple sorte de sa pauvreté. »

- Anatoli Rybakov (représentant le point de vue de Staline)

Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (133) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Malgré les problèmes au début des années 1930, la collectivisation a été une réussite qui a coûté très cher à la population de l'Union soviétique. En 1937, plus de 90 % des fermes avaient été collectivisées et les koulaks avaient été éliminés. La production agricole de l'Union soviétique, qui s'était améliorée depuis 1933, était beaucoup plus élevée en 1937. »

Source : Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly (34-35) [traduction libre]

10
C1 Avec le règne de Staline beaucoup de choses ont changé quand Lénine a mort en 1924. Staline a commencé par éliminer le NÉP (nouvelle économie pour) et a remplacé cette plan capitaliste avec le communisme en ces plans quinquennaux. Il a ~~est~~ changé la société de l'Union soviétique avec ses plans quinquennaux et les méthodes totalitaires comme la dékoulakisation, les purges Staliniennes et les coulages pour "améliorer" l'URSS.

D1 Avec les plans quinquennaux Staline a envisioned un U.R.S.S plus industrialisé "pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé". Il voulait que l'URSS soit une des pays plus puissants comme le G-B ou l'États-Unis. Pour renforcer cette idéologie il a commencé les plans quinquennaux en 1928. En cette première plan, Staline a forcé à construire les industries. D1 Il a aussi commencé la méthode de "collectivisation" où tous les petits fermes indépendantes ont regroupées en une grande ferme (~~tout~~ kolkhoze) et toute la produit est donné à l'état. Cette nouvelle méthode avait donné plus d'argent à l'état mais a aussi rendu les paysans plus pauvres.

C1 Avec la collectivisation il y a beaucoup de protestation entre les paysans, spécifiquement les koulaks. Avec le NÉP pour Lénine en 1925 il a établi deux groupes de fermiers : les koulaks (^{fermier} paysans riches) et les

ouvriers (^{firmiers} ~~personnes~~ ^{personnes} ~~personnes~~) avec les Plans Quinquennaux. Staline voulait que toutes les firmes donnent les produits à l'État. Ça a commencé le conflit parce que les koulaks ne voudraient pas donner tous les produits à l'État. Parce que cette privatisation Staline a commencé la dékoulakisation ou il a ~~envoyé~~ ~~démoli~~ ~~démoli~~ presque la moitié de la population koulak et détruit les fermes. "90% des koulaks étaient éliminés". En réponse de cela beaucoup de koulaks ont brûlé leur bétail au lieu de donner à l'État.

Un autre impact que le Plan Quinquennaux avait sur la population est que Staline ~~est~~ ~~est~~ toujours se promenait partout en train habillé comme un de ces dans les Plans est que Staline se croyait qu'un 2^{ème} guerre mondiale se déclencherait alors il a démarré toute ses usines plus l'est. Dans la population Union Soviétique cette promotion était démentie avec les Pans Staliniens ou Staline a envoyé le NKVD à tuer tous les ~~personnes~~ ~~personnes~~ qui peut être un menace à la mine de Staline. Il y a aussi des preuves que les personnes ont chargé de crime mais il n'était pas d'évidence. Staline a ~~parfois~~ ~~parfois~~ préparé de tuer toutes les "ennemis" dans son chemin "plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route".

Staline a aussi utilisé les Goulags pour envoyer quelques personnes qui braver l'autorité ou le censure de la gouvernance. Les goulags sont un ~~grand~~ ~~grand~~ camp de travail où il a aussi contribué à l'industrialisation de l'économie. L'impact de ces plans dans la population est que Staline ne s'est pas arrêté à rien pour améliorer l'économie (montré en source #1) "Pour atteindre son objectif il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple de l'Union de la puissance". Le résultat de toutes ces tentatives est que l'économie soviétique (montré en source #2) mais avec le prix du sang.

Valeur 10 % 53. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez l'impact des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique.

Source 1

« Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains et matériels pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé. Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité, mais l'enthousiasme ne suffit pas... Si plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route, l'histoire saura pardonner au camarade Staline... Pour atteindre ce grand objectif, il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple sorte de sa pauvreté. »

- Anatoli Rybakov (représentant le point de vue de Staline)

Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (133) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Malgré les problèmes au début des années 1930, la collectivisation a été une réussite qui a coûté très cher à la population de l'Union soviétique. En 1937, plus de 90 % des fermes avaient été collectivisées et les koulaks avaient été éliminés. La production agricole de l'Union soviétique, qui s'était améliorée depuis 1933, était beaucoup plus élevée en 1937. »

Source : Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly (34-35) [traduction libre]

Q
C1
C1
D1
Le but de les plans ~~quinquennaux~~ quinquennaux était l'amélioration de l'industrie et la militaire avec l'argent du secteur agricole. Staline a vu que les défauts au passé ~~étaient~~ ^{étaient} causés par la manque de l'industrie fort et la technologie militaire. Staline a voulu changer ceci, mais il a eu besoin d'argent pour faire ceci. Il a réformé le secteur agricole pour trouver cette argent. Son politique de collectivisation a utilisé des grandes fermes plus efficaces, pas les petites fermes individuelles du passé. Mais, les Koulaks, une classe de fermiers plus riches qui étaient créés par le Nouvelle Plan Economique de Lénine, n'ont pas voulu perdre leur territoires et l'argent. ~~La collectivisation~~ ^{Staline a décidé} Staline a décidé d'éliminer les Koulaks avec aucune force. Cette brutalité fait référence au Source 1. Staline a voulu ~~changer~~ changer la URSS, ~~pas même~~ même s'il faut tuer des millions. Il a tué ou expulsé des millions de Koulaks et la secteur agricole a chuté dans les premières années. Les Koulaks ont

B1

bruler leur produits en défiance de Staline. Aussi, après les purges, il n'y avait aucune personne avec l'expérience dans le secteur agricole, et des millions sont morts de faim (entre 4 et 5 millions). Ces faits, en combinaison avec la source numéro un, montrent comment Staline a utilisé la brutalité pour changer son pays.

D1

Mais, après ces problèmes, les plans ont eu beaucoup de succès. La deuxième source montre comment le secteur agricole a amélioré dans le pays. Les grandes fermes avec beaucoup de terres et beaucoup des fermiers étaient plus efficaces, même sans les koulaks. Cette succès a eu une grande impacte sur les plans quinquennaux. L'argent et la nourriture de ses fermes étaient mis dans les centres urbains pour stimuler la croissance de l'industrie. Une nouvelle système d'éducation ~~et d'enseignement~~ a aussi causé nouvelle développement scientifique. Le chômage a diminué beaucoup, et la qualité de vie a augmenté ~~beaucoup~~ pour les citoyens. Tous ces succès ~~étaient~~ étaient causés par le succès dans le secteur agricole.

D1

B1

Dans seulement 10 années, le URSS a complètement changer leur industrie. ~~Ils ont changé~~ Ils étaient un pays rural et pauvre, avec 80% de la population qui travaillaient dans le ~~secteur~~ secteur agricole. Au fin de les années '30 ils étaient un pays modernisé et bien équipé pour une guerre. La restructuration de l'industrie ~~était~~ était brutale, mais efficace. La union Soviétique ~~était~~ ~~était~~ a changé beaucoup en cause de la succès dans le secteur agricole, ~~et au point~~ et au fin des années 1930, leur industrie a surpassé celle de la France et le Japon. Les plans quinquennaux étaient une grande succès.

C1

Valeur 10 % 53. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez l'impact des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique.

Source 1

« Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains et matériels pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé. Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité, mais l'enthousiasme ne suffit pas... Si plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route, l'histoire saura pardonner au camarade Staline... Pour atteindre ce grand objectif, il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple sorte de sa pauvreté. »

- Anatoli Rybakov (représentant le point de vue de Staline)

Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (133) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Malgré les problèmes au début des années 1930, la collectivisation a été une réussite qui a coûté très cher à la population de l'Union soviétique. En 1937, plus de 90 % des fermes avaient été collectivisées et les koulaks avaient été éliminés. La production agricole de l'Union soviétique, qui s'était améliorée depuis 1933, était beaucoup plus élevée en 1937. »

Source : Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly (34-35) [traduction libre]

1
D1
Au début de la 19^{ème} siècle, la Russie était en un état pitoyable et avait une population en souffrance après une révolution communiste. Staline a mis en place des plans quinquennaux en Russie pour essayer de sortir son pays de la pauvreté mais ça coûtait "d'innombrables sacrifices humains" et l'élimination d'une classe sociale.

01
CO3
Staline, le dictateur communiste marxiste de la Russie, voulait sortir son pays de la pauvreté et créer une puissance économique et industrielle sur l'échelle mondiale. Pour faire ceci, Staline a introduit les plans quinquennaux pour augmenter la production agricole et industrielle de la Russie. Ces plans quinquennaux de Staline étaient une réponse de la nouvelle plan économique (NPE) de Vladimir Lénine, le ~~premier~~ dictateur de la Russie avant Staline. Le premier ^{des} plans quinquennaux de Staline visait à créer une augmentation dans la production agricole et le deuxième visait à augmenter la production des produits de minage. Ces plans quinquennaux ont eu une augmentation dans ces deux domaines mais pas sans une grande impact sur la population russe.

Valeur
10 % 53.

D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez l'impact des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique.

Source 1

« Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains et matériels pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé. Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité, mais l'enthousiasme ne suffit pas... Si plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route, l'histoire saura pardonner au camarade Staline... Pour atteindre ce grand objectif, il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple sorte de sa pauvreté. »

- Anatoli Rybakov (représentant le point de vue de Staline)

Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (133) [traduction libre]

raison industrialiser

Source 2

« Malgré les problèmes au début des années 1930, la collectivisation a été une réussite qui a coûté très cher à la population de l'Union soviétique. En 1937, plus de 90 % des fermes avaient été collectivisées et les koulaks avaient été éliminés. La production agricole de l'Union soviétique, qui s'était améliorée depuis 1933, était beaucoup plus élevée en 1937. »

Source : Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly (34-35) [traduction libre]

Staline était un dictateur très dur qui a causé beaucoup de morts pendant son temps comme leader des soviétiques. Mais qu'il avait le pouvoir il a détruit le NEP créé par Lénine et retourné l'URSS à une communisme dur. Il tué les personnes qu'il a vue comme ennemie en n'importe quel personne qui ~~existait~~ ne sont pas d'accord avec ce qu'il fait.

Le première source parle de comment Staline était prêt à tué n'importe quel personne pour être plus proche à une « pays industrialisé ». « Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains... » parle de les purges et goulags de Staline, et comment il essayer de les justifié. Les purges était quand Staline tué tout ce qu'il a vue comme ennemie et les goulags étaient des camps de travail où les personnes étaient forcé à faire les tâche très dure ~~travaux~~

Page 15 de 23

Histoire mondiale 3231, juin 2009

World History 3201 / Histoire mondiale 3231 Grading Standards – June 2009

36

ava beaucoup de faim. Beaucoup de personnes
sont morte dans ces camps mais Staline pensé
que c'était nécessaire.

Staline à aussi tué de nombreuse personne
dans le dékoulakisation ~~des pays~~ qui est
représenté par source 2. Pour avoir plus de
l'argent pour industrialisé Staline avait besoin de
tout l'argent qui ven des fermiers et des investisseurs
ferme. Il décidé de reprendre tous qui appartienn
aux Koulati (paysans/fermiers riche). «En 1937, plus
de 90% de fermes avaient été collectivisées et
les Koulati avaient été éliminés.» Les Koulati qui
essayer de résister était tué, et quelques une
ont détruit complètement leur ferme par proteste.

L'idée de Staline était qu'il était très importants
d'industrialiser pour défendre contre les puissance
à l'extérieur de l'URSS et pour être capable
d'agrandir le sphère d'influence. Il a mit beaucoup
de effort de ~~trava~~ crée plus de scientifique et
d'ingénieurs ~~pour~~ pour avoir les meilleures
technologie. Son plan quinquennaux à plutôt
réussi et aider l'industrialiser l'URSS car ils
ont surpassé la France plus vite qu'on à
jamais vue avant.

Se plan à peut-être marché pour
l'industrialisation mais les peuple Russe vivaient
un vie beaucoup plus dure que avant. Il
souffre beaucoup de la faim et
n'avait aucun droit comme personne. Ils
étaient complètement contrôlé par Staline.

Valeur
10 % 53. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez l'impact des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique.

Source 1

5
« Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains et matériels pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé. Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité, mais l'enthousiasme ne suffit pas... Si plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route, l'histoire saura pardonner au camarade Staline... Pour atteindre ce grand objectif, il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple sorte de sa pauvreté. »

- Anatoli Rybakov (représentant le point de vue de Staline)

Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (133) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Malgré les problèmes au début des années 1930, la collectivisation a été une réussite qui a coûté très cher à la population de l'Union soviétique. En 1937, plus de 90 % des fermes avaient été collectivisées et les koulaks avaient été éliminés. La production agricole de l'Union soviétique, qui s'était améliorée depuis 1933, était beaucoup plus élevée en 1937. »

Source : Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly (34-35) [traduction libre]

cl Les plans quinquennaux de Staline avaient des grands effets sur la population de l'Union soviétique, incluant l'amélioration de la lutte de pauvreté, mais qui endommager la production agricole et les agriculteurs eux-mêmes.

cl Quand Lénine a pris le pouvoir après la deuxième révolution russe en octobre-novembre 1917, il a mis en place la Nouvelle Politique Économique (NPE). Cette plan espérait d'arrêter le montant de pauvreté dans le pays. Quand il meurt, et Staline prend son place, il lutte pour le même but, mais par un façon différente. cl Il crée les plans quinquennaux qui servaient à éliminer la disparité entre riche et pauvre. Cette politique utilisait le fait de la collectivisation, où tout les produits agricoles allaient aux gouvernement pour le vendre. cl Les koulaks (les fermiers) n'étaient pas

en accord avec cette situation, car ils voulaient faire leurs propres profits. Ils ont décidé de former une révolte contre Staline.

01 Cette révolte a mené à une ralentissement dans la production agricole. Les Koulaks s'ils entendaient que les gens venaient collecter leurs produits, ils les mettaient sur terre et ont les mis à feu. Dans la source 1 Anatoli Rybakov, un représentant pour Staline, dit que "Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité" mais les Koulaks ne voulaient pas. Le NPE étaient le plan le plus meilleur pour eux en termes de profits, et maintenant ils étaient réduits à la pauvreté comme auparavant. Staline savait que cette révolte ne pouvait pas continuer, alors il décide de l'arrêter.

01 Après les manifestations des Koulaks, Staline a fait une purge de ce peuple. Dans la source 2, ça dit "En 1934, plus de 90% des fermes ~~ont~~ avaient été collectivisées et les Koulaks avaient été éliminés." Ces gens sont étaient tués car ils luttaient pour leurs ~~de~~ droits et cela est injuste. Même si la production agricole s'est remontée et le taux de pauvreté diminué, ce n'est jamais en façon de créer un nouveau système économique.

En améliorant le taux de pauvreté, mais en endommageant la production agricole et l'élimination d'un peuple russe, ~~et~~ les plans quinquennaux de Staline a eu des grands impacts sur la Russie.

Valeur 10 % 53. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez l'impact des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique.

Source 1

« Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains et matériels pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé. Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité, mais l'enthousiasme ne suffit pas... Si plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route, l'histoire saura pardonner au camarade Staline... Pour atteindre ce grand objectif, il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple sorte de sa pauvreté. »

- Ananoli Rybakov (représentant le point de vue de Staline)

Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (133) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Malgré les problèmes au début des années 1930, la collectivisation a été une réussite qui a coûté très cher à la population de l'Union soviétique. En 1937, plus de 90 % des fermes avaient été collectivisées et les koulaks avaient été éliminés. La production agricole de l'Union soviétique, qui s'était améliorée depuis 1933, était beaucoup plus élevée en 1937. »

Source : Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly (34-35) [traduction libre]

d1 La première source est dans le point de vue avec Staline, et Rybakov pense que Staline a le droit de faire des choses extrême, comme transformer la société paysanne, pour les ^{les} ~~les~~ bienfaits d'un pays industrialisé. La source montre que Staline peut faire comme il veut.

d1 Après la guerre civile, Lénine avait gagné le rôle du communisme. Il avait utilisé le rôle du communisme d'un avantage de lui et ~~parant tout les~~ après son mort, Staline fait la même chose. Il commence le plan quinquennaux pour cinq ans. Ce plan avait beaucoup d'effet sur les gens au l'URSS. Il ~~ont dit~~ dit au tout les fermiers et paysannes à aller avec sur un autre pièce de terre, pour ils peuvent travailler ensemble, et pas ~~exposer~~ acheter l'argent et les des autre

d1

gens. Pour un temps long, il n'y a pas beaucoup de nourriture, pas d'argent, tout les personnes sont misérables!

co. 5
Ce plan réduire le nombre des personnes dans la population de l'Union Soviétique. Staline était la cause de cet période de temps, parce ~~que~~ qu'il ne veut pas rien, seulement le pays de grandir, ~~et~~ et tout la nourriture et l'argent qui ~~sont~~ était de la fermes, va au des soldats, et la machinerie pour l'armée.

co. 5
La deuxième source dit que au cause de ce plan, ~~tout~~ l'armée était plus forte et grand depuis beaucoup des années.

Le plan quinquennaux avait beaucoup des facteurs sur la population. L'armée ont grandi plus rapid au cause ~~de~~ d'un grand parti de nourriture de l'argent va au l'armée mais ce n'est pas un bon chose pour les ~~autres~~ autres personnes qui n'étaient pas dans l'armée parce qu'il n'ont pas des nourriture ~~pour~~ pour des familles ~~de~~ de suivre.

cl
L'impact que Staline ont fait sur la population était très extrême. Des familles va de beaucoup d'argent et nourriture, de rien. La population réduit, ~~restes~~ ~~et~~ et Staline ~~seulement~~ pense seulement sur l'armée pour gagner des guerres en argent, et ~~pas~~ pas ~~les~~ son population de son pays.

Valeur
10 % 53. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez l'impact des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique.

Source 1

« Il a fallu consentir d'innombrables sacrifices humains et matériels pour transformer une société paysanne en un pays industrialisé. Le peuple a dû accepter cette réalité, mais l'enthousiasme ne suffit pas... Si plusieurs millions doivent mourir en cours de route, l'histoire saura pardonner au camarade Staline... Pour atteindre ce grand objectif, il fallait une grande énergie et des méthodes brutales pour assurer que le peuple sorte de sa pauvreté. »

- Anatoli Rybakov (représentant le point de vue de Staline)

Source : GCSE Modern World History, Ben Walsh (133) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Malgré les problèmes au début des années 1930, la collectivisation a été une réussite qui a coûté très cher à la population de l'Union soviétique. En 1937, plus de 90 % des fermes avaient été collectivisées et les koulaks avaient été éliminés. La production agricole de l'Union soviétique, qui s'était améliorée depuis 1933, était beaucoup plus élevée en 1937. »

Source : Russia and the USSR, Nigel Kelly (34-35) [traduction libre]

00.5
00.5
Source 1 fait référence à la peine causée par les plans quinquennaux de Staline, et tous la pauvreté, mort, et souffrance qu'il avaient causé. Source 2 parle du côté économique de cette situation, et la fait que les fermiers étaient forcés de quitter leurs fermes pour travailler dans les usines / industries. L'impacte des plans quinquennaux de Staline sur la population de l'Union soviétique étaient surtout négatif, et les méthodes d'encouragement semble stupide. Ses idées pour aider ses peuples de sortir du pauvreté on avait un affecte plus pire que positive. La fait qu'ils disaient "One step forward, 2 steps back" aussi sembler stupide, car la génération causant ne voulaient pas de souffrance à ce moment pour une longue période de temps jusqu'en essayant de aider la pays.

Question 54 (Value 10%)

Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the effectiveness of appeasement in containing Nazi aggression.

Source 1

“The central question that the appeasement era... poses for historians was stated by Winston Churchill when he dubbed the Second World War ‘the Unnecessary War.’ For if the League of Nations members had invoked sanctions... against Japanese, Italian and German violations of solemn international agreements, Axis aggression would have been nipped in the bud and a second world war averted.”

Source: The Journal of Modern History, December 1985 (728-730)

Source 2

“The Munich Pact was like giving a cannibal a finger in the hope of saving an arm.”

Source: The Complete Guide to World War II, Mitchell Bard. (58)

Use of Source

Source 1

It refers to Churchill’s criticism of appeasement and the League of Nations’ failure to stop international aggression.

- The League of Nations was weak and did not use effective sanctions.
- Churchill said the Second World War was unnecessary; it could have been avoided if Axis aggression had been stopped.
- The League of Nations failed to stop Japan in Manchuria, Italy in Abyssinia, Germany in the Rhineland, the Sudetenland and then all of Czechoslovakia.
- Churchill as anti-appeasement; Chamberlain as pro-appeasement

Source 2

It refers to the Munich Pact as an analogy of giving a cannibal a finger so that he [Hitler] would not want the whole arm.

- The Munich Pact gave Hitler the Sudetenland. He would not be satisfied with just one part of Czechoslovakia; he would want the whole thing (finger-arm analogy).

* NOTE: This question asks the student to *assess*, i.e. to examine the validity, to make an informed judgment; weigh the merit of two different points of view. Students could argue the following sides but must offer his or her assessment. A student could indicate that appeasement was not effective but may also argue that the reasons for its use were logical and reasonable.

Appeasement was NOT effective because it encouraged Hitler.

- Chamberlain’s critics, such as Churchill, say it simply encouraged Hitler’s gambling.
- If Britain and France had faced Hitler from the start, Hitler would have backed off. Peace would have been secured.

Appeasement was acceptable/logical/reasonable because Britain was not ready for war.

- Its armed forces were badly equipped and had fallen behind Germany.
- Public opinion in Britain, in important countries in the empire, even in the USA, were against war.
- It was the only policy available to Chamberlain. To take on Hitler meant that Chamberlain had to be prepared to take Britain into a war.

Use of Knowledge

- Germany's desire to expand (Lebensraum, Pan-Germanism, Treaty of Versailles).
- An explanation of appeasement, why it was practiced but still has to emphasize its ineffectiveness, i.e.
 - War weariness from the First World War, war debt from the First World War
 - Inability of countries to fund a military during the Depression
 - Greater fear of Communism than Fascism; Fascism seen by some as a possible solution to Depression
 - British guilt over the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles
 - Chamberlain's "it's all so far away" philosophy, etc.

Students

- Most students knew of the Munich Pact, the weaknesses of the League of Nations, the concept of appeasement and used this knowledge to explain the second source and assessed it as ineffective.
- Most students were familiar with the reasons why appeasement was used.
- Many students frequently restated sources rather than expanding on them and did not seem to know specific examples to explain the first source.
- Some students gave lists of examples of appeasement with no explanations and with only perfunctory reference to the sources at the end.
- Some students frequently confused the order of events; for example, that the Munich Pact was the first example of appeasement.
- Some students confused Chamberlain and Churchill; League of Nations with the United Nations.
- In Histoire mondiale, many students confused the word « empêcher » and seemed to think it meant « encourager ». Others confused « apaisement » with « endiguement ».

Value

10%

54.

Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the effectiveness of appeasement in containing Nazi aggression.

Source 1

"The central question that the appeasement era... poses for historians was stated by Winston Churchill when he dubbed the Second World War 'the Unnecessary War.' For if the League of Nations members had invoked sanctions... against Japanese, Italian and German violations of solemn international agreements, Axis aggression would have been nipped in the bud and a second world war averted."

Source: The Journal of Modern History, December 1985 (728-730)

Source 2

"The Munich Pact was like giving a cannibal a finger in the hope of saving an arm."

Source: The Complete Guide to World War II, Mitchell Bard. (58)

KI
KI
KI
As Adolf Hitler came into complete power of Germany, a new
is exposed his belief that
fascist state. ^{he exposed his belief that} The only way to grow as a nation that was
essentially crippled as a result of the First world war and the
Treaty of Versailles, was to violate the terms of the peace treaty. As
he began to build up his army and promote Anschluss, which would
unite Austrians and Germans, both clear violations of the treaty, the
allied powers used appeasement in the hopes to prevent a second
world war. However, this method proved to be a failure, as although
it was used with strong moral intention, it ultimately led to the
inevitable war and allowed for early German successes.

KI
Hitler's clear violations of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles,
including the expansion of the German military (including navy
and airforce which would both prove to be crucial factors in the
second world war), Hitler's expansion of German borders
into the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia and Poland to increase Lebensraum
(living space for the Aryan race), were essentially ignored by
the League of Nations and other European nations. The League was
set up after world war one to encourage world peace and security
and promised to do anything in the League's power to prevent conflict.
However, as Hitler prepared for another war and tested their luck
through the mobilization of their army, the League virtually
helped, in the fear that confronting Germany would result in

World History 3201 June 2009

Page 16 of 22

52 conflict. The Munich Pact allowed for the annexation of Sudetenland, an area rich in resources in Czechoslovakia. The agreement was an example of Chamberlain's, and other leaders, preferred method of dealing with Hitler, appeasement. As stated in the second source, "The Munich Pact... was like giving a cannibal a finger in the hope of saving an arm; meaning the agreement was made in the hopes that by giving Germany the area, Hitler would be content and would not continue his expansion or other violations of the Treaty of Versailles that would guarantee conflict. The appeasement of Hitler and the failure of the League of Nations to intervene ultimately led to the war the policy tried to prevent, showing the failure of the policy that was ^{established} with good intention.

K1 Further examples of appeasement and the other failures of the League of Nations are outlined in source two, with the devastations and loss of an entire generation of men, caused by still fresh in many nations minds, leaders feared intervention in already existing conflicts would lead to another large scale conflict, and practiced appeasement in the hopes of preventing their fears. Source one states "For if the League of Nations members had imposed sanctions... against Japanese, Italian and German violations of solemn international agreements, Axis aggression would have been nipped in the bud and a second world war averted." This quote alludes to activities in Manchuria by the Japanese as well as in Africa by Italy (Mussolini), both member nations of the alliance known as the Axis Powers. The League failed to implement sanctions on the Japanese, (besides moral sanctions with no effect on preventing the invasion) as they invaded Manchuria. Japan simply "dropped out" of the League, and the League took no immediate action on preventing the conflict in Asia, even with China asking the League to do so. The League's inability to properly resolve conflicts was also demonstrated through Mussolini's invasion of Africa, creating colonies in independent Ethiopia. Although the League threatened oil sanctions, Mussolini promised war in return, thus the League took no action. The repeated failure of the League, as member countries feared war was another example of appeasement in Europe that ultimately led to the outbreak of another world war due to the inability to prevent aggression.

S3 The "appeasement era" was a large factor that led to the outbreak of the Second World War, as although was used in the hopes to prevent a conflict, World History 3201 June 2009 as devastating as the Great War, and was therefore based with strong moral intention, was ineffective in containing Nazi aggression. It also resulted in early German victories as the military was strong and prepared for such a conflict, deemed the "Unnecessary War".

Value
10% 54. Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the effectiveness of appeasement in containing Nazi aggression.

Source 1

"The central question that the appeasement era... poses for historians was stated by Winston Churchill when he dubbed the Second World War 'the Unnecessary War.' For if the League of Nations members had invoked sanctions... against Japanese, Italian and German violations of solemn international agreements, Axis aggression would have been nipped in the bud and a second world war averted."

Source: The Journal of Modern History, December 1985 (728-730)

Source 2

"The Munich Pact was like giving a cannibal a finger in the hope of saving an arm."

Source: The Complete Guide to World War II, Mitchell Bard. (58)

11 With the horror and loss of millions of young lives fresh in the minds of France and Britain, they set out to appease—come to conclusions through compromise rather than dominance—the rising power of Nazi Germany. Source 1 From the Journal of Modern History references the failure of the Great League to stop Hitler's rising power. The policy of appeasement led to "the Second World War 'the Unnecessary War'" dubbed by British leader Winston Churchill that they were trying to avoid. After World War I, the great powers set up a "League of Nations" to try and stop another war from occurring by passing economic and moral sanctions on aggressive countries. Military sanctions were never used—the war's bloodshed was too fresh in the minds of the great powers. Although these economic sanctions were posed—they were never invoked, as mentioned in the sources line "For if the League of Nations members had invoked sanctions... against Japanese, Italian and German violations of solemn international agreements when Japan occupied Manchuria shortly after World War One, The League of Nations imposed moral sanctions on Japan. Japan paid no attention and continued to invade. The League did not do anything as they did not want a conflict to result. When Italy invaded Abyssinia, its leader appealed to the League

of Nations for help. The League suggested to the Italian Fascist leader Benito Mussolini - "Il Duce" that economic sanctions in the form of an oil embargo would be sanctioned if he did not pull out. Il Duce threatened all out war and refused angrily. Not wanting to start a war over a place in Africa, the League stepped back. Later, Benito Mussolini stated that if oil sanctions had been imposed, he would have left Abyssinia. Germany continued to re-arm in direct defiance to the Treaty of Versailles while the League of Nations did nothing, and then was able to test its weapons and forces as itself and Italy fought on the side of General Franco in Spain's Bloody Civil War. Appeasement was ineffective, as if these sanctions had been invoked "Axis aggression would have been nipped in the bud and a second world war averted." Germany continued to defy the treaty of Versailles as it achieved "Aunchless" Hitler's longtime dream of unification with Austria, militarized the "non-militarized zone of the Rhineland". Source two is a reference to the Munich Pact. France and Britain knew that Hitler had his eyes on Czechoslovakia. But, before he could finish plotting to invade, through the Munich Pact they decided to give him the Czech. border. The Czechoslovakian leader was not present at the conference that was an effort to appease Hitler. A conference that was proclaimed by the British leader Neville Chamberlain to be "Peace for our time" was in reality more akin to the source's quote "like giving a cannibal a finger in hope of saving an arm". As Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia any way under a year later even though he promised through the Munich Pact to pursue all changes peacefully. The policy of appeasement failed as the violent leader Hitler viewed the policies of the Western world to be weak and fearful of his great strength. The bloodshed of the second world war began soon after when Hitler invaded Poland.

Value

10%

54.

Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the effectiveness of appeasement in containing Nazi aggression.

Source 1

"The central question that the appeasement era... poses for historians was stated by Winston Churchill when he dubbed the Second World War 'the Unnecessary War.' For if the League of Nations members had invoked sanctions... against Japanese, Italian and German violations of solemn international agreements, Axis aggression would have been nipped in the bud and a second world war averted."

Source: *The Journal of Modern History*, December 1985 (728-730)

Source 2

"The Munich Pact was like giving a cannibal a finger in the hope of saving an arm."

Source: *The Complete Guide to World War II*, Mitchell Bard, (58)

K1 The First World War presented Germany with the Treaty of Versailles which was signed by the Weimar Republic. The view that the Weimar stabbed Germany in the back helped Hitler and the Nazis gain power in Germany. Hitler proposed a policy of Lebensraum to gain living space for Germans, and Pan-Germanism to unite all of the German speaking peoples in Europe. Other European countries still had the first world war fresh in their minds and thought that ~~ap~~ through appeasement they could prevent another world war. European countries also weren't ready for war which was another reason that lead to appeasement. There were a lot of German speaking people in places like Poland and Czechoslovakia ~~and~~ which were some of Hitler's main ~~targets~~ targets. Hitler wanted the ~~Sudetenland~~ Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia which was primarily Germans. Hitler mobilized for war but instead Britain met with Hitler and gave him the Sudetenland without ~~even~~ asking Czechoslovakia. Hitler

Value
10%

54. Based on the sources below and your knowledge of history, assess the effectiveness of appeasement in containing Nazi aggression.

Source 1

"The central question that the appeasement era... poses for historians was stated by Winston Churchill when he dubbed the Second World War 'the Unnecessary War.' For if the League of Nations members had invoked sanctions... against Japanese, Italian and German violations of solemn international agreements, Axis aggression would have been nipped in the bud and a second world war averted."

Source: *The Journal of Modern History*, December 1985 (728-730)

Source 2

"The Munich Pact was like giving a cannibal a finger in the hope of saving an arm."

Source: *The Complete Guide to World War II*, Mitchell Bard. (58)

KI
SI
The policy of appeasement was of a country giving in, in order to satisfy another. I don't think this had any effect on the Munich Pact. This is shown in Source 2, when they give the example of giving a cannibal a finger in hope of saving an arm. This explains that the British believed they could give in a little bit out of a time and hopefully save a lot more. If you only let them take a finger which could represent a minor chunk of a country then maybe they wouldn't come back for the rest.

As shown in Source one, it's the question that most historians, teachers, or students have about Winston Churchill's idea of appeasement. That we all know the 2nd world war should not have happened if the League of Nations had invoked economic sanctions against Japanese, Italian, German violations against international agreements that they refused to follow then maybe these people would not think

S1

they could get away with as much as they did. If these people were doing things over and over again when they agreed to something else, knowing it was wrong but never got in any trouble for it, then why wouldn't they do it again? They were getting their gun ways which they knew it and the League of Nations should have smartened up and did something about it. The aggression they caused would have been stopped way earlier than it had been and the Second world war may of had a chance in being prevented.

In my opinion, I believe that the policy of appeasement was one of the worst ideas that any place whether it be the US or Britain could give in to. It was seen as a way to walk over certain places and the smart leaders took the opportunity as an advantage to them.

3

Valeur
10 % 54. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez dans quelle mesure la politique d'apaisement a réussi à empêcher l'agression nazie.

Source 1

« La grande question de la période de l'apaisement... pour les historiens, a été expliquée par Winston Churchill quand il a qualifié la Seconde Guerre mondiale de "guerre inutile", car si les membres de la Société des Nations avaient pris des sanctions contre le Japon, l'Italie et l'Allemagne qui violaient les accords internationaux solennels, l'agression de l'Axe aurait été arrêtée dès le début et une seconde guerre mondiale aurait été évitée. »

Source : The Journal of Modern History, décembre 1985 (728-730) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Le pacte de Munich... c'était comme donner un doigt à un cannibale dans l'espoir de sauver le bras. »

Source : The Complete Guide to World War II, Mitchell Bard (58) [traduction libre]

10

~~Après la Première Guerre mondiale~~
C1 Quand Hitler a pris contrôle de l'Allemagne dans les années de 1930, il voulait faire l'Allemagne le pays le plus puissant dans l'Europe. Il voulait du Lebensraum, l'espace vital, l'Anschluss, l'union avec l'Autriche, et plus de pouvoir en Europe. Pour accomplir son plan la première chose qu'il a fait est le réarmement de la pays. Ceci était interdit par le Traité de Versailles mais il l'a fait non-plus. Après ceci il a reconquis la Rhénanie, ~~encore~~ encore ceci était défendu par le traité mais il savait qu'il n'aura pas de résistance car les autres pays ~~étaient~~ étaient trop occupés avec le maintien de la paix. Il avait de la confiance en faisant ces choses parce que il a vu que la Société des Nations était trop peur pour faire quelque chose. Ceci est montré dans les ~~cas de la~~ cas de la Mandchourie et l'Éthiopie. ~~Après~~ En Mandchourie les japonais ont envahi et la Société des Nations n'ont rien fait, ils ont imposé les sanctions morales sur le Japon mais quand ceci n'a pas fonctionné

CO5

D1

- ils ont arrêté et ont laissé la Mandchourie par
 soi-même. La même chose c'est passé en l'Ethiopie
 où Mussolini a envahi. ~~La~~ La Société ~~est~~
 a essayé les sanctions économiques mais en fin ~~est~~
 n'a pas les imposer quand Mussolini a menacé la
 guerre. Tous ces exemples de la peur de la
 Société a donné de la confiance à Hitler, ~~et~~
 Mais comme dans Source 1 si la Société ~~est~~
 avait fait quelque chose peut-être la guerre
 ne serait jamais commencé parce que Hitler n'aurait
 pas cette confiance, s'il savait que les autres va
 lui arrêter. C'était "une guerre inutile" comme Churchill a dit dans le Source
- Dans le deuxième Source, on voit la citation
 "c'était comme donner un doigt à un cannibale dans
 l'espoir de sauver le bras." Ceci fait référence ~~à~~
 aux ^{principaux} ~~dépenses~~ ~~principaux~~ ~~aux~~ des fascistes. Un des
 parties majeure de le fascisme est que le compromise
 est un signe de la faiblesse et alors on peut voir
 comment le pacte de Munich était vu pour Hitler. Dans
 ce pacte, la France et la Grande-Bretagne ont donné
 les Sudètes à Hitler et en retour il a dit qu'il n'aura
 pas demander un autre chose. ~~Mais~~ Ils ont essayé
 de apaiser Hitler au lieu de battre avec lui. Mais
 ceci n'a pas fonctionné. Hitler ~~un fasciste~~ (un fasciste)
 a vu ceci comme une faiblesse et il a ^{pensé} ~~pu~~ que
 l'Occident était prêt de lui donner n'importe de quoi
 pour éviter une guerre. *
- Alors c'est évident que la politique d'apaisement
 n'a pas fonctionné parce que Hitler a ^{continué} ~~continu~~ de
 demandé pour plus de territoire et il a envahi plusieurs
 pays après le pacte de Munich. ~~Mais~~
- et dans un façon il avait raison. Les pays de l'ouest ne
 voulaient pas une autre guerre parce qu'ils n'avaient pas de
 l'argent, ils ne voulaient pas un autre massacre comme ~~un~~ et aussi
 parce qu'ils ne pouvaient pas que le fascisme était le problème. Ils étaient
 contre le communisme.

Valeur
10 % 54. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez dans quelle mesure la politique d'apaisement a réussi à empêcher l'agression nazie.

Source 1

« La grande question de la période de l'apaisement... pour les historiens, a été expliquée par Winston Churchill quand il a qualifié la Seconde Guerre mondiale de "guerre inutile", car si les membres de la Société des Nations avaient pris des sanctions contre le Japon, l'Italie et l'Allemagne qui violaient les accords internationaux solennels, l'agression de l'Axe aurait été arrêtée dès le début et une seconde guerre mondiale aurait été évitée. »

Source : The Journal of Modern History, décembre 1985 (728-730) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Le pacte de Munich... c'était comme donner un doigt à un cannibale dans l'espoir de sauver le bras. »

Source : The Complete Guide to World War II, Mitchell Bard (58) [traduction libre]

C1
D1
D1
D0.5
D1

La politique d'apaisement était un échec pour éviter l'agression nazie. La première source explique que la Seconde Guerre mondiale était inutile et il se passe seulement parce que les Européens ^{et les} utilisent l'apaisement. Quand Hitler a fait des choses contre le Traité de Versailles comme réoccuper le Rhénanie et fabriquer une force militaire, le monde ~~ne~~ ^{pas} ~~est~~ ^{pas} interagi avec les actions économiques ou militaires. Comme résultat Hitler était encouragé de continuer avec l'annexion et le pacte de Munich a la prouve que l'Allemagne est devenue un pouvoir militaire de la monde et était capable de combattre dans une guerre. Si les SDN ou des autres pays a imposé des sanctions économiques contre l'Allemagne pour éviter la ~~très~~ grandir de leur puissance, les nazis et Hitler qui ~~de~~ ont dépendu sur l'action pour leur base de soutien, ~~et~~ ^{évidemment} échec dans ~~seulement~~ après les temps. L'autre source est un analogie pour le pacte de Munich et l'efficacité de le, qui était rien. Les nazis et Hitler ont eu l'idée...

de pan-germanisme pour réunir les peuples allemands et de donner plus de pouvoir à Hitler l'Allemagne. Le pacte de Munich est signé pour arrêter les demandes de Hitler en échange pour les pays sud-est, sous la représentation de Tchécoslovaquie. Hitler a prouvé avant qu'il n'a posé des problèmes avec les violations des accords, comme le traité de Versailles par la cession, l'occupation de la Rhénanie et la création des forces militaires vastes. après la prise il a suivi le même chemin en prendre le Tchécoslovaquie totale. Le source 2 dit que c'est stupide de donner les petites sections de protéger les plus grands parties parce que Hitler veut prendre tout qu'il été capable à réussir. Chamberlain et les Britanniques ont parié que ils ont protégé la paix pour Europe, mais en réalité (comme source 1 dit), la guerre est plus proche quand l'apaisement est utilisé. Les politiques d'apaisement finalement a été abandonné quand Hitler a envahi le Pologne, le prouve que l'apaisement a fait rien que acheter le temps et les ressources pour l'Allemagne l'agression naïve, à la point que la guerre est inévitable.

Valeur
10 % 54. D'après les sources ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez dans quelle mesure la politique d'apaisement a réussi à empêcher l'agression nazie.

Source 1

2

« La grande question de la période de l'apaisement... pour les historiens, a été expliquée par Winston Churchill quand il a qualifié la Seconde Guerre mondiale de "guerre inutile", car si les membres de la Société des Nations avaient pris des sanctions contre le Japon, l'Italie et l'Allemagne qui violaient les accords internationaux solennels, l'agression de l'Axe aurait été arrêtée dès le début et une seconde guerre mondiale aurait été évitée. »

Source : The Journal of Modern History, décembre 1985 (728-730) [traduction libre]

Source 2

« Le pacte de Munich... c'était comme donner un doigt à un cannibale dans l'espoir de sauver le bras. »

Source : The Complete Guide to World War II, Mitchell Bard (58) [traduction libre]

La source 1, utilise des mots pour de parler à propos de la politique d'apaisement et la période d'apaisement qui est expliquée par Winston Churchill.

La politique d'apaisement est aussi expliquée dans la deuxième source, quand "le pacte de Munich" était parler à propos de l'agression du pays.

Les deux sources expliquent que la deuxième guerre mondiale causé des pays d'augmenté plus d'agression contre un à l'autre. L'Allemagne était tout à propos de gagné la guerre contre l'URSS, et tout les autres pays. Il n'arrêté pas jusqu'à il gagné.

Mais au cause de la guerre augmenté, mais beaucoup des personnes veut que les deux pays peut signé le pacte de Munich.

c1 Tout les chefs, avec-tout l'exception de Staline, parce que les autres chefs ne demande lui pas.

La politique d'apaisement veut que les pays aient la paix et la sécurité, et ne se battent l'un à l'autre. Les chefs ont décidé de signer le pacte de non-agression.

c)

Tout les personnes pense que maintenant, il n'y a pas de guerre, au cause de la politique d'apaisement, mais, Hitler pense de le pacte comme un seul feuille de papier avec pas de d'importance.

Alois, il continue de se battre avec beaucoup de force brutal et grand, avec-ça rien de d'arrêter lui.

Question 55 (Value 5%)

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the circumstances that led to the Cuban Missile Crisis.



Use of Source

- Castro looking out from a tank
- a scene from the Bay of Pigs invasion, as mentioned in the caption
- Castro's role in Cuba in the 1950s:
As leader of the "26th of July movement," Castro was an early and vocal opponent of the dictatorship of Batista and thus played a major role in the 1959 Cuban Revolution which eventually overthrew Batista.
- Significance of the 1961 CIA-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion:
The invasion failed as the Cuban 'ex-pats' were quickly defeated on the beaches of Cuba by Castro's forces. Those who were not killed in action were taken prisoner by Castro's forces. This was a huge embarrassment for Kennedy's government and only served to strengthen ties between Castro and the U.S.S.R.

Use of Knowledge

- Cuba had been basically controlled by the USA since the Spanish-American War of 1898.
- U.S.A. controlled most of Cuba's wealth; supported the corrupt dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista.
- The popular uprising led by Castro culminated in the removal of Batista from power in 1959. Castro quickly nationalized American industries without compensation. The U.S.A. responded first with an embargo of sugar, then a general embargo of goods, to and from Cuba.
- Castro turned to the U.S.S.R. for help and protection. The CIA-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion (as well as other plots to overthrow Castro) led Castro to declare his revolution communist. The belief that the U.S.A. would continue its campaign to remove communism in Cuba leads Castro to seek more Soviet support.
- Khrushchev seized the opportunity to provide Cuba, not only with financial and conventional military support, but also send ballistic missiles to Cuba. This protected Cuba from further American aggression – but also countered the threat of American missiles in Turkey.
- This results in the naval blockade of Cuba and the display of brinkmanship in that crisis.

Students

- Most discussed well the Soviet placement of missiles in Cuba and the overthrow of Batista.
- Some poorly explained the source (the Bay of Pigs Invasion) – many responses were vague on specifics and made general comments about the Cold War.
- Some referenced Stalin instead of Khrushchev.
- Some could not recognize or make reference to Castro (as mentioned in the source).

Value
5%

55.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the circumstances that led to the Cuban Missile Crisis.



Castro during the Bay of Pigs invasion

The Cuban Missile Crisis was a time of paranoia and fear as the tension caused by the Cold War exaggerated the crisis and led to the threat of nuclear war between the communist USSR and the very anti-communist United States of America. The USA had controlled Cuba and had economic power and influence since the Spanish American War in the late 1800's. However, as the idea of independence became a prominent ideology in countries controlled by other nations, Cuba experienced a communist revolution, led by Fidel Castro who is depicted in the source. The United States, who feared the spread of communism and practiced containment to keep communist ideologies isolated within Eastern Europe, saw the revolution as rebellion, and enforced trade sanctions on Cuba that made the importation or exportation of goods from in and out of Cuba very difficult, in the hopes to regain control of the country. The Bay of Pigs Invasion occurred in Cuba, in which the US military fought the communist 'rebels', under the presidency of Kennedy. However, the communists in Cuba used guerrilla warfare, a method of fighting that includes quick, violent ambushes of the enemy, and the Americans proved to be inexperienced and unable to defend themselves or create an opposition, and the invasion was a failure. The source depicts the communists during the Bay of Pigs Invasion, including leader Fidel Castro. The invasion was a source of humiliation for Kennedy and the USA. American spies would later discover the Soviet Union, the former ally, but now enemy in the Cold War, had been shipping missiles, and weapons to Cuba that would be targeted at the USA. This led to the intense, serious crisis termed the Cuban Missile Crisis. Through naval blockade, the USA effectively

World History 3201 June 2009

Page 18 of 22

cut off the shipping of these weapons and would later compromise with the USSR, which resulted in the removal of nuclear weapons in Turkey and Cuba, alleviating the sense of fear throughout the world.

Value

5% 55.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the circumstances that led to the Cuban Missile Crisis.



5

The above source depicts Castro during the Bay of Pigs invasion. The Bay of Pigs invasion took place on the island of Cuba, ^{also pictured in the above source.} After Castro had taken communist control of the island. Although Castro's regime led to increased health care and education for the Cubans on the island, he nationalized the American owned companies on the island which angered the US who had much invested in Cuban industries and resources such as sugar. Under the leadership of the Central Intelligence Agency, Cuban exiles that had sought refuge in America attacked Cuba at the Bay of Pigs. Castro, as pictured above, quickly rounded up the invaders. This failure was an embarrassment to the new American President J.F. Kennedy, who continued to place trade embargos and a naval blockade on Cuba. Cuba, now highly isolated, appealed to the Soviet Union. Tensions had been mounting between the Soviet Union and America, as after world war one they both emerged, locked in an arms race as leading world powers. The Soviet Union, glad to achieve an out post close to the United States supported Cuba financially and militantly — buying their sugar and eventually shipping nuclear weapons. The Cuban Missile Crisis came into place when nuclear weapons being shipped to Cuba from the USSR were spotted on American radar. America went into prepare for war mode, as tension rose and it looked as if the world was to plunge head first into a nuclear war. It was JF Kennedy's brother Robert, however that founded the ultimatum: The US would dismantle its missile sites in Turkey if the Soviets would dismantle the sites in Cuba — as Cuba was an island nation in such close proximity to the US, those long range missiles could easily be fired into America. The Cuban missile crisis was a great source of tension that highlighted the need for international communication — resulting in the creation of the famous "hotline" a direct telephone line between the two super powers.

World History 3201 June 2009 Page 18 of 22

Value

5% 55.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain the circumstances that led to the Cuban Missile Crisis.



4.5

With Fidel Castro as the newly elected, young leader of Cuba came a promise of free elections... a promise that was never intended to be kept. America and Cuba had a good history, and Americans owned the majority of minerals and other resources located in Cuba. Castro, however, wasted no time in taking over American-owned property and splitting it up for small Cuban landowners. Americans caught wind of this and were positively outraged. Cuba, however, sought a friend in Russia who bought huge quantities of sugar from Cuba. Russia, in fact, became much closer to Cuba than most nations realized. In a spy plane, Americans discovered, to their horror, a Soviet nuclear base being set up in Cuba, aimed at the US. Outraged, the US had nuclear weapons in Turkey, ready and aimed at Cuba. The irony of the situation was, that because the Americans discovered this nuclear missile site before it was finished being built, it posed no real threat. The president of the United States's brother was sent to propose an ultimatum to Russia, stating that if the missiles were removed the following day, US would remove theirs from Turkey and Cuba would not be attacked. Fortunately, it was agreed to as both sides knew there'd be no winning a nuclear war. It was an embarrassment to the US, however, as the CIA had trained a number of Cuban exiles, and as is depicted in the source above, they attacked the Bay of Pigs, only to be defeated all too quickly and the battle barely lasted a short while.

World History 3201 June 2009

Page 18 of 22

Valeur

5 %

55.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les circonstances qui ont mené à la crise des missiles de Cuba.



La crise des missiles de Cuba a été un point important dans la guerre froide. Batista, le chef du Cuba, a été d'accord avec l'EU, qui ont eu plusieurs industries dans Cuba. Les Américains ont utilisé la pays pour l'amusement et la richesse. Puis, Castro a pris contrôle dans un coup d'Etat et il a changé le système. Il a amélioré plusieurs choses, comme la santé, mais il a aussi nationalisé les industries américains en Cuba. Les propriétaires américains ont perdu plus qu'un milliard des biens et ils ont ~~aller~~ allé au président pour l'aide. L'EU a placé les restrictions ~~économiques~~ commerciales sur l'île, et sans un pays pour les marchés, le Cuba a tourné vers l'URSS. L'URSS a acheté la sucre du Cuba mais aussi l'a ~~vu~~ vu comme une chance de ^{mettre en} position les missiles. L'EU a eu les missiles en Turquie, et l'URSS a eu besoin d'une place de proximité aussi. L'EU a déjà essayé de pris le Cuba par force, comme dans le ~~source~~ source, au baie des Cochons. Mais Castro, comme on peut voir, a été préparé pour l'attaque et le CIA a fait faillit. Quand l'EU a vu les sites des missiles ils ont arrêté toutes les navires de les portes de Cuba. Ils ont lancé une ultimatum à l'URSS pour retirer les missiles et sans les armes prêts, l'URSS a accepté, mais l'EU a eu besoin de retirer leur missiles de la Turquie aussi. C'était très proche à une guerre ~~entre~~ entre les deux. Le téléphone rouge a été établi pour améliorer la communication en l'avenir.

Histoire mondiale

Good 4 / 5

Example # 1

Valeur

5%

55.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les circonstances qui ont mené à la crise des missiles de Cuba.



4

quel est
centré dans
la source

Cuba, un petite île à la côte des États-Unis
était dans la sphère d'influence des américains mais
quand Castro a pris pouvoir il a nationalisé tous les
propriétés et les États-Unis ont perdu presque
1 milliard de dollars. Ceci a mené à les sanctions économiques
par les États-Unis et puis la Cuba a regardé vers la
Russie pour une alliance. Ils avaient besoin de quelques
pour acheter leurs produits et pour avoir une alliance
militaire. Mais c'était dans la temps de la guerre
froide et les américains ne voulaient pas que la Cuba
change à la Communisme. Alors ils ont perdu les
ailes de Cuba et ont essayé de tuer Castro
dans l'incident de la Baie des Cochons. Malheureusement
cette plan a échoué. Pour éviter une autre attaque,
la Russie a commencé d'envoyer les armes à Cuba
et puis les États-Unis ont pris les photos de la
construction des missiles.
Ceci a mené à la crise des missiles de Cuba et
bientôt la Russie et les États-Unis étaient proche
à une guerre nucléaire. Les États ont donné un
ultimatum à la Russie et finalement la crise
a été évitée avec une compromission. La Russie a pris
leurs missiles de Cuba et les États-Unis ont pris leurs
missiles de la Turquie. Mais pour quelques
jours la guerre était presque déclaré et un des
catalysts de
cette incident était la invasion de la baie des Cochons.

Valeur

5 % 55.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les circonstances qui ont mené à la crise des missiles de Cuba.



4

Comme si les bases de missiles à Cuba n'étaient pas finies. Les États-Unis n'ont pas su ceci.

Depuis des années, Cuba a été un pays ~~qui~~ sous le contrôle des États-Unis. Mais, quand un jeune homme ~~nommé~~ ^{nomme} Fidel Castro a renversé le gouvernement de Batista, les choses ont changé. C/ Castro a ~~été~~ ^{été} ~~socialiste~~, voulu que le pays soit contrôlé par des cubains, et il a rejeté l'influence américaine. Il a pris les territoires sous le contrôle américain et il les a donnés aux peuples. Les Américains ont perdu des millions de dollars, alors ils ont mis un embargo d'échange sur l'île. Castro a cherché une nouvelle marche dans l'Union soviétique. Ils ont acheté des grandes quantités de sucre à sucre. Aussi, les Soviétiques ont mis des missiles au Cuba pour avoir un bras proche aux États-Unis. C/ Les Américains sont rendus compte de la situation, et ils ont mis une blocus navale autour de l'île. Mais, avant ça, il a essayé d'envahir l'île avec une petite force de 1,500 soldats. Ils ont battu complètement à la baie des Cochons. C'est un événement embarrassant dans l'histoire des États-Unis, et Castro était surpris que les États-Unis ont essayé ~~de~~ d'envahir son ~~île~~ ^{île} avec une petite force comme ça. Les tensions entre l'URSS et les États-Unis sont montées, et la guerre nucléaire a presque débuté. Dans le fin, les deux côtés ont trouvé une compromis: Les Soviétiques ont détruit ~~leur~~ ^{leurs} missiles à Cuba, et les États-Unis ont détruit leurs missiles à Turquie. C/ Mais, l'embarras de la situation de Cuba (et la baie des cochons) (dans la source) reste aujourd'hui. L'embargo sur l'échange reste aussi.)

Valeur

5%

55.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les circonstances qui ont mené à la crise des missiles de Cuba.



3.5

Avec la révolution communiste en Cuba et en réponse à l'existence des missiles nucléaires qui pouvaient frapper à l'intérieur de l'Hémisphère Sud, l'URSS a mis plusieurs bases de missiles nucléaires à Cuba qui étaient déconvoqués par la reconnaissance américaine en AB1.

Dans les années qui suivent la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale, le Cuba était pour une grande partie sous le contrôle américain; des américains possédaient la plupart de leurs entreprises. En visant une libération de son peuple, Fidel Castro a mené une révolution socialiste qui, ayant pris contrôle du pays, nationalisait des milliards de dollars américains en propriété. En réponse, les États-Unis ont mis un embargo qui dure à aujourd'hui, et ils ont même contre-attaqué. À l'invasion de la baie des Cochons, une attaque qui avait le but de faire tomber le régime, les Cubains, sous le commandement de Castro et avec des armements soviétiques comme montré dans la photo, ont repoussé l'attaque. Castro a voulu empêcher une telle invasion à l'avenir, et l'URSS a voulu la partie stratégique avec l'Amérique, donc on a stationné plusieurs missiles nucléaires sur l'île. Après avoir fait un blocus naval autour de l'île et avoir fait tous les préparations pour une guerre nucléaire, les représentants de Kennedy et de Khrushchev se sont entendus en négociation. Comme résultat, les Russes retraits leurs missiles, les Américains ont retiré les leurs de la Turquie, et les Américains promettaient de ne pas envahir le Cuba.

Valeur
5 % 55.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les circonstances qui ont mené à la crise des missiles de Cuba.

- Batista
- nationalisme
- embargo
- URSS
- baïe des cochons (sua)
- avions d'espionnage
- blocus

3.5



Depuis longtemps, les États-Unis avaient des bons relations avec la Cuba. Mais, quand Fidel Castro a renversé l'ancien chef, Batista, ^{après la guerre civile} Castro a nationalisé des entreprises américaines. Donc, les États-Unis ont perdu beaucoup d'argent qu'ils ont réussi depuis longtemps de Cuba. Alors, le président des États-Unis a imposé un embargo sur le commerce à Cuba qui existe toujours aujourd'hui.

Castro a tourné vers l'autre grande puissance d'époque, l'Union Soviétique, pour le commerce. Les États-Unis étaient fâchés, et cela a rendu les relations entre Staline et Castro plus proche.

Des exilés cubains ont planifié une attaque sur Cuba pour essayer de renverser Castro. Ils sont entrés par la Baie des Cochons. Mais, l'Union Soviétique était là pour aider Cuba et le renversement était un échec. ^{Cela a renoué les relations avec les États-Unis plus proches.} Mais, comme on voit dans la ^{et attaque} ~~Soviet~~ Union, elle a menacé Castro. Il a besoin quelque chose pour protéger la Cuba. Donc, l'Union Soviétique a installé une base de missiles à Cuba. Les avions d'espionnage des EU ont vu la base de missiles, et les États-Unis ont créé un blocus naval donc les soviétiques ne pouvaient plus construire la base lorsque les EU disaient les termes de paix avec l'Union Soviétique.

Clairément, il y avait plusieurs étapes vers la crise de missiles de Cuba pendant la guerre froide, beaucoup liées aux tensions entre les EU, le vieux allié de Cuba, et l'Union Soviétique qui était nouveau en alliance avec la Cuba.

Valeur
5 %

55.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez les circonstances qui ont mené à la crise des missiles de Cuba.



Cuba dirigée par un nouveau dictateur Fidel Castro a rendu les États-Unis très fâchés. Cuba venait au États-Unis pour prendre contrôle de leur entreprises et d'autre choses. À ce temps les États-Unis dirigée par John F Kennedy a décidé la baie des Cochons. Ils ont envahir Cuba pour que Cuba s'arrête qu'est qu'ils fait au États-Unis. Mais comme le caractère monte, ~~les~~ Cuba et Castro était pensée qu'est qu'il fait. Alors Castro n'a rien fait et c'était J.F.K et les États-Unis était très humilié par ce incident. Aussi à ce temps la Russie, l'ennemi de les États-Unis venait pour mis les ~~missiles~~ missiles dans Cuba à cause que Cuba était proches aux États-Unis. Quand J.F.K entendre cette nouvelle, il disait au Russie de retourner ~~maintenant~~ maintenant ou nous vont commencer un guerre. Mais la Russie retire et retourne leurs missiles à la Russie.

Question 56 (Value 5%)

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, assess the reaction of the Soviet Union to the policy of containment.

"The policy of the Marshall Plan was seen in the Soviet Union as the Americans wanting to impose their influence over the countries to which they gave Marshall Plan Aid. The Soviet Union could not accept that, believing it to be an aggressive act on behalf of the Americans. That is why the Marshall Plan was never accepted...."

- Dmitri Sukhanov, Soviet Politburo Member

Use of Source

- The source refers to Marshall Plan aid being unacceptable to the Soviet Union.
- Concept of containment
- The U.S.S.R. reacted to the Marshall Plan by creating the Molotov Plan.

Use of Knowledge

- The reaction to containment, as exemplified in the Marshall Plan.
- The Americans introduced the Marshall Plan. The Soviet Union reacted with the Molotov Plan.
- The West formed NATO. The Soviet Union reacted with the formation of the Warsaw Pact.
- The West planned to establish West Germany. The Soviet Union reacted by launching the Berlin Blockade, which was followed by the Berlin Airlift.
- Student's assessment may look at the "success" of the above three aspects.

Students

- Most were able to discuss the Soviet Union's discontent with the Marshall Plan, as prompted by the source.
- Few could link the Molotov Plan to the source and the Soviet reaction.
- Some focused on Churchill's "Iron Curtain" and Stalin's "hostile camps" speeches.
- Many needlessly discussed in detail how the U.S.A. used containment (i.e. giving explanations of NATO, the Truman Doctrine, and the Marshall Plan), but did not mention the Warsaw Pact or the Berlin Blockade.

Value
5%

56. Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, assess the reaction of the Soviet Union to the policy of containment.

"The policy of the Marshall Plan was seen in the Soviet Union as the Americans wanting to impose their influence over the countries to which they gave Marshall Plan Aid. The Soviet Union could not accept that, believing it to be an aggressive act on behalf of the Americans. That is why the Marshall Plan was never accepted...."

- Dmitri Sukhanov, Soviet Politburo Member

The American policy of containing the spread of communism became known, worldwide, as the Truman Doctrine. Beginning as a strictly defensive strategy, it was tweaked until its mandate wasn't just to contain communism, but to eliminate it.

George Marshall's "Marshall Plan", as is shown in the source above, "was seen in the Soviet Union as the Americans wanting to impose their influence," whereas America demonstrated that it was simply to help out nations in need, particularly war-torn Europe. Either way, the Soviet Union, at first, was open-minded about the Marshall Plan. Molotov even considered it, that is, until he became aware of the conditions... ① open economic records to the U.S., ② ^{make} ~~make~~ financial needs public, and ③ present a plan for the allocation of funds. Thus, the Soviets reacted swiftly, believing the Marshall Plan "to be an aggressive act on behalf of the Americans." The Marshall Plan was counteracted with the Molotov Plan, so Soviet bloc countries who might've been considering the Marshall Plan now had no other choice. The Soviets were not pleased at all, and they even counteracted NATO with the Warsaw Pact, as well as Comecon and Cominform. They clearly weren't ready for the sort of economic restructuring that America had in mind, and couldn't accept the Marshall Plan with the notion that their way of life would have to be altered to fit the Americans.

Value

5%

56.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, assess the reaction of the Soviet Union to the policy of containment.

"The policy of the Marshall Plan was seen in the Soviet Union as the Americans wanting to impose their influence over the countries to which they gave Marshall Plan Aid. The Soviet Union could not accept that, believing it to be an aggressive act on behalf of the Americans. That is why the Marshall Plan was never accepted...."

- Dmitri Sukhanov, Soviet Politburo Member

5. The policy of containment was to reduce the global spread of communism. The Soviets did not react well to this. ~~Every~~ Everything the US would create, the USSR would counteract. The first example, as stated in the source, is the Marshall Plan. The plan offered aid to ~~the~~ ^{Western} European countries suffering from the war. Not only was this to aid them, but to prevent them from falling under communism as countries often did in times of economic failure. The Soviets reacted with the Molotov Plan. It was basically the same thing, a bilateral trade agreement, but offered to the Soviet bloc countries. As said in the source, this was so they did not accept the Marshall plan. The next example is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO included the US, Canada, and Western European countries. Their goal was that if they were ~~attacked~~ attacked by the Eastern European countries, they would respond collectively with defence. The USSR's reaction was to create the exact same thing but with Eastern European countries. This was called the Warsaw Pact. Next was the Berlin Blockade. The Blockade was a reaction to the US currency reform. In this, Stalin cut off all access into West Berlin by ground and cut electricity from East to West Berlin. The US reacted again by an airlift, in which tonnes of goods were flown into West Berlin daily. This continued until several months later when Stalin ended the blockade.

Value

5% 56.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, assess the reaction of the Soviet Union to the policy of containment.

"The policy of the Marshall Plan was seen in the Soviet Union as the Americans wanting to impose their influence over the countries to which they gave Marshall Plan Aid. The Soviet Union could not accept that, believing it to be an aggressive act on behalf of the Americans. That is why the Marshall Plan was never accepted...."

- Dmitri Sukhanov, Soviet Politburo Member

4.5

Containment was a policy used by the United States to stop the spread of communism throughout the world, and to keep Communism isolated to Eastern Europe. Containment led to the implementation of many policies by the United States, as well as systems of alliances including the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). However, the Soviets were quick to react to these policies and alliances and implemented the Molotov Plan and created the Warsaw Pact. The Marshall Plan was created to extend their influence over both communist and non-communist countries. The plan offered economic relief to countries experiencing hardship and poverty as many East European nations faced. They used financial aid to impose their influence as it would help abolish communist ideologies and influences in these communist states. This Plan was a prime example of containment. However, the Soviets quickly reacted to this plan, to ensure their influence in other countries was not abolished. As stated in the source, the Soviets saw the Marshall Plan as the Americans wanting to impose their influence over the countries to which they gave Marshall Plan Aid. The source further states, "The Soviet Union could not accept that, believing it to be an aggressive act on behalf of the Americans," depicting the Soviet reaction. The Soviets implemented the Molotov Plan, which also offered aid to communist nations, to counteract the Americans' plan, and ensuring the Marshall Plan was never accepted. As well, in 1949, the NATO pact was formed between western powers and Western European countries. The Soviets reacted by creating their own military alliance, the Warsaw Pact with Eastern European, communist countries, ensuring containment would not be successful. The Soviets were quick to react to the American attempts of containment, and the tensions between the two superpowers increased, and the conflict to oppose the spread of each countries sphere of influence continued.

Value

3%

56.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, assess the reaction of the Soviet Union to the policy of containment.

"The policy of the Marshall Plan was seen in the Soviet Union as the Americans wanting to impose their influence over the countries to which they gave Marshall Plan Aid. The Soviet Union could not accept that, believing it to be an aggressive act on behalf of the Americans. That is why the Marshall Plan was never accepted...."

- Dmitri Sukhanov, Soviet Politburo Member

2.5

The policy of containment was a method of preventing the spread of Communism. The Soviet Union became very resentful of this U.S. policy and saw acts of containment as aggressive. As the source explains the Marshall Plan was an aid plan for European countries devastated by the war. The Soviets did not approve of this plan and saw it as an American attempt to spread their influence. As a means of "fighting" against the Marshall plan, the Soviet Union created the Molotov Plan, which was an aid plan for Soviet satellites.

The Truman doctrine was another act of containment. This doctrine, declared in 1947, stated that the U.S. would support any country attacked by Communist rebels. As a result, the Soviet Union created the Brezhnev doctrine which was the exact opposite. The Soviet Union would support and communist countries attacked by non-Communist rebels.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was a military alliance formed in 1949 against Communist countries. NATO would use force against any country it saw as a threat. The Soviet Union in turn, created the Warsaw Pact which was a military alliance against non-Communist countries.

The Soviet Union resented the policy of containment and counteracted every act of containment made by the U.S.

Valeur
5%

56. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez la réaction de l'Union soviétique à la politique de l'endiguement.

- Plan Molotov

- Blocus de Berlin

- Pacte de Varsovie

« La politique du plan Marshall était perçue en Union soviétique comme étant la volonté des Américains d'imposer leur influence dans les pays qu'ils aidaient par le plan Marshall. L'Union soviétique, croyant qu'il s'agissait d'une agression de la part des Américains ne pouvait accepter cela. C'est pourquoi le plan Marshall n'a jamais été accepté... »

- Dmitri Sukhanov, membre du Politburo soviétique [traduction libre]

5

Avec référence de la source, nous avons une citation d'un
membre de la Partis Soviétique qui explique comment le Plan de
Marshall était perçu comme la politique de l'expansion des
E-U. de leur influence capitaliste. ~~l'U.R.S.S.~~ l'U.R.S.S.
a répondu contre le Plan Marshall et la politique d'expansion des
E-U. (expansion de capitalisme, endiguement du communisme) avec leur
propre plans et stratégie.

Le Plan Molotov était mis en place par l'U.R.S.S. pour répondre
au Plan de Marshall, par les E-U. Le Plan Molotov était de donner
l'argent et l'aide économique à tous les pays de l'U.R.S.S. pour
battre contre ~~la~~ la pol. endiguement des E-U. et contre les influences
capitalistes. Avec ~~ce~~ l'argent les pays peuvent payer leurs réparations
de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale et ils peuvent battre pour l'expansion
du communisme et contre ~~la~~ la politique d'endiguement adoptée
par les E-U.

Le Blocus de Berlin était mis en place par Staline pour battre
contre la Doctrine Truman et la politique d'expansion (l'idée
de battre contre le communisme = la Doctrine Truman) des E-U. Staline
a mis le blocus surtout Berlin pour l'endiguement des influences
capitalistes et en réaction de l'expansion d'influence des E-U. Cela
était un échec de Staline au cours du Pont aérien ~~entre~~ entre
par les E-U. et aussi au cours de l'argent, mais, c'était un
réaction significatif de l'U.R.S.S. contre la politique d'endiguement
contre le communisme adoptée par les E-U.

Le Pacte de Varsovie était un pacte entre les pays de l'U.R.S.S.
pour défendre contre les influences des E-U. c'était un Pacte
défensif entre les pays communistes. C'était pour battre contre l'OTAN
et la politique étrangère des E-U. aussi.

Histoire mondiale 3231, juin 2009

Page 20 de 23

Valeur

5 % 56.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez la réaction de l'Union soviétique à la politique de l'endiguement.

« La politique du plan Marshall était perçue en Union soviétique comme étant la volonté des Américains d'imposer leur influence dans les pays qu'ils aidaient par le plan Marshall. L'Union soviétique, croyant qu'il s'agissait d'une agression de la part des Américains ne pouvait accepter cela. C'est pourquoi le plan Marshall n'a jamais été accepté... »

- Dmitri Sukhanov, membre du Politburo soviétique [traduction libre]

5

La politique d'endiguement a été adoptée et supportée dans la Doctrine Truman. L'endiguement est une politique visée à contenir l'expansion du communisme. Truman l'a introduit aux États-Unis dans la Doctrine Truman et le plan Marshall, qui cherchaient ^{à donner de} l'argent pour que les pays puissent combattre le communisme. Le plan Marshall est écrit du point de vue soviétique dans la source donnée. ~~Le~~ Le plan Marshall a offert de l'aide financière des États-Unis aux pays européens qui avaient l'économie dévastée après la guerre et ~~qui~~ demander l'ouvert des livres financières en échange. La citation explique comment les soviétiques ont vu cela comme une acte d'agression contre lui car ils cherchaient à étendre leur influence dans les pays européens que les soviétiques voulaient inclure dans leur sphère d'influence. ~~Le~~ L'Union soviétique a réagi ~~en réponse~~ ^{avec} le Plan Molotov, qui concentrait sur le commerce bilatéral entre les pays d'Europe. Il a reçu un peu de succès car 7 pays ont rejeté le plan Marshall pour celui de Molotov. Quand même, le plan Marshall avait des grands succès économiques. Truman a élaboré ~~son~~ action d'endiguement avec la formation de l'Organisation du Traité de l'Atlantique du Nord (l'OTAN), une alliance militaire. En réponse, l'URSS a mis en place la pacte de Varsovie qui a imposé son gouvernement sur plusieurs de ces pays satellites. En plus, l'Union soviétique a essayé de vaincre Berlin Ouest avec le blocus de Berlin, en réponse aux succès américains. Les États-Unis ont établi un pont aérien pour ~~il~~ ^{ils} ~~mise~~ pour montrer leur détermination, ~~ils~~ ils avaient du succès.

Histoire mondiale 3231, juin 2009

Page 20 de 23

Valeur

5 % 56.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez la réaction de l'Union soviétique à la politique de l'endiguement.

« La politique du plan Marshall était perçue en Union soviétique comme étant la volonté des Américains d'imposer leur influence dans les pays qu'ils aidaient par le plan Marshall. L'Union soviétique, croyant qu'il s'agissait d'une agression de la part des Américains ne pouvait accepter cela. C'est pourquoi le plan Marshall n'a jamais été accepté... »

- Dmitri Sukhanov, membre du Politburo soviétique [traduction libre]

3.5

La de l'endiguement était un plan mis en place par les États-Unis pour contenir le communisme et minimiser la sphère d'influence de l'Union soviétique pendant la guerre froide. Cette politique visait la création de plusieurs plans pour l'effectuer, un de ces plans est le plan Marshall. Le plan Marshall était un moyen de donner de l'argent aux pays démocratiques en trouble financier pour les éviter de tourner vers le communisme. ou les pays communistes pour les convaincre de devenir démocratique. Comme la source démontre les pays communistes n'ont accepté ^{ce} plan et le voyait comme un moyen pour les Américains d'imposer leur influence dans l'Europe de l'est. En réaction de ce plan, l'Union soviétique a créé le plan Molotov qui donnait de l'argent aux pays communistes pour rester communistes. Un autre plan dans la politique d'endiguement des États-Unis était l'Organisation du Traité de l'Atlantique du Nord (OTAN) pour aider les pays démocratiques à résister aux pressions communistes. L'Union soviétique voyait ce plan dans le même sens que le plan Marshall et a créé le pacte de Varsovie qui aider les pays communistes de résister contre la menace. Pour tous les plans que les États-Unis ont employé pour effectuer leur politique d'endiguement, les soviétiques le voyait comme un moyen pour les Américains d'imposer leur influence dans l'Europe de l'est et comme la source démontre, ils ne l'ont jamais accepté. Pour chaque force que les Américains ont mis sur le communisme l'Union soviétique a mis une force égale et opposée.

Valeur
5 % 56. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez la réaction de l'Union soviétique à la politique de l'endiguement.

« La politique du plan Marshall était perçue en Union soviétique comme étant la volonté des Américains d'imposer leur influence dans les pays qu'ils aidaient par le plan Marshall. L'Union soviétique, croyant qu'il s'agissait d'une agression de la part des Américains ne pouvait accepter cela. C'est pourquoi le plan Marshall n'a jamais été accepté... »
- Dmitri Sukhanov, membre du Politburo soviétique [traduction libre]

3. La réaction de l'Union soviétique à la politique d'endiguement n'était pas bonne. Cette politique mise en place par Truman avait pour but de d'arrêter l'agrandissement de la communisme au monde. Truman a ainsi créé le plan Marshall, qui donnerait de l'argent aux pays qui résistaient de devenir communiste. Comme réponse, la Russie a créé le plan Molotov, qui faisait exactement l'opposé: de donner l'argent aux pays qui restaient communistes et évitaient la démocratie. Puis le groupe d'OTAN, c'est-à-dire, l'organisation du traité de l'Atlantique du Nord, était formé pour les pays démocrates, pendant que le pacte de Varsovie comptait les pays communistes. Donc la source, ça dit que "La politique du plan Marshall était perçue en Union soviétique comme étant la volonté des Américains d'imposer leur influence dans les pays qu'ils aidaient par le plan Marshall". Cela veut dire que la Russie a vu cette politique d'endiguement et les plans qui le suivait comme une menace, et ont répondu en façon que le communisme y vienne pour toujours, et il n'y a rien qui peut l'arrêter.

Valeur
5 % 56.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, évaluez la réaction de l'Union soviétique à la politique de l'endiguement.

Marshall Molotov
Truman Blocus
à money summit
US, CA, Fr
NATO Varsovie

« La politique du plan Marshall était perçue en Union soviétique comme étant la volonté des Américains d'imposer leur influence dans les pays qu'ils aidaient par le plan Marshall. L'Union soviétique, croyant qu'il s'agissait d'une agression de la part des Américains ne pouvait accepter cela. C'est pourquoi le plan Marshall n'a jamais été accepté... »

- Dmitri Sukhanov, membre du Politburo soviétique [traduction libre]

3

Le plan Marshall des É-U, comme mentionner dans la source était vu comme un moyen d'imposer une influence Américain sur des régions de l'Europe de l'ouest. Alors ~~en~~ réaction de cette politique Américain, l'Union Soviétique a introduit le plan Molotov. Un plan qui offre de l'aide financière aux pays de l'Europe de l'est en espérant (naïvement) à contrer l'influence occidentale avec du communisme de l'est. Puis l'Union Soviétique ~~est~~ a mis en place le Blocus de Berlin en réaction de la monnaie commune à Berlin de l'ouest. Le Blocus était une cesse de transportations, des biens comme nourriture et communications au Berlin de l'ouest en pensant ~~qu'~~ qu'avec des conditions assez mal, l'ouest va réunir avec l'est pour que l'Union Soviétique pourrait tenir contrôle de tout Berlin. Cela était une échec soviète parce qu'une pont aérienne ~~à~~ des É-U a détruit l'efficacité de la Blocus en humiliant l'Union sovi. Finalement, l'Union Soviétique a formé la pacte Varsovie en réaction de la pacte américaine d'OTAN. Varsovie était une pacte militaire ou une alliance entre des pays communiste de l'Europe de l'est ; une essai à contrer la politique d'endiguement des É-U ~~mais~~ encore.

Question 57 (Value 5%)

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how terrorist attacks in the United States and the Middle East since 2001 have threatened world peace and security.

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

- U.S. President George W. Bush, address to Congress, September 21, 2001.

Use of Source

- A quote by U.S. President George W. Bush.
- It was said ten days after the 9/11 World Trade Centre attacks.
- Every nation and region has to decide if they side with the U.S.A. or with the terrorists.

Points from the source that a student may reference include:

- Al-Qaeda attacks on American interests
- Suicide bombings in the Middle East
- Attacks are related to a belief that American influence in the Islamic world has led to a secularization of their society as well as governments that are pro-Western.

Use of Knowledge

- These attacks have dominated American policy in the post-Cold War world. The attacks threaten security/peace.
- A student can refer to :
 - War on Terror (pro-active defense of U.S.A.)
 - Invasion of Afghanistan
 - Invasion of Iraq
 - London bombings of 7 July 2005
 - Axis of Evil (Iran, Iraq, North Korea)
 - Department of Homeland Defense has led to a greater cooperation between American security agencies (FBI/CIA – increase of military spending since 9/11)
 - The rise of Islamic fundamentalism
 - Greater security at airports, borders, ports
 - Efforts to stop weapons of mass destruction
 - Hamas' efforts to attack Israel
 - A rise in racism/hatred towards visible minority groups has led to conflict
 - Other plausible answers

Students

- Most students used the source well, specifically the terrorist attack reference.
- Most students were able to identify the source, speaker and background.
- Most discussed the increase of airport security but did not focus on other events/ideas.
- Some incorrectly referred to the 9/11 hijackers as kamikaze pilots.
- There were very few references to suicide bombings in Israel, recent London bombings, the secularization of the Middle East by the West, the rise of Islamic fundamentalism.

Value

5% 57.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how terrorist attacks in the United States and the Middle East since 2001 have threatened world peace and security.

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

- U.S. President George W. Bush, address to Congress, September 21, 2001.

Recent terrorist attacks have greatly impacted and threatened world peace and security. There have been several notable attacks in both the United States and the Middle East since 2001, including the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11th, 2001, as well as the numerous suicide bombings that have occurred in the Middle East in the various countries that are threatened by terrorist groups or involved in the War on Terrorism. These attacks have effected everyone in society, increasing fear, and have posed large threats on global peace and security.

5 The source alludes to the United States' "War on Terrorism". The quote, said by President George W. Bush shortly after the terrorist attacks in the United States, shows the nation's perspective, that either you are an ally or an enemy, leaving no room for neutrality in the fight to ensure global peace and security that is threatened due to terrorist attacks. The United States invasion in Iraq, which was intended to recover the weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) that were suspected to be in the nation's possession, ^{also played a large role in the war} through the war in Iraq, numerous casualties have been experienced in the attempt of stabilizing global security, due to suicide bombings and other methods of terrorism in the Middle East. As well, terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda that are located prominently in the Middle East, also pose threats on global peace and security.

Everyone has been effected due to the threats terrorist attacks pose on global peace and security. As stated in the source, "Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make," depicting the universal effects, whether through fear, or increased security in the airports, everyone has felt the threats these attacks have on world peace.

Value

5% 57.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how terrorist attacks in the United States and the Middle East since 2001 have threatened world peace and security.

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

- U.S. President George W. Bush, address to Congress, September 21, 2001.

5

The September 11th terrorist attacks on prominent American buildings such as the Twin Towers were a result of religious tensions between Islamic Fundamentalists and the American western culture. These attacks heightened the world's awareness of "terrorism", threatening world peace and security. The above source is the address of U.S. President George Bush to Congress on September 21, 2001, soon after the plane hijackings. His line "Every nation... has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists" is a clear definition of how terrorist attacks in the United States have threatened world security, as President Bush in fear believed terrorism to be a black or white thing, something to be classified as either or "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." Terrorist attacks in the United States led to fear as men with beards are continually searched on buses, while women wearing burkas or hijabs are viewed with suspicion and searched at airports. As tensions continue to increase in the Middle East, we saw Palestine "Freedom Fighters" strap bombs to their bodies at the check-in line for an Israeli flight — killing many. The Hamas led terrorist missions into Israeli occupied territories, and Israel too continues to attack ^{Palestinian} refugees. In Afghanistan the Taliban blew up schools, raped women and used guerrilla war tactics against villages. Terrorist attacks in the United States and the Middle East since 2001 have threatened world peace and security, scaring even the powerful leaders such as George Bush who we looked to for guiding leadership. Oil and nuclear weapons continue to be a source of tension between Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and America, as well as Islamic fundamentalism. In other Middle Eastern areas such as Palestine religious beliefs continue to evoke terrorism conflicts. Terrorism will continue to harm world peace and security unless every nation believes in the hope and possibility of coming together, out of ignorance to achieve peace and understanding.

Value

5% 57.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how terrorist attacks in the United States and the Middle East since 2001 have threatened world peace and security.

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

- U.S. President George W. Bush, address to Congress, September 21, 2001.

S2
K2
4

have

Every terrorist attack made threatens Global Peace and security. As stated in the source, security has been threatened and now global security must be increased. Previous to 2001, the PLO and the Hamas had been carrying out terrorist attacks in the middle East. These attacks have now moved onto the USA, ~~where~~ upon which the Al-Qaida have made many attacks. Situations like the bombing of the World Trade Center ~~have~~ greatly affected us. The Al-Qaida try to justify these attacks with Islamic Fundamentalism, as they try to reduce the spread of westernization. But we still feel the effects. Security everywhere has increased, examples being at airports and train stations. Again as stated in the source, terrorists are seen everywhere as the enemy. If you are not against them, then you are seen as a threat. Attacks in both the USA and the Middle East have forced an increase in global security, and an increase of global fear. We are now living in a time of fear where we must always be ready for an attack, all because of terrorism.

Poor 1 / 5
Example # 1

Value

5%

57.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how terrorist attacks in the United States and the Middle East since 2001 have threatened world peace and security.

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

- U.S. President George W. Bush, address to Congress, September 21, 2001.

I think terrorist attacks have threatened world peace and security simply by the fact that people have now realized: if a 3rd world country has those weapons, and would do that, what is stopping anybody else? There are people in the world who want everyone to die. And it is possible. There are two sides now, the terrorists and the others. Depending on which side your on, the opposite one is called the terrorist. As a North American, to me the Middle East is terrorist.

George Bush sums this up in the quote "... either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists". This is a challenge to every nation, every person in the world. Because as long as there are terrorists, especially those with nuclear capabilities, there will never be a feeling of world peace and security. No one, anywhere, is safe. Not until the fighting stops.

S O K I

Poor 1 / 5
Example # 2

Value

5%

57.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how terrorist attacks in the United States and the Middle East since 2001 have threatened world peace and security.

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

- U.S. President George W. Bush, address to Congress, September 21, 2001.

In the source above, we see a quote from the former U.S. president that states that every nation is either siding with the U.S. or with terrorists. What this means is that terrorist attacks have become so opposed by the U.S., that they have become a country dedicated to wiping out terrorism.

The tragedy of 9/11 made it so that the U.S. was more wary of terrorist attacks. Security has become tighter so as to make terrorism wiped out. The fact that they were subject to terrorism made them invade Iraq to find weapons of mass destruction, to evade more terrorism.

Terrorist attacks of the PLO on Israel have also occurred, and made it so that peace between the Palestinian people and Israel will always be tenuous. Terrorist attacks have resulted in greater security, and in more tenuous peace in our time.

S i k o

Valeur
5%

57.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment les attaques par les terroristes aux États-Unis et au Moyen-Orient depuis 2001 ont menacé la paix et la sécurité dans le monde.

- & hostile
- sens de peur
- sentiment de
sécurité

« Chaque pays, dans chaque région, doit maintenant prendre une décision. Vous êtes soit avec nous, ou bien vous êtes avec les terroristes. »

- George W. Bush, président des États-Unis, discours au Congrès, le 21 septembre 2001
[traduction libre]

George W. Bush a donné l'adresse soulignée dans la source dix jours après les attaques de sur le World Trade Centre, en 9/11. La source démontre que l'après cette attaque, dans qui deux avions détournés ont frappés le W.T.C., il y avait immédiatement un sens nouveau d'hostilité et de conflit, dans que le président Bush dit "Vous êtes soit avec nous, ou bien vous êtes avec les terroristes". Ceci démontre que le monde était instantanément demandé à prendre un côté, soit celui des Américains, ou celui des extrémistes islamiques, qui ont pris la responsabilité pour l'attaque. Depuis 9/11, il ont passer quelques attaques terroristes, comme les attentats en Londres. Ces événements créent une sens de peur élevé dans la société. La suspicion et la xénophobie sont beaucoup plus prévalent dans notre société. Ceci mène à un montant ~~de~~ beaucoup plus haut de sécurité, dans nos maisons, ~~en~~ nos aéroports, et sur nos frontières. Malgré notre situation dans la vie, nous sommes tous affectés actuellement par la peur, logique ou non, du terrorisme étrangère. Dans se façon, les attaques terroristes ~~&~~ présentent une menace éternelle contre la paix et la sécurité individuelle et collective.

Valeur

5 % 57.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment les attaques par les terroristes aux États-Unis et au Moyen-Orient depuis 2001 ont menacé la paix et la sécurité dans le monde.

« Chaque pays, dans chaque région, doit maintenant prendre une décision. Vous êtes soit avec nous, ou bien vous êtes avec les terroristes. »

- George W. Bush, président des États-Unis, discours au Congrès, le 21 septembre 2001
[traduction libre]

2 /

Al-Quida est une groupe terroriste avec un nombre inconnu de participant. Éduquer au États-Unis, ~~par~~ Saddam Hussaine a organiser l'attaque des twin towers à New York dans l'États-Unis. Al-Quida continuent leur attaque dans la Moyen-Orient aussi, depuis 2001 cette groupe terroriste menacer la monde.

C'est à dire que la paix et la sécurité dans la monde était détruite par eu simplement parce qu'ils sont un groupe contre la monde entier. La source suggère que tu devrait être sûre, bien, la côte terroriste ou la côte anti-terroriste. La décision est utile et c'est important pour la vie du pays. Chaque région vont être affecter a une certaine pointe alors tout le monde doivent être sur la même page.

Les attaques par les terroristes Al-Quida détruit nos monde. La damage a les pays et même les peuples sont énorme. Ils sont les seuls qui sont entrain d'être violent (comme une groupe) alors on doit les arrêter. La sécurité du monde comme les transport d'aviation et les frontières sont plus stricte et effreux alors pour nos enfants c'est une chose qui leur fait peur. Ils ont le droit d'être sûr et de sentir sûr, mais ce n'est pas possible avec cette groupe terroriste dans la monde.

Question 58 (Value 5%)

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how Nasser's actions contributed to the Suez Crisis.



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East. (15)

Use of Source

- Nasser-angry, uniformed, fist-clenching
- Nasser-speaking into an Egypt radio microphone
- Nasser-surrounded by torn papers, including “Suez Canal Treaty”, “Anti-West”, “Anti-British Broadcasts”

Use of Knowledge

- To achieve his goals, Nasser needed lots of money, thus he accepted both American and Soviet aid in the form of cash, military equipment, technical expertise and food.
- To industrialize, Nasser needed electricity. He announced plans to expand the Aswan Dam. By 1956 it seemed he had maneuvered the Soviets into providing arms and the Americans into supplying technical expertise...but it was about to fall apart. Nasser's continued conflict with Israel and his non-aligned nationalism cost him Western support.
- On 26 July 1956, Nasser seized control of the Suez Canal – against international and U.N. agreements. He turned to the U.S.S.R. for help in building the dam.
- By nationalizing the Canal, he achieved two goals: it marked the end of Egypt's colonial status and provided funds for the building the Aswan Dam and modernizing Egypt.
- This crisis increased global tensions, since the military leaders of Britain and France plotted with Israel to recapture the Suez Canal and bring down Nasser. When Israel invaded Egypt in October 1956, the world was shocked when France and Britain attacked too.
- The crisis heightened Arab distrust of Israel's intentions in the Middle East.

Students

- Most students knew when the Canal was built and who built it.
- Many students knew about
 - Nasser receiving money from the U.S.A. and support from the U.S.S.R.
 - Nasser's nationalization of the canal.
 - Nasser's main goals.
- Some students had a poor understanding of
 - the relationship between Great Britain and Egypt; between the U.S.A. and Israel
 - Nasser's goals and how he planned to achieve them.
 - how Nasser's actions contributed to the Suez Crisis and his role in the crisis.
 - Nasser's relationship in the U.S.A. and the West.
 - Nasser's reputation in the Arab world.
- Some students confused the Aswan Dam and the Suez Canal
- Some students confused Israel and India.
- Some students poorly interpreted the source or simply rewrote it.
- Several students referred to "Nasser Arafat".

Value
5%

58.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how Nasser's actions contributed to the Suez Crisis.

The second President of Egypt, General Abdul Nasser, played a large role in the Suez Canal Crisis. Through his nationalization of the canal, as well as his attempts to ensure the canal remains under Egyptian control, the situation in Egypt evolved to become the Suez Crisis, which became a hostile conflict in which UN intervention was necessary.



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East, (15)

K1

The Suez Canal was opened by French and Egyptian governments, however it was dug by the Egyptians. As the importance of the canal became evident, as it was vital during the world wars, an important oil site, and was a link to the European colonies, Britain gained interest in the Canal and bought the Egyptian shares. However, as Egypt later became independent of colonial powers, and Nasser became president, his first vital move was to nationalize the canal, which outraged the European powers as he had broken the treaty which allowed for a 20 year lease for the British. Nasser also created a blockade in the canal, due to Egypt's ongoing conflicts with Israel, and would not allow Israeli shipping to occur within the canal. Nasser also accepted Soviet (communist) financial support to help build the Aswan Dam, which infuriated the Americans. These actions are all depicted in the source,

K1

D1

as the seemingly raging Nasser is promoting "Anti-British Broadcasts," and "Anti-Western" beliefs on the "Egypt Radio." As well, it is apparent from the source that Nasser is disregarding the agreements with British through the torn, "Suez Canal Treaty." The canal blockade is also depicted in the source.

D1

ready "Egyptian Embargo on Israeli Shipping." These actions that enraged the western world led to UN involvement, and eventually the creation of the UNEF, to resolve

Page 21 of 22

World History 3201 June 2009

Complete either 58 or 59 depending on the unit studied.

Unit 5.1 India, Egypt, and South Africa

Value

5% 58.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how Nasser's actions contributed to the Suez Crisis.

S2
K3
Nasser's actions
~~was~~ the main factor
that contributed to
the Suez Canal Crisis.
Gamal Abdel Nasser
was the President of
Egypt and decided
to abolish the
Anglo-Egyptian Treaty
that let Britain lease
the Suez Canal for
20 years. France



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East, (15)

and Britain owned the Suez Canal
and it was extremely important during
wars and as well, was abundant in oil.
So when Nasser decided to nationalize
the canal, France and Britain were very
aggravated. The U.S. was also going to give
Egypt over 200 million dollars to build the
Aswan Dam, but Nasser's decision to sign
a treaty with Czechoslovakia made them
take back this promise. Another one of Nasser's
decision that contributed to the Suez Crisis
was his decision to destroy Israel's
cargo ships going through the Canal to
Israel. This act got the UN involved;
and when Egypt (Nasser) ^{refused} ~~denied~~ to comply
with the UN's wishes, France, Britain and
Israel made a plan to takeover the
Suez canal and overthrow Nasser. As
seen in the document above, Nasser was
a very angry and unpredictable man who
was clamping up the Treaty with Britain and
planning an Egyptian embargo on Israeli shipping.
Many of his actions led to the outbreak of the Suez Canal
Crisis.

5% 58. Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how Nasser's actions contributed to the Suez Crisis.

After the Arab-Israeli war of 1948, Nasser became President of Egypt. As shown in the source, he had very clear goals about what he wished to achieve while in power and was willing to stand up to European powers in order to do so. His goals were to achieve independence from Britain, and to defeat Israel (The Arabs had been humiliated in their own defeat). He was not partial to



Source: *War & Peace in the Middle East*, (15)

Communism or Democracy, and was willing to accept help from both the U.S and Soviet Union, and let them compete for his allegiance. In order to build his army against Israel, he was given war weapons by the U.S. The U.S signed an agreement to help with Nasser's Aswan Dam project, which would give Egypt electricity (this was needed if they were to become independent of Britain). However, this balancing act could not last long. The U.S began withdrawing support because they had ties to Israel and were suspicious of Egypt's pan-Arab nationalism. ^{In 1956} It was discovered that Egypt was blocking Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal. The U.S immediately withdrew financial support for the Aswan Dam. Nasser responded swiftly, taking over the entire Suez Canal, and turning to the Soviets for assistance with the Dam. The takeover was peaceful, but Britain and France (although being allied with Israel) were outraged and plotted a conspiracy whereby Israeli troops would move into the Suez Canal and attack. Then French and British troops would come under the pretence of protecting International Shipping. The Americans and Soviets were outraged, and the U.N. after much turmoil, sent Peacekeeping troops to the Suez Canal to remove French, British and Israeli troops.

Complete either 58 or 59 depending on the unit studied.

Unit 5.1 India, Egypt, and South Africa

Value

5% 58. Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how Nasser's actions contributed to the Suez Crisis.

Nasser's actions was a main thing that contributed to the Suez crisis

Nasser thought that he could play both sides. That he could get help from the states and help with USSR. But states and USSR don't like each other. Nasser wanted a better country and with that he need better

economic. So he went to the states and asked them for help with electricity. The states said that they can share the canal. He also wanted better arms force so for this he went to USSR. When the states found out they said you got to stop getting help from them if not will withdraw the help with the canal.

As seen in the source Nasser was really angry that the plan he had could not go on. He couldn't get help from both sides anymore. He told everyone on Egypt radio at what was going on and wanted to ~~stop~~ ^{stop} all of the things that have been signed up.

Nasser thought that he could get help from both sides and that what he wanted to do. He ~~was~~ ^{was} really mad when everything came out about what he was doing.



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East, (15)

Répondez à la question 58 ou 59 en fonction de ce qui a été étudié en classe.

Unité 5.1 Inde, Égypte et Afrique du Sud

Valeur

5% 58.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment les actions menées par Nasser ont contribué à la crise du canal de Suez.

- En Égypte, après Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser a pris contrôle du pays de la roi Farouk, Nasser a eu trois buts pour l'Égypte. Il a voulu ~~de~~ commencer l'industrialisation d'Égypte, il a voulu trouver la souveraineté pour l'Égypte et il a voulu détruire l'Israël. Pour commencer, il a essayé de industrialiser le pays. Il a planifié de ~~construire un pont~~ développer en plus le pont (dam?) Aswan à la rivière Nile, alors, il a tourné vers les États-Unis pour donner l'argent pour et les connaissances techniques pour construire le pont (dam?). Aussi, il a tourné vers l'Union soviétique pour des armes, des biens et des matériaux. Quand les États-Unis ont trouvé le plan, ils ont laissé tomber l'accord avec Nasser. Sans argent pour construire le pont, Nasser a tourné vers le canal Suez. Il a compensé les vieilles propriétaires, la Grande-Bretagne et la France, et il a pris contrôle du Suez. Vraiment, les causes qui ont mis à la crise de la Suez, se trouvent dans les motivations de Nasser, il a voulu industrialisation pour l'Égypte, représenté dans l'image par la "Traité du Canal Suez" dans l'image. Aussi il a voulu la souveraineté pour l'Égypte, représenté par "Reportage anti-anglais" et "Anti-occident" dans l'image, où il a voulu de sortir de l'influence de l'ouest. Et finalement il a voulu de détruire l'Israël, ceci est représenté par "Embargo égyptien sur la navigation israélienne" dans l'image, évidemment, parti de la haine des arabes contre les israéliens.



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East, (15)
[traduction libre]

Répondez à la question 58 ou 59 en fonction de ce qui a été étudié en classe.

Unité 5.1 Inde, Égypte et Afrique du Sud

Valeur

5 % 58. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment les actions menées par Nasser ont contribué à la crise du canal de Suez.

Nasser a voulu trois choses pour l'Égypte, l'indépendance, l'industrialisation et la destruction d'Israël. Nasser a besoin d'argent et d'aide s'il veut finir son but de créer l'Aswan dam? Alors il a industrialisé l'Égypte et de faire indépendant.



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East, (15)
[traduction libre]

Nasser a tourné vers les États-Unis pour l'aide avec la construction de l'« Aswan dam » et aussi il a tourné vers l'Union soviétique pour aide financière et aussi militaire. Mais les deux rivaux ont rendu compte de ce que Nasser a fait et les États-Unis ont arrêté l'aide. Alors, le projet de « Aswan dam » était arrêté pour maintenant et Nasser a nationalisé le Canal de Suez qui était sous le contrôle de la Grande-Bretagne et la France, comme vu dans la source Nasser voulait arrêter la navigation israélienne. Mais la Grande-Bretagne et la France était très facher et a convaincre l'Israël d'aide se battre contre l'Égypte pour la sphère d'influence d'Israël et de la réoccupation de la Canal de Suez par la France est la Grande-Bretagne. Nasser n'était pas content comme vu dans la source de l'anglaise et l'occident.


Répondez à la question 58 ou 59 en fonction de ce qui a été étudié en classe.

Unité 5.1 Inde, Égypte et Afrique du Sud

Valeur

5% 58. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment les actions menées par Nasser ont contribué à la crise du canal de Suez.

C/ Nasser ~~est~~ était un dirigeant d'Égypte et il avait trois buts. Il voulait rendre ~~l'Égypte~~ l'Égypte indépendante, il voulait augmenter l'industrie de l'Égypte et il voulait chasser l'Israël. Pour accomplir ceci il a besoin d'argent et il a demandé à cette argent des États-Unis. Mais il a aussi demandé de l'aide militaire des soviétiques et quand les États-Unis ont découvert ceci ils ont arrêté l'argent. En réponse de ceci il a mis à côté son projet pour l'Asie et il a pris contrôle de le canal de Suez. ~~Il~~ a arrêté tous les bateaux d'Israël ~~et puis~~ Mais ceci a rendu la Grande-Bretagne et la France très fâché ~~et~~ parce qu'ils avaient beaucoup de ~~contrôle~~ contrôle sur cette canal. Comme on peut voir dans la source, Nasser a cassé beaucoup des règles en ~~essayant~~ essayant d'accomplir ses buts et il a rendu fâché plusieurs personnes. Après il a pris contrôle la France et la Grande-Bretagne ont fait un pacte avec l'Israël et puis en guise de protéger leur bateaux dans le canal ~~ils~~ ils ont envahis. Ceci était un pacte de leur pacte avec l'Israël. Cette invasion a mis en ~~en~~ colère les États-Unis et l'ONU et bientôt la situation était un vrai chaos et c'était ~~causé~~ causé par Nasser et ses actions.



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East, (15)
[traduction libre]

4

Cette source est pour la construction le plan de Nasser.

Répondez à la question 58 ou 59 en fonction de ce qui a été étudié en classe.

Unité 5.1 Inde, Égypte et Afrique du Sud

Valeur

5 %

58. D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment les actions menées par Nasser ont contribué à la crise du canal de Suez.

①

Le canal de Suez s'étend de la mer méditerranéenne jusqu'à la mer adriatique. Depuis ce temps, l'Égypte, en Afrique du Sud, contrôle ce canal. Ce fait était l'acharnement à Nasser à cause du fait que les bateaux se passaient par ce canal et l'Afrique du Sud prenait toute les profits au lieu que des portions aillent à l'Égypte.



Source: War & Peace in the Middle East, (15)
[traduction libre]

Dans la source fournie, Nasser semble très fâché et les mots comme "Reportage anti-Anglais" et "Anti-Occident" sont utilisés. Cela démontre qu'il n'est pas en accord avec le fait que l'Afrique du Sud reçoit tout l'argent de les profits du canal. Après le traité du canal du Suez est signé. Cela renforce que l'Égypte reçoit une portion des profits du canal, et qu'il peut imposer une taxe d'entrée pour les bateaux pour que les deux pays reçoivent de l'argent égal. Cette crise est résolue avec ce traité, et ça y existe toujours entre les pays de l'Afrique du Sud et l'Égypte.

Question 59 (Value 5%)

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how the partition of British Palestine led to the Arab-Israeli conflict (1948-1973).

“[After] the War of Independence, as the Israelis called it... the Israeli state had captured 30 percent more territory than the UN had allotted For [the Arabs], 1948 was al-Nakbah, ‘the Disaster’ The defeat [produced] no heroes, only embittered soldiers...who now sought revenge ...against Israel....”

Source: Six Days of War, Michael Oren, (4-6)

Use of Source

- The source alludes to the 1948-1949 Arab-Israeli War (Israel’s war “of Independence”). The day Israel became a country it was invaded on all sides by a coalition of Arab countries (Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon) outraged by the U.N. decision to create Israel. Israel won this war and annexed Palestinian territory, expanding the original size of Israel proposed by UNSCOP some 30%. This created a large humanitarian crisis as Israel expelled over 700,000 Palestinians living in their new territory. This mass exodus of Palestinians and its ensuing crisis are remembered by many Arabs as "al-Nakbah" (or ‘the disaster’ in English).

Use of Knowledge

- **The Suez Crisis of 1956:** In July 1956, the U.S.A. was angry because Nasser, leader of Egypt, had purchased arms from Czechoslovakia; therefore, they suddenly withdrew the Aswan Dam loan offer in an attempt to punish him. Nasser responded by nationalizing the Suez Canal Company on July 26, 1956, hoping to use its profits to pay for the dam. In October 1956, Israel (with French and British support) invaded Egypt. Britain and France attacked Egypt to gain back control of the Canal, but international pressure forced them to withdraw. This event heightened the distrust between Arabs and Israelis.
- **The Six-Day War of 1967:** A third Arab-Israeli war broke out on June 5, and lasted only six days. Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser vowed to avenge Arab losses and press the cause of Palestinian nationalism. To this end, he organized an alliance of Arab states surrounding Israel and mobilized for war. Israel pre-empted the invasion with its own attack on 5 June 1967. In the following days, Israel drove Arab armies from the Sinai Peninsula, Gaza Strip, West Bank, and Golan Heights, all of which it then occupied. Israel also reunited Jerusalem, the eastern half of which Jordan had controlled since the 1948-1949 War. The Six Day War was viewed as an enormous victory for Israel, but the territories it gained did not stop future fighting. In six days, Israel had gained more land than it had before 1949, but many Arabs felt anger and resentment which did not foster peace in the Middle East, and only heightened tension in the conflict between Arabs and Israelis.
- **The Yom Kippur War of 1973:** The Yom Kippur War was fought from 6 October to 26 October 1973 by a coalition of Arab states led by Egypt and Syria against Israel. The war began with a surprise joint attack by Egypt and Syria on the Jewish holiday of Yom Kippur. Egypt and Syria crossed the cease-fire lines in the Sinai and Golan Heights, respectively, which had been captured by Israel in 1967 during the Six-Day War. The war had far-reaching implications for many nations. The Arab world, which had been humiliated by the lopsided defeat of the Egyptian-Syrian-Jordanian alliance during the Six Day War, felt psychologically vindicated by its string of victories early in the conflict.

Students

- Many did not mention the four Arab-Israeli wars at all, or merely listed them without describing how each war contributed to the Arab-Israeli conflict.
- Some students incorrectly stated the source referred to the 1967 Six Day War. This was likely due to the origin of the source entitled “Six Days of War” by Michael Oren.
- Some discussed attempts at peace (S.C.O. 5.2.4), but did not answer the question being asked.
- Some students spent too much time on the ancient history of the region.
- Some students seemed to have little knowledge about the four wars between the Palestinian-Arab world and the Israelis (Suez Crisis, Six Day War, Yom Kippur War, 1948-1949 Arab-Israeli War)
- Some discussed the Intifadas and Hamas attacks against Israel, however while contributing to the Arab-Israeli conflict, they fall outside the date range given in the question since they happened after 1973.

Unit 5.2 Middle East

Value

5% 59.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how the partition of British Palestine led to the Arab-Israeli conflict (1948-1973).

"[After] the War of Independence, as the Israelis called it... the Israeli state had captured 30 percent more territory than the UN had allotted For [the Arabs], 1948 was al-Nakbah, 'the Disaster' The defeat [produced] no heroes, only embittered soldiers...who now sought revenge ...against Israel...."

Source: *Six Days of War*, Michael Oren, (4-6)

The Partition of British Palestine led to Arab-Israeli conflict as the Palestinian Arabs felt abandoned by the British who had promised to promote their interests. With the terrible treatment of the Jewish people during the Second World War, however, Britain and much of the western world (including America) believed that the Jewish Zionists should be able to have their religious homeland - Israel, thus Palestine was partitioned into two states, Palestine & Israel. The Middle East has long been home to the world's three most prominent religions: Christianity, Judaism and Islam, thus it has long been an area of deep religious conflict. As ^{Israeli} immigrants continued to flock to Palestine, causing many Palestinians to seek refuge in other often unfriendly countries such as Lebanon & Jordan, Palestinian hatred against Israel grew. The Palestinian refugee camps were squalid and cramped with little food, water or medical care for the refugees who had been forced from their homes. Resentment grew.

The source above, by Michael Oren is in reference to the 6 day war fought by Israel in the late 1940's where Israel acquired vast territory. The source recalled the Israel expansion as such "After the war of Independence as the Israelis called it, the Israeli state had captured 30% more territory than the UN allotted" The Palestine reaction was one of deep resentment, as conditions in the occupied territories proved to be dire as Palestinians were given few rights and little access to health care and supplies. The source speaks of the Palestinian reaction as such "1948 was al-Nakbah, 'The Disaster' The defeat [produced] no heroes, only embittered soldiers who now sought revenge against Israel. The Palestinian refugee camps became hotbeds of resentment against Israel as the PLO - Palestinian Liberation Organization was created, under the pretense of voicing Palestinian rights - although many terrorist groups were launched

through its leadership. Resentment spawning among the Palestinians who "sought revenge against Israel" led to the Yom Kippur war as Palestinians attacked Israel by surprise as they celebrated the religious festival Yom Kippur. Although the Palestinians had the advantage in the beginning, as the Israelis were backed by the United States advanced weaponry Israel soon gained the defensive.

"The War of Independence" as the Israelis call it continues to spark wars today among the Palestinians who "seek revenge" against Israel - a state some refuse to acknowledge the existence of.

Although the search for peace through Camp David and the Oslo Peace accords achieved some peace, other wars such as the Suez canal conflict (where Israel attacked Egypt under Britain's jurisdiction)

and the 1st and 2nd Intifadas show that the Partition of Palestine is a great source of tension between Palestinians and Israelis. Great efforts will have to be put forward by both sides in the search for peace.

$$\begin{array}{r} S \ 2 \\ K \ 3 \\ \hline 5 \end{array}$$

Unit 5.2 Middle East

Value

5% 59.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how the partition of British Palestine led to the Arab-Israeli conflict (1948-1973).

"[After] the War of Independence, as the Israelis called it... the Israeli state had captured 30 percent more territory than the UN had allotted For [the Arabs], 1948 was al-Nakbah, 'the Disaster' The defeat [produced] no heroes, only embittered soldiers...who now sought revenge ...against Israel...."

Source: *Six Days of War*, Michael Oren, (4-6)

5.2
K.2
4

The partition of Palestine caused many wars after the Jewish state of Israel was created. The source above talks about how Israel was given land from Palestine to create its own Jewish state. The first conflict was in 1948, when Israel was attacked by Palestine. Israel defeated Palestine and gained 70% more land. They kicked out all the Arabics from this land, and now become refugees. Then there was the Suez Crisis, where Nasser closed the canal, and attacked the Israeli forces outside the Sinai peninsula. Israel won, and took the Sinai peninsula as victory conquest. Then came the Six Day War, Arab armed forces collected outside the Israel border. Israel attacked first and wiped out most of the soldiers in one attack. Then finally was the Yom Kippur War. This was when Israel was attacked on a Jewish holiday, by Arab forces. Israel defeated the opposing army, and that was the last time that conventional warfare was used against the Israelis. These were the major wars between (1948-1973).

Value

5% 59.

Based on the source below and your knowledge of history, explain how the partition of British Palestine led to the Arab-Israeli conflict (1948-1973).

"[After] the War of Independence, as the Israelis called it... the Israeli state had captured 30 percent more territory than the UN had allotted For [the Arabs], 1948 was al-Nakbah, 'the Disaster'.... The defeat [produced] no heroes, only embittered soldiers...who now sought revenge ...against Israel...."

Source: Six Days of War, Michael Oren, (4-6)

SI

KS

In the past, Britain controlled much of India and the Palestine Region.

And in Palestine, there was upsets due to Jewish-Muslim conflicts. So they partitioned Palestine so the Jews owned some of it, and the Muslims owned the rest. However, it was not split fairly.

The Jews thought it was their "promised land" from way back in the Moses Era, and to the Muslims, it was their homeland. This created huge conflicts and even led to war. And no matter what happened, someone was always upset: "For the Arabs... the defeat produced no heroes, only embittered soldiers ... who now sought revenge..." Both sides believed it was their land, and by partitioning it and giving some away to the others, all they managed to do was make both sides even more angry and upset.

Unité 5.2 Moyen-Orient

Valeur

5 % 59.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment la partition du territoire de la Palestine sous mandat britannique a mené au conflit arabo-Israélien (1948-1973).

« Après la guerre d'indépendance comme les Israéliens l'appelaient... l'État israélien avait capturé un territoire 30 pour cent plus grand que les Nations-Unies lui avaient attribué... Pour les Arabes, 1948 fut la Nakbah, "la grande catastrophe"... La défaite n'avait pas fait de héros, mais seulement des soldats mécontents qui cherchaient à se venger contre Israël. »

Source : Six Days of War, Michael Oren (4-6) [traduction libre]

5
4

Dans la source on voit un personne qui parle au propos de la guerre israélo-arabe, qui a prendre lieu le première jour que l'Israël été crée par la partition du territoire de la Palestine, le 15 mai, 1948. Ce jour, les forces des États Arabes qui s'inclure l'Égypte, le Jordanie, le Syrie, et le Palestine ont attaquer l'Israël. L'Israël a gagner cette bataille et comme il dit dans la source, 30 % plus de la terre du Palestine dans le conflit. Puis tous les Palestiniens qui vit en quest ce que est maintenant l'Israël ont tous devenu des réfugiés et doivent quitter leurs terres.

Un autre conflit israélien été ~~appelé~~ le crise de Suez, quand le président Nasser de l'Égypte a nationaliser le canal de Suez et ne permit pas ~~le G.B~~ le G.B, la France ou l'Israël de le utiliser pour le transport de leur pétrole. Alors ces pays ont attaquer l'Égypte et l'Israël a gagner le péninsule de Sinaï mais ~~l'ONU~~ leurs ont forcé de le retourner à l'Égypte. Après cela l'Égypte, la Jordanie et le Palestine ont essayer à détruire Israël avec le ~~la guerre~~ guerre de six jours. Ils veulent lancer un attaque surprise alors les soldats été à la frontière entre l'Égypte et Israël mais l'Israël a vu les soldats là et à décider d'attaquer d'abord. C'est un victoire s'éclatante pour Israël, qui a gagner le péninsule de Sinaï, le Cis-Jordanie et le Bande de Gaza. ~~Après le dernier guerre~~ ~~la guerre de six jours~~ durant ce temps été le guerre du Kippour, quand ~~le Israël~~ le Palestine ont attaquer l'Israël sur son jour le plus sainte, Yom Kippour. Les forces arabes ont presque gagner, mais l'Israël a gagner dans la fin. Les États-Unis et l'USSR à forcé ~~de~~ les deux côtés d'avoir un cessez-le-feu parce qu'ils été peur que les bombes nucléaires serait utiliser. Alors tous ces conflits sont passé au cause de la création de l'Israël avec la partition de la Palestine parce que toutes ces guerres été un effort de détruire l'Israël.

Unité 5.2 Moyen-Orient

Valeur

5 % 59.

D'après la source ci-dessous et vos connaissances en histoire, expliquez comment la partition du territoire de la Palestine sous mandat britannique a mené au conflit arabo-israélien (1948-1973).

« Après la guerre d'indépendance comme les Israéliens l'appelaient... l'État israélien avait capturé un territoire 30 pour cent plus grand que les Nations-Unies lui avaient attribué... Pour les Arabes, 1948 fut la Nakbah, "la grande catastrophe"... La défaite n'avait pas fait de héros, mais seulement des soldats mécontents qui cherchaient à se venger contre Israël. »

Source : Six Days of War, Michael Oren (4-6) [traduction libre]

0.5
La partition du territoire de la Palestine a mené au conflit arabo-israélien dans beaucoup de façon. La partition de la Palestine original sous mandat britannique n'est pas ce que les arabes voulaient. Alors ça cause du conflit de la droit au terre. Pour les Palestiniens, c'est leur terre. Pas ce de les Israéliens. Ils sont toujours en combat pour la terre et chaque fois les israéliens gagne plus de terre que la montant donné par les Nations-Unies. Comme la source dit, après la bataille les Palestiniens n'est pas contentes. Les Arabes seulement bâtir pour ce qu'ils pensaient ^{sois} est ils. Mais chaque fois ils mesurent plus petite ~~à~~ contre l'Israël et ça continue de cause les conflits jusqu'au point qu'ils pouvaient à gagner leur propre état.

Table 1
World History 3201
Item Analysis
Multiple Choice (Part I)

Item	Answer	Responses			
		A	B	C	D
		%	%	%	%
1	A	86.6	2.4	2.9	8.1
2	D	35.7	4.4	1.4	58.3
3	C	2.0	24.6	70.4	3.0
4	C	3.9	3.7	86.2	6.3
5	B	15.4	77.2	2.0	5.4
6	A	65.4	9.8	11.0	13.7
7	D	9.4	0.9	4.4	85.2
8	B	2.7	74.5	20.7	2.1
9	B	1.0	97.6	1.3	0.2
10	A	82.8	6.3	7.8	3.1
11	D	3.1	1.6	1.6	93.8
12	B	0.9	89.4	0.7	8.9
13	D	9.3	1.5	0.5	88.6
14	B	8.7	72.7	14.1	4.5
15	D	11.0	32.5	10.6	46.0
16	A	50.7	11.4	11.4	26.4
17	D	14.5	8.9	14.7	61.5
18	B	3.1	89.1	5.9	1.9
19	B	22.2	61.1	12.2	4.4
20	C	1.5	19.3	78.2	1.0
21	C	10.7	14.1	68.6	6.7
22	C	12.7	4.9	81.9	0.5
23	A	85.5	4.5	6.5	3.4
24	D	8.4	18.8	4.0	68.7
25	D	22.6	2.4	10.1	64.8
26	D	8.5	6.0	3.1	82.2
27	D	4.2	1.2	2.5	92.0
28	B	28.9	60.6	0.6	9.8
29	A	82.1	9.4	6.5	1.9
30	D	7.6	3.6	2.0	86.9
31	B	5.6	88.3	3.1	2.9
32	C	6.5	6.9	82.0	4.5
33	D	4.6	1.8	4.9	88.7
34	B	6.3	65.8	1.8	25.9
35	A	93.6	4.1	1.7	0.6

Table 1
World History 3201
Item Analysis (*Continued*)
Multiple Choice (Part I)

Item	Answer	Responses			
		A	B	C	D
		%	%	%	%
36	A	62.9	13.1	4.4	19.6
37	D	39.0	1.6	2.7	56.7
38	B	13.7	42.2	27.8	16.3
39	B	4.7	89.5	5.4	0.3
40	A	83.6	8.7	6.5	1.2
41	C	10.0	7.6	77.7	4.2
42	A	94.8	1.1	1.5	2.7
43	D	10.8	3.2	5.2	80.8
44	B	5.2	83.3	0.4	11.1
45	D	21.1	4.8	20.3	53.6
46	C	7.5	8.1	79.4	4.7
47	C	1.7	3.1	89.7	5.5
48	B	2.0	96.0	1.2	0.7
*49	D	4.3	7.0	8.5	79.8
*50	C	8.3	8.3	79.8	3.4

Note: Percentages may not add to 100% due to multiple responses, missing values, or rounding.
* Students completed either question 49 or 50, depending on the unit studied.

Table 2
World History 3201
Item Analysis
Constructed Response (Part II)

Item	Number of Students Completing Item	Value	Average
51	1279	5	3.0
52	1279	5	2.8
53	1279	10	5.3
54	1279	10	5.1
55	1279	5	2.2
56	1279	5	2.1
57	1279	5	2.3
*58	943	5	1.9
*59	336	5	2.2

Note: Percentages may not add to 100% due to multiple responses, missing values, or rounding.
 * Students completed either question 58 or 59, depending on the unit studied.

Table 3
Histoire mondiale 3231
L’analyse des items
Questions à choix multiple (Partie I)

Item	Bonne réponse	Choix			
		A	B	C	D
		%	%	%	%
1	A	92.6	1.9	0.3	5.2
2	D	19.5	4.4	1.1	74.7
3	C	1.1	17.9	79.7	1.4
4	C	1.1	0.3	94.8	3.9
5	B	16.8	76.4	1.7	5.0
6	A	76.4	7.1	7.1	9.3
7	D	4.7	1.4	1.7	92.3
8	B	2.5	85.2	11.0	1.4
9	B	4.4	86.0	9.1	0.6
10	A	89.3	3.6	6.0	1.1
11	D	7.1	6.0	6.3	80.5
12	B	2.2	90.7	0.3	6.9
13	D	2.8	0.8	0.6	95.9
14	B	4.7	79.4	12.6	3.3
15	D	7.7	25.0	7.7	59.6
16	A	53.0	5.8	5.2	36.0
17	D	9.6	5.2	29.4	55.8
18	B	0.3	97.0	2.2	0.6
19	B	14.0	75.3	8.0	2.8
20	C or D	0.6	18.4	71.7	9.3
21	C	12.4	9.1	74.7	3.9
22	C	11.3	2.8	85.4	0.6
23	A	89.3	5.5	1.9	3.3
24	D	5.5	16.8	1.7	76.1
25	D	22.5	0.3	10.2	67.0
26	D	14.6	3.3	3.9	78
27	D	2.2	0.3	2.8	94.8
28	B	19.5	76.7	0.3	3.3
29	A	86.3	8.2	4.4	1.1
30	D	2.5	3.9	2.2	91.2
31	B	23.1	72	1.9	3.0
32	C	4.1	5.5	86.3	4.1
33	D	2.5	1.9	2.5	93.1
34	B	5.5	77.5	1.4	15.4
35	A	97.3	1.4	1.4	0.0

Table 3
Histoire mondiale 3231
L'analyse des items (*continué*)
Questions à choix multiple (Partie I)

Item	Bonne réponse	Choix			
		A	B	C	D
		%	%	%	%
36	A	76.7	8.0	2.8	12.4
37	D	38.2	0.3	2.2	59.3
38	B	13.7	48.9	22.3	15.1
39	B	19.2	67.3	12.9	0.6
40	A	83.8	8.5	6.0	1.7
41	C	14.8	11.3	69.0	5.0
42	A	94.0	1.7	3.6	0.8
43	D	6.9	2.2	1.7	89.3
44	B	5.8	75.8	2.5	15.9
45	D	10.4	4.1	50.8	34.6
46	C	4.1	7.4	84.9	3.6
47	C	1.9	2.5	89.0	6.6
48	B	2.2	95.1	0.6	2.2
*49	D	1.7	9.9	8.2	80.0
*50	C	8.8	8.8	73.6	8.5

N.B. : Les pourcentages ne s’élèvent forcément pas à 100 % en raison des réponses multiples, des valeurs absentes ou de l’arrondissement.

*** Les élèves ont complété soit la question 49 ou la 50, en fonction de ce qui a été étudié en classe.**

Table 4
Histoire mondiale 3231
L'analyse des items
Questions à développement (Partie II)

Item	Nº d'élèves qui ont complété l'item	Valeur	Moyenne
51	364	5	3.2
52	364	5	2.9
53	364	10	5.2
54	364	10	5.0
55	364	5	2.5
56	364	5	2.1
57	364	5	2.5
*58	211	5	2.4
*59	153	5	2.0

N.B. : Les pourcentages ne s’élèvent forcément pas à 100 % en raison des réponses multiples, des valeurs absentes ou de l’arrondissement.

*** Les élèves ont complété soit la question 58 ou la 59, en fonction de ce qui a été étudié en classe.**