

**Grading Standards  
World History 3201 / Histoire Mondiale 3231  
June 2006**

**PRE-MARKING APPRAISAL**

The marking board was generally pleased with the examination. The selected-response questions were fair and considered to be a good sampling of the curriculum outcomes. Adjustments were made to question 32 as more than one distractor was arguably correct..Question 3 was eliminated due to a sequencing problem with the distractors

It was agreed that Question 56 needed a more specific time frame and, as a result, the answer key was adjusted to accommodate different interpretations of the term “former Soviet Republics”.

**Marking Scales**

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

5 point questions:

<b>Use of Document: 2%</b>		
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
<b>Use of Own Knowledge: 3%</b>		
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:

<b>Use of Documents: 5%</b>		
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

<b>Use of Own Knowledge: 5%</b>		
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

## **Marking Standard and Consistency**

An answer key/scoring scale was provided to all markers on the first day. The key was examined and discussed. Some modifications were made and a final key was agreed upon.

Marker reliability was checked by obtaining a random sample of 50 papers that went through the marker panel and marks were assigned to each question on a separate sheet of paper. The 50 exams were put back into the original stacks of exams and corrected again.

Throughout the marking process a statistical analysis was run on item data. This was done to enhance reliability and consistency of marking.

## **COMMENTARY ON RESPONSE:**

The three questions that were the most poorly answered were Items 54, 56, 58.

- In question 54, many students left it out or poorly answered the question.
- In question 56, students confused the time frame, talking about different historical periods.
- Many students did not attempt question 58.

**PART 11**  
**Total Value: 50%**

Value

5%

51. Using the cartoon and your knowledge of history, explain whether or not the Treaty of Versailles was just?

**Use of Document:**

The cartoon shows the victorious Allies (Britain, France, U.S., Italy, Japan) trying to shove the pill (“the peace terms”) down the throat of Germany, and the indication is that Germany is not willing to swallow the pill (“you got to swallow it whether you like it or not”). This forcing of the “peace terms” on Germany, without Germany having any input, made the Treaty of Versailles very unjust.

**Use of Own Knowledge:**

The Treaty of Versailles was unjust for the following reasons:

- forced reparations payment
- deflating Germany’s self-image
- weakened German economy
- drastically reduced its military

**Commentary on Response:**

Most students answered this question and overall it was fairly well done. The majority referred to the document and related this to their own knowledge of history.

**Students:**

- blamed Hitler for the problems of WWI.
- thought the Allied nations, listed on the fingers in the graphic, were being forced to swallow the “peace terms”.
- thought that the man being held represented the British Empire.

Exemplars:

5

and how unfair these treaties were.

At the time, the Versailles Treaty was perhaps not as controversial then as it can be seen to be now. Today we can see the results of the Treaty and justify it either way. Germany was a defeated nation. It was in enough hard times as it was and to force the terms on it would almost certainly send the world spiralling into another war. We can see in the document Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the US grasping what we assume to be Germany. This shows how vulnerable Germany was. The leaders say "You've got to swallow it whether you like it or not!" Showing how the Germans really had no say or choice in the matter. Germany was not invited to the Peace talks in Paris and were expected to just accept the terms of the treaty (represented by the spoon in the document). The question of the war guilt clause is one of great debate, can one country be held responsible for an entire world war? Sure Germany may have been more of an aggressor, but for the country to accept full responsibility would certainly cause a loss of any pride felt within the country. As well, the country was defeated. They had to rebuild themselves before they could even attempt to rebuild the rest of

the world. <sup>How could a country already experiencing economic problems be expected to fix the rest of the world's economies as well. By paying the immense reparation payments forced on it by France (mostly), Germany was forced into hyperinflation, poverty and a dramatic drop in nationalism. The country had completely turned around and in those dramatic times, the people look to a dramatic leader. A new government that would bring them out of the slump the Treaty had forced them into. Perhaps if the future was more closely analysed WWII could have been prevented.</sup>

World History 3201 June 2006

Page 12 of 22

2 The treaty of Versailles was not a just treaty. Germany had no other choice but to agree to the treaty's terms or else the Allies would occupy Germany.

The treaty's terms were unfair, and unjust. It demanded that Germany must pay for all reparations, and must accept to the war guilt clause, which means Germany must agree to full responsibility for the war.

In the cartoon provided it is showing Ben showing the peace terms down Dalman's throat, who represents Germany, and he is being held in place by a giant hand that has the names of the Allies on each finger. This cartoon is completely accurate. The allies did shove the terms down Germany's throat because Germany just had no other choice than to agree to the treaty's demands.

5  
Selon cette caricature, le traité de Versailles - le traité de paix signé en 1919 par l'Allemagne n'était pas juste. Les vainqueurs (le Grand-Bretagne, ~~la~~ France, <sup>et les EU</sup> et notamment) les Alliés avaient des demandes à imposer sur l'Allemagne sous le défaut sans condition. L'Allemagne n'avait aucune choix mais d'accepter ces conditions. Dans la caricature, le train représente tout les pays vainqueurs qui tenait l'Allemagne (l'homme) et le forçait de signer le traité de Versailles, sans que leur soit opinion (représenté par les pillules "dont la boîte vaut des millions"). Les hommes qui donne les pillules au l'homme (l'Allemagne) sont ces mêmes pays que sur le train - les gagnants de WWI. Ils disent "Que vous aimez, ou non, vous devez l'avaler!" qui représente que si l'Allemagne aime le traité ou non, ils doivent le signer. Ce traité a été injuste pour l'Allemagne au cause des demandes. La clause de culpabilité disait que l'Allemagne devait prendre tout responsabilité pour WWI, et de payer des réparations au vainqueurs de 30 milliard dollars (dont 52% au France), et il devait limiter leur armée terrière et navale (ce que le GB veut) et redonne l'Alsace Lorraine au France. Ces clauses de le Traité de Versailles ont été forcé sur l'Allemagne parcequ'il a perdu WWI et il avait aucune choix que de le signer, ou les combats recommenceraient. Ceci a diminué le nationalisme Allemand et augmenté celle des Alliés (gagnants) alors ce traité n'était pas juste.

3.5

Le traité de Versailles n'était pas juste. Le traité a consisté d'une clause de culpabilité, où l'Allemagne était forcée de prendre toute responsabilité de la guerre. Les conditions étaient que l'Allemagne doit payer de milliards de dollars pour des réparations en Europe, ils doivent démanteler le Rhénanie et finalement, ils doivent baisser leur armée à 100,000 soldats. Ceci était une décision très difficile pour l'Allemagne. Ils ne peuvent pas rejeter les conditions et recommencer la guerre, mais sur l'autre main, les réparations étaient beaucoup trop chers. Finalement, l'Allemagne a signé le traité de Versailles et étaient humiliés. Le traité n'était pas juste parce que les demandes étaient humiliantes et presque impossible. Le traité a aussi causé le xénophobie dans des Allemandes et les Allemands. Ils maintenant haïr les Alliés et, éventuellement, avec l'aide de d'Adolf Hitler, ont eu leur chance pour revanche dans le deuxième guerre mondiale.

D.S

Value

5%

52. Using the source provided and your knowledge of history, assess how German and British attitudes on the eve of World War I contributed to rivalry and conflict.

**Use of Document:**

The quote provided highlighted the fact that Germany was a new player to the international scene and its attitude was that they would change the world. Conversely Britain, which had been the leader in international affairs for centuries, wanted to maintain the “status quo”

**Use of Own Knowledge:**

- Germany and Britain believed that any war would be short.
- Both countries had an imperialist attitude.
- Both had a strong pride in their nation.
- Britain felt that Germany was a threat to its position in the world.
- Germany felt left out of the race for colonies.

**Commentary on Response:**

The majority of students answered this question. The document was used by almost all students, but in a few cases, no mention of the document was included in an otherwise good answer.

**Students:**

- referenced only the document but did not support it with historical knowledge.
- blamed Hitler and his mistreatment of groups such as the Jews, illustrating a lack of knowledge regarding 20<sup>th</sup> century time lines

## Exemplars:

5 German and British attitudes on the eve of World War I ~~contributed~~ contributed very much to the rivalry and conflict of the two countries. From the source above we can see that the Germans were looking to change the world and become more powerful, while Britain wanted a war so they could preserve the world and remain the imperial power that it has been for many years. The Germans wanted to become an imperial power and thought war would be the best way to reach their goal. Germany thought that they were just as good and even better than Britain. They had a strong growing economy and wanted to expand their land, but were unable to do so because Britain being the imperial power already owned much of the land. In order for Germany to expand and grow to become an imperial power they needed ~~to~~ war to defeat Britain. While Germany wanted war to become an imperial power Britain wanted one so they could remain in power. Britain was fighting for pride and legacy. The young men could not wait to fight for Pax Britannica (~~Britain~~ British Peace). Britain wanted to keep their status and preserve the world. They thought a war was needed, that it would last a short time, and protect the British empire. As you can see from the source above the rivalry and conflict was caused because Germans wanted change and a chance to grow and gain power, while Britain didn't want change and wanted to keep things the way they are, "preserve the world".

World History 301 June 2006

3

There are many underlying causes of the first world war (WWI). Alliances, nationalism, imperialism and militarism all helped fuel the fire of war. The Germans and the British, key players in WWI, had different attitudes prior to WWI that only added to this conflict and rivalry.

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Britain was at the top of its game. It was further along industrially than other countries and had an empire so vast it was said "the sun never sets on the British Empire." This is why, as stated in the source, "this was a war to preserve the world." The British liked things as they were and felt they needed to preserve it. However, the Germans were beginning to become more industrialized and wanted more colonies, they wanted their "place in the sun." As it says in the quote, to the Germans "this was a war to change the world" as they were becoming more powerful.

An example of how these attitudes contributed to rivalry and conflict is during the arms race. To catch up to Britain industrially Germany produced many weapons but they also wanted to challenge British naval power as they began to produce warships. The British had more but the German's were more powerful and new.

In conclusion, the very different views prior to WWI by Britain and Germany contributed greatly to rivalry and conflict.

5

Cette citation fait directe référence aux attitudes de l'Allemagne et le GB avant la première Guerre mondiale. La partie de citation qui dit "Pour les Allemands, c'était une guerre destinée à changer le monde", ceci fait référence aux attitudes agressives et territoriales de Guillaume II (empereur d'Allemagne). Il pensait que l'Allemagne avait besoin d'une guerre pour prouver leur puissance. Et pour qu'il pouvait devenir un pays superpuissance. L'Allemagne était ambitieuse. Au l'autre côté, la citation "Le GB, c'était une guerre destinée à préserver le monde", le GB était positif envers la guerre. Il voulait combattre seulement pour maintenir leur status quo en Europe et de maintenir leur superpuissance navale - pas pour dominer. Les attitudes ont mené à la rivalité entre ces deux pays, et directement au WWI. Allemagne était ambitieuse et voulait devenir <sup>un</sup> superpuissance, alors l'impérialisme est devenu un rivalité entre les deux. Le GB avait déjà annexé beaucoup de colonies en Afrique et Asie et alors l'Allemagne voulait entrer dans la compétition pour les colonies. Les rivalités, donc économiques se sont formés au cause de ceci. Aussi, la course aux armements est un autre rivalité entre les deux pays qui a augmenté les tensions. Le GB était la superpuissance navale, mais Allemagne voulait rattrapper, alors avec son fer et charbon de l'Alsace Lorraine (acquises au fin du guerre franco-allemande - ancienne colonie française) il a construit 41 cuirassés. Le GB sentait menacé, alors il a créé le Dreadnaught - le plus gros, forte et vite cuirassé jamais. L'Allemagne voulait ceci et a créé 18 dreadnaughts, mais le GB en avait déjà 29. Les deux éléments en combinaison avec le nationalisme extrême (xénophobie) de ces deux pays et leurs alliances (Triple Entente (GB) et Triple Alliance (Allemagne)) a mené à la Première Guerre mondiale.

Les mœurs de l'attitude de l'Allemagne et la Grande-Bretagne était vraiment différent pendant la Première Guerre Mondiale et a contribué beaucoup au conflits. L'Allemagne voulu expansionné et coloniser, il voulu du pouvoir et un empire. Comme la Grande-Bretagne. " Pour les Allemands, c'était une guerre destinée à changer le monde..." Comme France et l'Angleterre ils voulait montrer au monde qu'ils avaient du force. Les attitude des deux pays à mener au guerre. La guerre pour les Allemands sera vite et facile. Cependant les anglais penser un peu le même chose. Comme l'Allemagne il pensé que la guerre sera court. Il pensait que c'était nécessaire. La Grande-Bretagne voulait protéger leur empire. " Le soleil ne couche jamais sur l'empire du Grande-Bretagne." Il voulait montrer qu'ils était le plus puissant comme toujours. "... Pour la G.B, c'était une guerre destinée à préserver le monde." Comme d'habitude la Grande-Bretagne sera là pour bâtir fort et sauver les peuples.

Value

10%

53. Using the sources provided and your knowledge of history, analyze the basic elements of fascism.

**Source 1:**

- Source 1 indicates the fascist element of military strength or “might is right”, and the idea of war being a possible way to meet this goal of military glory. “Germany will either become a world power or will not continue to exist at all”.
- territorial growth

**Source 2:**

- Source 2 highlights the fascist element of both military strength and extreme nationalism, indicated by the symbols in the picture. As well, students could say that dictatorship is indicated because Hitler is the focus of attention / obedience / unity of purpose.
- glorification of a leader: der Fuhrer
- glorification of the military
- Other elements of fascism that could be mentioned or expanded upon would be:
  - economic self-sufficiency
  - creation of scapegoats / Jews
  - policy of Lebensraum
  - a glorification of the past
  - the idea of emotion not reason
  - extreme right
  - anti-communist (also alluded to as a scapegoat).

**Use of Own Knowledge:**

- extreme nationalism
- dictatorship - devotion of leader
- economic self-sufficiency
- glorification of war
- totalitarianism
- creation of a scapegoat / Jews
- world domination
- Lebensraum
- glorification of the past
- might makes right
- emotion not reason
- simple answers to complex questions

### Commentary on Response:

For the most part, the question was fairly well answered. Students generally had some notion of "Fascist" ideology. Most students referenced both documents in their answers.

### Students:

- did not elaborate on their answers.
- confused Fascism with Communism. (e.g., Hitler wanted to spread Communism throughout Europe.)
- merely re-stated the obvious from the sources with little extension
- missed obvious connections regarding the source (e.g., pageantry in the illustration, nationalism or devotion to a leader).

### Exemplars:

Fascism is ~~to~~ the opposite of communism. Its name is derived from the Italian word fasces meaning of bundle of rods. Facists ~~believe~~ ideas around the world differ but the basic elements everywhere remain the same. Facists believe in using force ~~to~~ or fear to obtain. They believe that passiveness is a sign of weakness, that they need a strong ~~the~~ leader/dictator. This dictator demands complete, and total loyalty, it is a cult of the leader atmosphere, the people obey the leader or are eliminated. They believe in a master race <sup>that will cure the inferior</sup> or racial purity which results in the separation of races. Inter racial mixing is <sup>illegal</sup> ~~illegal~~. The idea of racial purity also leads to scapegoats; or entire races or ethnic groups or handicapped people etc being <sup>K</sup> blamed for all ~~the~~ <sup>facist</sup> nations problems. Those scapegoats are punished for the problems ~~and~~ segregated and often eliminated because ~~facist~~ fascists wont have an inferior peoples in

K) there perfect nation. Fascists also ~~are~~ have extreme feelings of Nationalism and Superiority to all others. Fascists leaders often stir up Nationalism by talk of wanting to revert back to the glory days. Fascists want to expand and conquer the divine race will rule all others. In Germany the case was no different, Hitler a fascist leader wanted to expand to the east to create more lebensraum (living space) ~~this is illustrated~~ for the "true dreams" <sup>(German/Austrian usually blond or blue)</sup> to live a rule.

This is illustrated in <sup>source</sup> ~~quote~~ 1 a quote from Mein Kampf Hitlers book. In this quote he basically says Germany will either become a world power or will not continue to exist at all... "showing he believes Germany is the best and will be very powerful" "to be

10 - e a world power it needs that territorial magnitude which gives it the necessary importance today... This colossal empire in the East is ripe for dissolution..." Basically stating Germany needs to expand to be more powerful and larger & the east is the perfect place to expand. This shows Hitlers desire to expand and conquer and that he ~~believes~~ is very <sup>nationalistic</sup> believes that Germany will be a great power & rule, which is what Hitler preached as he came to power & stated his rise when he re militarized the Rhineland (showing need for power ~~was~~ reunited to Austria in Anschluss (uniting all of the master race) signed Munich pact getting Sudetenland and taking the rest of Czech while the other power appeased (showing Hitler they were weak) all the while preaching anti-Semitism = hatred of the Jew. The second source is a picture showing Hitler after he had made himself a dictator driving down the street in front of the parliament with Nazi symbols everywhere being honored by all the Germans ~~everywhere~~ lining the streets, <sup>& Promoted</sup>

showing the cult of the leader attitude, the respect & dedication to ~~the~~ the leader & fear of the leader b/c everyone is lined up perfectly. Hitler is being followed by other cars containing military officers showing that force is the way to get things done & that Germany would be number one. The picture also has Nazi symbols everywhere <sup>& German/Nazi</sup> flags flying showing the strong Nationalism of the country. All of these things illustrate the characteristics of fascism in Germany and in other fascist nations as well.

The basic elements of fascism are as follows: Strong Military forces, economic independence, extreme nationalism, dictatorship and scapegoating, all of which were evident in a few European countries throughout the aftermath of the first world war.

A prime example of fascism at its heights could have been the reign of Adolf Hitler. Adolf Hitler had extreme fascist views and carried them out during his reign as leader of Germany.

The first element of fascism is a strong military force. Hitler believed greatly in having a forceful power behind

him. He established the Gestapo as a prime example to eliminate all opposition to his reign. He also began his secret cultivating of his army which would be used for his territorial expansion and creating fear upon others.

Another element of fascism would be a country's belief in economic independence and not depending on anyone else to help provide and support their economy. This was a strategic move so that if the country fell into turmoil with another, supplies and sanctions could not be issued.

In addition, fascism is also composed up of the feeling of extreme nationalism to one's country. As seen in source 2, this extremity of nationalism is very evident. The German people are very nationalized as a people and a country and again in source 1 it states that Germany must expand territorial to be up to speed with the rest of the world.

Furthermore, fascism is big on dictatorship which again was very prominent in the fascist rulers of the eastern world. Hitler was a dictator throughout his rule and again evidently expressing fascist views.

And finally, scapegoating was the last element of fascism. This is putting the blame for something on someone else and Hitler did exactly that to all people of Jewish descent in Germany, thus completing the views and

7

10

Les deux sources en combinaison avec des autres facteurs des années 20 et 30 sont les bases des éléments fondamentaux du fascisme. La première source est une citation de Hitler dans son livre "Mein Kampf" qu'il a écrit en prison. Dans cette livre, Hitler parle de beaucoup de ses politiques fascistes en Allemagne, mais un qui est très dominant est le Lebensraum. Lebensraum est le terme allemand pour "l'espace vital des allemands". Dans la citation, il dit "...elle a besoin de ce vaste territoire qui lui donne l'importance nécessaire aujourd'hui". Ceci parle directement du Lebensraum - qui est un territoire nécessaire pour les allemands pour leur vaste empire. Il parle aussi de son ambition territoriale et d'expansion en Europe quand Hitler dit "L'empire colossal de l'Est est prêt pour la dissolution". Hitler veut envahir et annexer l'Europe de l'Est pour son espace vital allemand.

La deuxième source est une photo de Hitler qui se parade dans la rue avec beaucoup de gens qui l'entourent et le symbole Nazi partout. Cette source fait référence aux les autres éléments fascistes. Un, est de

Continued below

ferme à un leader. Ceci est évident avec le fait que les Allemands ont signalé au Hitler et pense qu'il est comme un demi-Dieu. Avec seulement un leader, il y a aucune opposition et la création des polices secrètes pour éliminer les opposés. Pour Hitler, il avait le Gestapo. Le symbole Nazi, et le fait que tous les gens se sont réunis pour regarder Hitler est un autre élément fasciste - le nationalisme extrême, ou le xénophobie. Ceci est un amour profond pour l'état qui mène à la haine et peur des autres cultures.

En plus de cela, les autres éléments fascistes sont la création des boucs émissaires. Les boucs émissaires sont les groupes minoritaires que le parti fasciste blame pour tous les problèmes de l'état. Pour Hitler, il y avait la République Weimar pour leur gouvernement faible et la faiblesse de la traité de Versailles. Il y avait aussi les juifs. Le sentiment anti-semitisme est très fréquent dans le régime totalitaire fasciste de Hitler. Il pensait que les juifs étaient le raison pour tous problèmes et qu'ils étaient une race inférieure et impure, comparée au Race Aryenne (race pure et supérieure Allemand) de Hitler. Hitler n'aime pas aussi les autres minorités comme les femmes, les homosexuelles et les communistes.

Le régime fasciste d'un leader de Hitler était un régime totalitaire. Il avait le contrôle suprême de son peuple au cause de la force et la violence du Gestapo et les SA (Storm Troopers). Hitler utilisait la propagande et l'indoctrination et la censure partout en Allemagne pour créer un peuple fidèle au parti fasciste. Il a utilisé deux slogans qui représentent le fascisme parfaitement. Un est "Croire, Obéir et Combattre" qui représente de croire à ton chef et nation, Obéir ton chef et combattre pour ton nation en cas d'une guerre. L'autre est "Unité et Autorité" qui représente le nationalisme du peuple Allemand et l'autorité du chef qui est Hitler. Comme Mussolini a dit, "Je prends l'enfant du berceau jusqu'à son mort, et là, je le redonne au Dieu". Le fascisme a tous ces éléments et plus

Le fascisme et le nationalisme extrême.  
Il y a plusieurs caractéristiques communes  
présentes dans chaque gouvernement fasciste.

6  
La première caractéristique est le  
développement d'un manque de respect pour  
les autres pays et pour les autres  
cultures/religions. Une exemple parfait de cela  
est la "Holocauste". Hitler et les Nazis croyaient  
que il-y-a un seul race principale  
des deux mondes, donc les Juifs étaient, à Hitler,  
un malade. Ils ont donc tués  
des millions de Juifs.

La deuxième caractéristique de  
fascisme est ~~la~~

et la présence d'un dictateur pour  
que le régime fasciste marche. Le  
fasciste a besoin d'être aperçu comme  
un dieu. Comme on voit dans la  
source 2 pour exemple, Hitler était présente  
dans plusieurs événements spectaculaires pour  
se promouvoir et pour gagner la  
confiance des paysans.

Dernièrement, la troisième caractéristique  
dans une régime fasciste, comme  
dans la définition, est le nationalisme  
extrême. Comme on voit dans la  
source 1, Hitler sentait que l'Allemagne  
était plus important que le reste  
de l'Europe, donc il sentait que  
l'Allemagne devrait être donné Lebensraum  
("living space") pour les citoyens  
Allemands. Donc la vision impérialiste son  
aussi présentes en fascisme.

Value

10% 54.

Using the sources provided and your knowledge of history, evaluate how the impact of new leaders and technological advances increased tensions at the Potsdam Conference.

**Source 1:**

“After Potsdam, one wouldn’t be very hopeful any longer. It was quite obvious they (Soviet Union) were going to be troublesome. The war had left them holding positions far into Eastern Europe.”

- Clement Atlee, British Prime Minister, recalling the Potsdam Conference

**Source: 2**

“Stalin was convinced that the United States would use the ‘bomb’ to win worldwide power.”

**Use of Documents:**

Source 1 highlights the fact that changes in leadership at Potsdam resulted in increased tensions - Atlee who replaced Winston Churchill, mentioned the tension when he said “It was quite obvious they (Soviet Union) were going to be troublesome”, because of their domination of Eastern Europe.

Source 2, refers to tension created by technology advances, specifically the atomic bomb. (See *knowledge of items* for further information of what students could use with this document.)

**Use of Knowledge:**

- Between July 17 and August 17, 1945, the last wartime conference was held at Potsdam. Stalin met with U.S. President Harry Truman (Roosevelt had died) and British Prime Minister Clement Atlee (Churchill had lost the recent British election). There was disagreement on the question of Poland. It was agreed that all Nazi institutions would be dismantled and Nazi war criminals would be tried and punished. Reparations would be paid in machinery, the Soviets had the right to take what they wanted from the Eastern sector of Germany and 35% from the western sector.
- They could not agree on the future of Germany so the “temporary arrangement” to divide Germany and Berlin remained
- The West wanted to reinstate the London Poles while Stalin would only recognize the Lublin Poles who were already in place.
- President Truman saw things in black and white terms, with little room for compromise. As a result, he adopted a “get tough” attitude with the Soviets (different from Roosevelt). He believed the Soviets were acting like a bully in Europe and should be made to mend its ways.

- Unlike Roosevelt, Truman was highly suspicious of the Soviets and had no intention of working closely with Stalin like Roosevelt. This new approach towards the Soviets increased tensions.
- In August 1945, the United States ended WWII by dropping atomic bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
- The atomic bomb became a source of tension for several reasons:
  - Truman had not told Stalin that the U.S. intended to drop these on Japan.
  - The U.S. refused to share the secret of how to make such a bomb.
  - Stalin was convinced the U.S. would use the bomb to win worldwide power.
  - Stalin ordered his scientists to develop an atomic bomb.

**Commentary on Response:**

This question was generally not answered well.

**Students:**

- answered the question but showed no understanding of what the question was asking or the sources.
- concentrated on one source or the other - but not both. When both sources were used it was generally a repeat of sources with little or no extension.
- answered the Potsdam question by discussing the tension at Potsdam in relation to the Cuban Missile Crisis, Berlin Blockade, Vietnam, etc.
- were not able to discuss tensions caused by new leaders as they did not know who these new leaders were or that there were tensions between them. Many referred to Clement Atlee because of the source but confused him with U.S. President Truman.
- discussed technological developments as being all weapons from rifles to U-boats / submarines when referencing Source 2.
- referred to tensions between leaders as the Iron Curtain / Two Hostile Camp speeches.
- discussed the Atomic bomb as having been dropped already -not after Potsdam.
- immediately went into a discussion of the Truman Doctrine, Policy of Containment, Marshall Plan, etc, when they mentioned Truman replacing Roosevelt.

## Exemplars:

The Yalta Conference was held February, 1945. There were 3 leaders present, Stalin representing the Soviet Union, Churchill representing Great Britain, and Roosevelt representing the United States. At Yalta, many agreements were made and the leaders were fairly cooperative. Roosevelt believed that the best way to deal with Stalin was to talk to him openly and maintain good relations with the Soviet Union. At Yalta it was agreed that ~~Europe~~<sup>Germany</sup> would be split into 3 regions, one for Britain, the U.S., and the U.S.S.R. Berlin would be split the same way. Stalin also agreed to allow Eastern European countries such as Poland to hold free elections.

Six months later, at the Potsdam Conference, much had changed. Firstly, the leaders representing the ~~U.S.~~ U.S. and Great Britain had changed. Truman had replaced Roosevelt, and Attlee had replaced Churchill. Truman, (who was vice-president but had ~~then~~ replaced Roosevelt following his death) felt that a harder approach had to be taken to contain communism. He did not want to

Stalin or make deals with him. He believed in a zero-tolerance approach. This increased tension between the two sides.

Another thing that had changed between the conferences is that Stalin had not abided by his promises regarding Eastern Europe. He had not allowed the free elections to take place. As stated in Source 1, Stalin had been holding his position in Eastern Europe, trying to spread communism and his sphere of influence. The fact that Stalin had not done what he had agreed upon, and that it was quite obvious that he had never planned to (Source 1) also added to the increased tensions at Potsdam.

Another factor which led to increased tension at ~~the~~ Potsdam was the U.S. development of the atomic bomb and the dropping of this bomb on Japan. Many things regarding this act troubled and worried the Soviets. First of all, the U.S. had not told the Soviets about ~~the~~ their plans to drop the bomb on Japan. Also, Truman refused to tell Stalin how to manufacture such a bomb. It is for these two reasons that Stalin was suspicious of the U.S. As it states in Source 2, Stalin was convinced that the U.S. was planning to take over the world using the bomb. This suspicion and ~~and distrust~~ ~~deep distrust~~ further increased tensions at Potsdam.

After Potsdam, Stalin immediately set his scientists to work to develop an ~~atom~~ atomic bomb. With a deep distrust established on both sides and the beginning of an arms race which was sure to spiral out of control, after Potsdam "we couldn't be hopeful much longer" (Source 1). The Cold War had begun.

Potsdam est une conférence de paix en 1945 pour faire les décisions finales de la deuxième guerre mondiale. Au cours des autres conférences, les États étaient représentés par Roosevelt, le GB par Churchill et URSS par Staline. Ces conférences semblaient d'être très optimistes, mais au Potsdam, les dirigeants politiques ont changé, qui menait au mécontentement. Roosevelt est mort avant le début de Potsdam et alors Truman, son successeur, l'a remplacé au Potsdam. Truman était un homme agressif et qui tenait ses mots. Mi-chemin de la conférence, Churchill devait retourner au GB pour les résultats de l'élection qu'il en était certain de l'avoir gagné, mais Clement Attlee s'est retourné au Potsdam en son place. Alors Staline a été le seul participant qui a été à tous les conférences de paix, et il a utilisé ceci à son avantage. Attlee a dit en source 1: "On ne pouvait pas être aussi optimiste", car, le pouvoir de Staline, il va l'exercer. Au Potsdam, le prioritaire de discussion était de quoi faire de Pologne? Attlee voulait que c'était un pays libre, gouvernée par les "Polonais de Londres" (les réfugiés de Pologne en GB quand Hitler l'a annexé). Mais Staline a dit qu'il voulait que la Pologne serait un zone dans le sphère d'influence soviétique avec un gouvernement pro-soviétique - pour être comme une zone de tampon pour URSS, car l'Allemagne a attaqué l'URSS en traverser par Pologne en WWI et WWII, et Staline voulait Pologne

comme un sécurité. Au cause qu'il a été à les autres conférence il a convaincu Truman et Atlee, qui étaient nouvelle au sujet, et a cédé au Staline le contrôle du Pologne.

Staline a aussi eu le contrôle de Roumanie, Bulgarie, Tchécoslovaquie, Hongrie, et les autres pays slaves pour une compensation dans son Sphère d'Influence Sovétique. (Il avait demi d'Allemagne, comme décidé au Yalta.) Tout ces ~~avancés~~ avancements territoriales peuvent être blâmé sur la faiblesse de Truman et Atlee pour céder au Staline tout ce qu'il voulait.

Alors le 1<sup>er</sup> source est vrai en dire "l'Union soviétique allaient être une source de problèmes. La guerre leur avait permis de pénétrer très loin en Europe de l'Est". Staline est devenu un menace au sécurité de l'Europe parce qu'il avait contrôle de beaucoup de colonies. Le regret de GB et EU après ont augmentés les tensions entre eux et URSS.

Le deuxième source parle au sujet de les États-Unis et la « bombe ». Il dit que Staline pense que les EU avaient la bombe seulement pour s'empares au pouvoir dans le monde et pour prouver au monde qu'ils étaient puissants. Au Potsdam, la discussion de la bombe Atomique en possession de Truman a été mentionnée - s'ils devraient l'utilisé sur le Japon pour arrêter la guerre au Pacifique. C'est une rumeur que Truman a mentionné ceci au Staline pour lui faire peur et faire connaissance du pouvoir Américain - que les EU pourraient l'utilisé sur l'URSS s'ils sont un menace en Europe. Staline a pensé ceci et aussi beaucoup d'autres gens. Le menace de la Bombe était un autre élément qui a augmentés les tensions entre les EU et l'URSS - qui est, le capitalisme et le communisme.

Value

5%

55. Using the document provided and your knowledge of history, evaluate the Soviet Union's reaction to the policy of containment.

*Thus the Marshall Plan widely advertised as a plan to "save peace" was essentially aimed at uniting bourgeois countries on an anti-Soviet basis. Even right wing politicians and publicists (supporters in the press) saw the Marshall Plan as the nucleus (beginning) of a new Holy Alliance against Communism.*

Source: Russia and the USSR,(70)

### **Use of Document:**

The document refers to the Marshall Plan and how this was an "anti-Soviet Plan" and how it was the "nucleus beginning / of a new alliance against Communism". This then created a reaction to containment by motivating the Soviet Union to create the Molotov Plan. (The Marshall Plan and the Molotov Plan should both be explained.)

### **Use of Knowledge:**

- discussion of the Berlin Blockade and how this to was a reaction to containment, (eg.: The Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine).
- discussion about the Warsaw Pact and how this policy resulted from the formation of NATO.
- students could also mention how the reaction to containment, increased the feeling of suspicion between the USSR & the West.

### **Students:**

- did not mention the Berlin Blockade, the Warsaw Pack or NATO, although most students mentioned or elaborated on the Marshall Plan and the Molotov Plan.
- simply gave a definition of containment and elaborated only on the Molotov Plan.

## Exemplars:

The American policy of containment was a policy to stop the spread of communism throughout the world. This policy was set into action by the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan which was an American policy that offered US aid to European countries devastated by war. It was also put into action with the plans to create an independent West German state and with the formation of NATO, an American initiative that united twelve countries against the perceived threat of the Soviets. The Soviets had a strong and swift reaction to containment and the policies it included. As the above quote demonstrates the Soviets were aware of the containment and its implications and they were determined to counter balance it with their own policies. In response to the Marshall plan the Soviets developed the Molotov plan. This was a Soviet plan that offered financial aid to Soviet bloc nations which included Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. It involved bilateral trade agreements - eventually 70% of trade of Soviet bloc nations was between other bloc nations. It was designed to offer aid to Soviet countries who had considered the Marshall plan. In response to Britain and the Americas plan to create an independent West German state the Soviets set up the Berlin Blockade. The Soviets were vehemently against this plan, in fact they hoped to unite Germany under Soviet control. To accomplish this they set up blockades across the main railway canal and road lines going in and out of Berlin. They hoped that the West would give up and allow them to take control of Germany. In response to NATO the Soviet Union developed the Warsaw Pact which was modeled after NATO. It was an agreement of mutual defense that was created in Warsaw five days after West Germany joined NATO. It united such countries as East Germany, Hungary and Poland. It set up a united military command headquarters in Moscow. As the above quote points out the USSR were aware that the Americans planned to wage an all out war on Communism. The Soviets through their own policies attempted to counteract American policies. As a result it intensified tensions and affirmed the Soviets strong Communist view point.

The policy of containment was an idea by the U.S.A. to stop the spread of communism, no matter the cause. The U.S.S.R viewed this as blindly outrageous, and it heavily increased the already soaring tensions between the two superpowers. One of the ways the U.S. fought the spread of communism was the issuing of the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan, was an economic program in which the U.S. would lend economic aid to countries rebuilding following World War Two. This was essential because, in order to fight off Communism, you must make sure there is no reason for it to begin in the first place, by having a economically stable country. The Soviets in response issued the Molotov plan, which promoted free trade between the U.S.S.R and countries who needed aid. This was very important because the Soviets viewed the Marshall plan as a threat to communism, and they must defend against it. The document above states that.

The Marshall plan was essential in stopping communism, but the Soviets countered with the Molotov plan, essential for saving communism.

g. 3

La politique de l'endiguement est une politique visant à freiner les puissances ou idéologie hostile. L'États-Unis ont adopté cette politique <sup>plurent les</sup> pendant les années 1940's pour empêcher l'Union soviétique de se <sup>ils essaye de réduire l'expansion soviétique</sup> franchir. ~~Il~~ <sup>Dans</sup> le document se explique que le Plan Marshall était pour seulement aller contre l'Union soviétique et pour créer une alliance contre le communisme, "d'une nouvelle Grande Alliance contre le communisme". Le Plan Marshall était établi en 1947 pour donner l'aide financière au pays dévasté de la deuxième guerre mondiale et pour la croissance de pays industrialisés qui pourrait stimuler l'économie de l'E-U par les exportations. Mais l'Union soviétique n'a pas laissé parce qu'il pensait que le plan diviserait l'Europe, renforcer l'Allemagne et donner les affaires étranger de l'Europe qui l'E-U. Alors les soviétiques ont créé le plan Molotov pour contrebalancer et pour créer les ententes bilatérales entre les pays du bloc soviétique. ~~Il~~ <sup>l'Union soviétique</sup> ont pensé que le plan Marshall était créé seulement pour aller contre le communisme il ~~avait~~ <sup>il</sup> a déjà reçu avec colère avec le discours "rideau de fer" par Churchill et le discours de Truman il pensait que le Plan Marshall était un autre facteur de la politique de l'endiguement. Dans le document se dit que le plan Marshall était destiné à assurer le pays mais les soviétiques pensait que c'était pour réunir ~~le~~ et avverti le pertrique et les pays contre l'expansion soviétique. Les soviétiques n'étaient pas content avec l'endiguement est à cause <sup>de Churchill et Truman</sup> de l'essai à ~~faire~~ imposer le dominion des pays indépendants contre le communisme et ils pensaient que le Plan Marshall était aussi pour l'allier contre les soviétiques.

3 La politique d'endiguement était la politique des États-Unis, basée sur la peur de communisme. En le document, c'est montré que le Plan Marshall (basé sur la politique d'endiguement), est commencé et que ce plan visait à réunir les pays contre l'Union Soviétique et contre le communisme. Beaucoup des politiciens ont considéré le Plan Marshall d'être la commencement d'une alliance contre le communisme. L'Union Soviétique n'était pas content avec la politique d'endiguement et le plan Marshall. En réponse à ce plan Marshall, l'Union ~~Soviétique~~ Soviétique a créé le plan Molotov, qui était pour promouvoir la ~~communisme~~ communisme dans des autres pays. L'Union Soviétique n'étaient pas d'accord avec la peur de communisme que les États-Unis essaye d'installer en les autres pays du monde.

Value

5%

56. Using the document provided and your knowledge of history, assess the challenges faced by the former Soviet republics.

*“The only way to save the situation from the rubbish heap of history is to allow other groups in society, eventually other parties, to compete against the Party. Only if people choose it, is it worth having.”*

- Communist Officer

Source: The Cold War and After.(41)

### **Use of Document:**

The document refers to the challenges of political reform that the former Soviet Republics were faced with, particularly the idea of the democratic process. “The only way to save . . . communism from the rubble of history, is to allow other groups in society to compete against the communist party.” This was a new concept and caused many problems for the Soviet government, for example, how could Gorbachev incorporate democratic principles into a communist system?

### **Use of Knowledge:**

- Students should also discuss the challenges of economic stability. Moving from a static-controlled economy to a free-market economy proved to be a very big challenge. Strikes, which were forbidden under the old communist system, became a very common occurrence, because people felt that their living and working conditions were becoming worse. The Soviet people felt their needs, for such common items as food, housing, and medical supplies, were not being addressed. As well the new market economy resulted in spiraling inflation and escalating unemployment.
- Ethnic relations: The former Soviet Union consisted of 50 different nationalities speaking 100 different languages and practicing many different religions. Many groups under the old Soviet system were restricted and separatist activities were repressed. Under Gorbachev’s rule, these groups were given much more freedom, and become more vocal and more difficult to control. Arguments over language rights and other problems surfaced which challenged the peaceful co-existence of these ethnic groups and sometimes created rivalries and hostilities among these groups.

**Students:**

- discussed the challenges of former republics since the break-up of the USSR since 1991 (as was originally intended in the question), however, answers were not very well developed.
- discussed the challenges of the “former Soviet Republics” when they were communist states (i.e., challenges of living in a totalitarian state) and many listed all of the challenges since the 1917 revolution, (eg.: NEP, collectivization, purges).
- interpreted the question as meaning challenges faced by the new satellite communist countries (post 1945). This was not recognized as a valid interpretation.
- misinterpreted (in Histoire mondiale) the word “défis” in the question which means “challenges”. They interpreted the word as meaning “defeat”. This is a unusual mistake as “défis” is a common word that they should recognize, and it is also part of the name for Unit 2 in the course.

**Exemplars:**

3.5

With the breakup of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s, the former republics are facing many challenges. Among these challenges are economic and social problems which create problems for people in all walks of life.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the smaller former republics have found themselves in economic turmoil. Once looking to the greater USSR for financial guidance, the new republics must learn to provide for themselves. As well, since the dissolution of the USSR, ten million people have become unemployed. As a result of these economic futures of the challenges, the former Soviet republics are unclear and uncertain.

The former republics have also faced numerous social issues since capitalism was introduced. With reduced military spending and a loss of jobs, poverty is abundant throughout many regions. As well, there are poor education and health care facilities and many children cannot go to school or get proper medical care. Another important social issue is the rise in substance abuse, particularly alcoholism, which often leads to domestic (spousal) and child abuse and neglect. Social conditions in the former USSR countries have deteriorated since the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

Since the breakup of the Soviet Union, the newly independent

D 1/2

K3

Après la dissolution de l'URSS en 1991, les anciennes républiques ont <sup>du</sup> combattre beaucoup de déficits. La citation parle des défis politiques. Après la dissolution, le communisme était fini, mais il y avait beaucoup de problèmes. Pour plus que 70 ans, le pays était communiste et maintenant c'est capitaliste donc c'est certain qu'il y aurait des problèmes. Un officier communiste dit que le peuple a choisi le capitalisme, donc les autres groupes dans la société doit essayer d'aider la situation en former un parti parce que le parti communiste n'existe plus, et la société a besoin un parti pour créer une solution aux problèmes. Mais il n'était pas seulement les problèmes politiques, il y avait les problèmes sociaux et économique aussi. À cause de la change au capitalisme, l'économie était dévasté, il y avait de la chômage, de l'inflation et de la pauvreté. Le pays a besoin d'un parti pour sauver la situation. Finalement, il y avait toujours beaucoup des groupes ethniques à l'URSS et maintenant que le communisme n'existe pas ces groupes luttent pour la pouvoir et il y avait beaucoup des problèmes sociaux.

Les anciennes républiques soviétiques ont connu beaucoup de déficits dans les politiques, l'économie et la vie sociale après la dissolution de l'URSS et la tombe de la communisme.

Les anciennes républiques soviétiques ne savait pas comment contrôler un pays sans communisme. C'est difficile à changer tout un pays d'une façon à vivre jusqu'à un autre façon complètement différent.

3 Quand les républiques deviennent indépendantes ils ne savent pas qui est en contrôle. Alors tous les différents groupes ethniques, religieuses, régionales veulent le pouvoir. En presque chaque pays il y avait une guerre civile pour pris contrôle de gouvernement.

Comme la citation adit « Ce n'est une solution valable que si c'est le peuple qui la choisit », parce que quand il y a beaucoup des parties qui combattent pour le pouvoir, il y a toujours la corruption et les élections peut-être avoir un faux résultats.

Value

5%

57. Using the source provided and your knowledge of history, analyze how suicide bombings in Israel have posed threats to world peace and security.

*“On July 30, 1997 two men, dressed in suits and carrying brief cases, walked into the market in Jerusalem and pulled the cords on their twin bombs. They killed themselves and twelve others. Hamas, an extremist Palestinian group, said that it was responsible for the attack. Their aim: to destroy the peace talks and the state of Israel.”*

Source: War and Peace in the Middle East. (46)

### **Use of Document:**

The source refers to two suicide bombers, supposedly from Hamas, an extremist Palestinian group, “dressed in suits and carrying brief cases”, killing themselves and twelve others in an ordinary market place in Jerusalem. This incident highlights the threat to world peace because as the document also states, the main purpose or aim of the Hamas suicide bombing, was to “destroy the peace talks and the state of Israel.” This has worldwide consequences as the United States is a close ally of Israel and this places them at odds with Islamic countries in the Middle East.

### **Use of Knowledge:**

- Students could mention the other impediments to peace and security such as Islamic fundamentalism and its opposition to Western secularism.
- Suicide bombings in other parts of the world have increased threats to world peace and security.

### **Students:**

- did not refer to the source.
- focused on the suicide bombings in Israel rather than broadening their answer to a world context..
- confused Israelis with Palestinians.

## Exemplars:

Ever since the state of Israel was created, countries in the middle East, especially Palestine have been opposed to its existence. This has led to constant violence and scenes like the one described in the source, ~~etc~~ where terrorists kill themselves in order to ~~etc~~ take the lives of others and to create chaos. However, these terrorists like the ones in the source are D1 ~~etc~~ do not just propose a threat to Israeli security, but to world security.

5 Since Middle Eastern countries and organisations like Hamas (source) the PLO, and Al-Qaeda are so firmly against Israel, they are also against the countries which support Israel, like countries K3 in Europe and the U.S. This means that these organisations have been planning attacks D1 against not only Israel, like in the source, but against other countries as well. Examples of these attacks include the <sup>U.S.</sup> embassies in Kenya, 9/11, and the London Underground Bombings. The fact that these attacks may be followed by more is a definite threat to world peace and security.

3.5

Suicide bombings have posed great threats to world peace and security. As the quote above shows, anyone can really go anywhere and set off a bomb, and there's really no way of knowing if they have a bomb. In the quote, two respectable looking men with suits & briefcases who look like they are coming home from work walked into a market & twin bombs, killing themselves and other people. The same thing could happen just as easily in Canada or the U.S. The suicide bombings in Israel have posed threats to world peace and security, because ~~those~~ bombs often really set off anywhere without anyone knowing about it until it's too late. These suicide bombers also show other terrorist groups how to set off bombs in heavily populated areas, and with basically no way of anyone knowing that there is a bomb there. That is why suicide bombings in Israel have posed threats to world peace and security.

D1.5

K1

K1

5

Il y a plusieurs tensions et conflits dans le monde où les gens qui combattent n'ont aucune représentation politique qui voient les propres sentiments ou qui n'ont aucune force militaristique pour combattre en termes de guerre. Ces "terroristes" ou gens qui font des actes de violence pour exprimer la politique / le désir de leur propre groupe ethnique menacé la sécurité mondiale et parce qu'ils n'avaient un groupe ou corps officiel c'est pratiquement impossible d'y arrêter. Les Intifadaks ou soulèvements d'Israël par le groupe «Hamas» ont tué plusieurs gens innocents comme en source il dit que "deux hommes ont pénétré à pied dans un marché de Jérusalem et ont déclenché leurs explosifs et tué douze autres personnes à part de leur-propre". Ces actes terroristes tuent les gens innocents, évitent de peur autour de la population et font de la pression à gouvernement pour corriger les problèmes et cet effet ont influencé plusieurs autres gens dans autres parties du monde de même circonstance et on voyait les bombes du train en Madrid par les Basques séparatistes; massacre à Beslan école par des Tchadiens et à la WTC le 9/11 par des musulmans fâchés. Cette acte terroriste en Israël est voyait autour du monde et concerne beaucoup la sécurité mondiale.

3

Partout le monde, on voit des actes de terrorisme qui menacent la paix et la sécurité des peuples et des citoyens. Avec la guerre en Israël entre Palestiniens on voyait comment les terroristes utilisent les armes et des bombes pour perturber la paix. Les sources dessus se racontent d'une histoire comment des hommes ordinaires sacrifient eux-mêmes et donnent d'autres personnes pour faire échouer les négociations de paix. "C'est en cause de ces personnes là qui menacent la paix et la sécurité du monde. Ces deux hommes étaient, "bien habillés et transportant des pertes documents." Ils ne ressemblent pas des terroristes, on ne jamais savoir qui est sur le côté de la paix ou le côté de destruction. Ceci rend le monde dans une situation tellement attentive. Avec les attaques d'ingé septembre, les règles et les frontières ont augmenté en États-Unis. Nous sommes toujours en garde pour des personnes comme ces deux hommes en Israël, qui veulent détruire la paix. C'est en cause des événements dans Israël qui ont mené le monde avec des sentiments de peur et qui menacent la paix et la sécurité.

Value

5%

58. Using the source provided and your knowledge of history, explain the causes of the Suez Crisis in Egypt.

In September 1956, Eden wrote to the US President:

*"... the seizure of the Suez Canal is, we [Britain] are convinced, the opening move in a planned campaign designed by Nasser to expel all western influence and interests from Arab countries. He believes that if he can get away with this, his prestige in Arabia will be so great that [Arab] governments will have to place their united oil resources under the control of a united Arabia led by Egypt and under Russian influence. When that moment comes Nasser can deny oil to western Europe and we shall all be at his mercy."*

Source: War & Peace. (15)

**Use of Document:**

- Pan-Arabic Movement
- Nationalism
- Oil

**Use of Knowledge:**

- Imperialism / Colonialism
- Nationalism
- Arab-Israeli Conflict
- Non-alignment status
- Cold War
- Czech Arms
- Israeli Embargo

**Students:**

- summary of events, and key knowledge components were left out.
- confused Israel with India or Africa (South Africa)
- generalized about the Suez Crisis events.

## Exemplars:

5 The Suez Crisis refers to when France and Britain invaded the Suez Canal and attempted to seize the area. This was in response to the leader of Egypt, Nasser, blocking the canal and stopping all Israeli ships from getting through. Britain and France did not want to lose the economic possibilities created by the canal drive Britain and France out. As it states in the source, Britain thought that this was a plot by Nasser to "expel all western influence". So, Britain and France convinced Israel to invade Egypt in a complicated manoeuvre designed to eventually rid Egypt of Nasser, and quash any Egyptian hopes of independence from Britain. However, they had not counted on the reaction of the U.S. and the U.N., who managed to mobilize troops to come and come to the aid of Egypt. D1

Another factor that led to the Crisis was the fact that Egypt had been a colony of Great Britain. Nasser wanted independence, and Britain was reluctant to give ~~them~~ it to him, as they wanted to protect their interest in oil. As it says in ~~for~~ the source, Britain felt that the "seizure ~~was~~ of the Canal" was the first step in a plan to "deny oil to Western Europe." To protect their economic interests, Britain decided to take action. D1

The Suez crisis began when Nasser had two objectives in mind. He wanted to make Egypt self-sufficient and he wanted to destroy the newly formed nation of Israel. Nasser was not in favor of communism or democracy so he let the superpowers bid for his allegiance. He needed a military to destroy Israel so he signed an arms deal with Czechoslovakia or Soviet block. He also needed electricity to help make the economy flourish so he signed a deal with the U.S. to build the Aswan Dam. Following this he began to lose Western support so he stopped all Israeli ships from entering the canal. The U.S. then pulled out of the Aswan dam project and that's when Nasser took complete control over the Suez canal. It was a peaceful takeover. As seen in the quote "the seizure of the Suez Canal can lead to Britain and France being at his mercy" but Nasser offered Britain and France complete access to the canal. Britain and France devised a scheme to take over the canal. Israel would attack the front and France and Britain would secretly drop traps into the canal. As seen in the source Nasser believed he could get away with that and his prestige would be so great. Therefore Britain and France needed to stop him before they would be at his mercy if he denied the oil.

La source explique l'importance de la canal de Suez à la Grande-Bretagne. Si Nasser <sup>(le président d'Égypte)</sup> gagne contrôle complet du canal il « pourra refuser de fournir du pétrole à l'Europe occidentale » et cela aura une grande répercussion pour l'ouest car on dépend sur le pétrole pour vivre. Ainsi, Eden dit que Nasser veut « chasser toute influence et tout intérêt occidentaux des pays arabes » pour que ces pays tourne vers lui. Cela est aussi très mauvais pour la Grande-Bretagne.

5 En 1956, Nasser a deux buts politiques, de faire Égypte une puissance et de détruire Israël. Pour détruire Israël il a besoin argent, donc il a tourné vers les États-Unis et l'URSS. Puis il a décidé de bloquer le canal parce qu'il connaît l'importance de la canal au Israël. Mais il n'a pas pensé de la réaction de la Grande-Bretagne. Comme la citation dit, le canal est très important à la Grande-Bretagne et il ne veulent pas que Nasser à toute le contrôle. Donc les tensions ont commencé à grandir et la Grande-Bretagne a tourné vers Israël pour aide. Les deux pays, avec l'aide de la France, a décidé d'attaquer Nasser pour reprendre le canal et pour que Israël peut prendre Égypte. Cette attaque était le <sup>climax de</sup> la crise du Canal de Suez. C'était seulement résoudre avec l'intervention de l'ONU.

C'était les buts politiques de Nasser (détruire Israël) et faire Égypte une puissance. <sup>Page 21 de 22</sup> <sup>Histoire mondiale 3231 juin 2006</sup> avec l'importance du canal de Suez à la Grande-Bretagne qui a mené à la crise du Canal de Suez, quand Nasser a décidé de bloquer le canal.

3 La crise du canal de Suez s'est produite quand Nasser a repris le canal des anglais et français en essayant de nationaliser son pays et unir le peuple arabe. Les tensions sont augmentées quand la Grande-Bretagne et la France sont illégalement entrées dans l'Égypte en essayant de reprendre le canal. Les Nations Unies étaient choquées que deux membres de leur conseil de sécurité aient désobéi les lois internationales. L'URSS qui appuyait Nasser s'est répondu en menaçant la France et la Grande-Bretagne avec les missiles nucléaires. Les anglais et français avaient peur que si Nasser atteint son but de nationaliser son pays et unir les peuples arabes que les arabes refuseraient de fournir le pétrole à l'Europe occidentale. Mais les Nations Unies ont intervenu pour maintenir la paix et ont réussi.

Value

5%

59. Using the source provided and your knowledge of history, analyze how the partitioning of Palestine triggered tension in the Middle East leading to Arab-Israel wars between 1948-1973.

**Use of Document:**

- non defined borders
- surrounded by Arab states

**Use of Knowledge:**

- Two new countries Palestine & Israel were created by the U.N.
- Palestinians became refugees.
- Palestinians refused UN defense of borders.
- Palestinians refused to recognize role of Jerusalem.
- Israel became an occupying power as a result of its successes.
- All Arab states refused to recognize Israel's right to exist.
- State of Palestine ceased to exist.

**Students:**

- gave a lot of background historical information rather than deal with the source and specific examples of "tensions" that resulted from the "partitioning of Palestine."
- gave general responses.
- did not deal with any Arab-Israeli war/wars in any detail.
- students did not mention the document/source.
- confused the Israelis and Palestinians.

## Exemplars:

5

Historically, there has been much tension throughout the Middle East, especially in the region of Palestine, which has been battled over by several different groups. The map shown above shows the UN plan proposed in 1948 for the partitioning of Palestine. They decided that so much of the area should become an independent Jewish state and that so much should become an independent Arab state. This way both groups would have an independent state, which they desired, in the area they wanted. They also proposed that Jerusalem <sup>(city)</sup> ~~(city)~~ become an international zone because of its religious significance to three world religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam). The Israelis reluctantly accepted this arrangement, but the Arabs rejected it. They believed that the land was theirs and that it could not be simply taken from them and awarded to the Israelis. These tensions escalated and led to the first Arab-Israeli War. Israel was superior militarily and was victorious on the battlefields. This led to thousands of refugees fleeing the area to nearby Arab states. This has led to many problems in the host countries, especially since guerrilla groups often launch attacks from here, resulting in retaliation from Israel. In following wars, such as the Six Day War and the Yom Kippur War, the <sup>(see back page)</sup>

While tensions in Palestine had been building for years, the 1948 partition & the subsequent declaration of the State of Israel triggered the First Arab-Israeli war which was the root of the Six Day, and Yom Kippur wars in 1967 and 1973 respectively. D1

In 1948, after <sup>Israeli</sup> ~~Israeli~~ acceptance and ~~Palestinian~~ rejection of the UN partition shown above, Ben Gurion on May 14 1948 declared the state of Israel. Syria, Egypt, Jordan & ~~to~~ other Arab nations invaded Israel, but were repulsed. <sup>Israel expanded into</sup> ~~before~~ ~~occupied~~ all of Palestine except the West Bank & Gaza, occupied by Jordan & Egypt respectively. <sup>Palestinian</sup> ~~Arab~~ rejection of the partition led to Israel's creation, viewed as illegal & illegitimate by Arabs.

Israel's existence caused the Six Day War, during which Israeli preemptive strikes gained them the Sinai, Gaza, West Bank, all of Jerusalem & Syria's Golan Heights. This occupation & damage to Arab pride led to the October Yom Kippur War, when Egypt & Syria invaded Israel, but were repulsed. K1.5

35

Au cause de la partition de la Palestine, il y était beaucoup de tensions au Moyen-Orient. Aussi il y était beaucoup de conflits israëlo-arabes. Quelques de ces conflits, été...

• 1948 → ~~Premier~~ Conflit ~~Isra~~ Israëli-Arabe. Les arabes essayé de prendre contrôle totale d'Israël. ~~Il~~ Ils attaque des Israéliens. Mais, Israëli gagne car ils été ~~un~~ plus équipés et plus organisé.

• 1956 - Conflit de la Canal de Suez. Nasser veulle nationalisé le Canal de Suez, mais il ne permet pas des israëlis de l'utilise. Cela cause un grande conflit. G.B. et France, qui avait "owned" la plupart de la canal a ~~un~~ combattre sur la côté de les Israéliens. C'était G.B., France et des Israéliens contre des pays Arabs. Pour un autre fois, des Israéliens avait gagné, et aussi, il gagne du terrain, comme le Sinäi, mais les U.N. Forcé Israéliens de ~~remettre~~ <sup>redonne</sup> au Egypte.

• Guerre de Six Jours - Egypte mette son armée sur le "border" de Egypte et Israël. Des Israéliens avait attaqué ~~des~~ l'armé d'Egypte. C'était un surprise, et Israëli gagne pour un autre fois. Israëli a aussi gagné, Sinäi, Cis

Comme ça c'est demonstre dans le photo, il y été beaucoup de conflits au cause de la partition de Palestine. Il y a des états Juif et des états Arabienne. Tous la nationalisme par des Juifs et par des Arabiennes cause beaucoup de conflits et il y a des attaques sur chaque état par l'autre état. Ces attaques sont nommé intifada. Il y était comme 2 ou 3 ~~intifadas~~ intifadas, c'est plutôt que des Arabs commence de jeter des grandes roches aux des monument israëliens, et puis les policiers israëliens ~~un~~ battre, mais avec des armes (guns).

**TABLE 1**  
**WORLD HISTORY 3201 ITEM ANALYSIS**  
**SELECTED-RESPONSE PART 1**

Item	Answer	Responses			
		A	B	C	D
		%	%	%	%
1.	D	17.1	1.7	3.8	77.2
2.	A	78.1	12.6	3.1	6.2
3.	<b>Question Omitted</b>				
4.	A	59.9	8.2	20.6	11.3
5.	A	62.9	5.6	18.2	13.2
6.	C	15.6	4.4	67.1	12.8
7.	C	20.8	4.4	70.5	4.1
8.	C	1.0	0.5	96.5	2.0
9.	B	3.8	85.2	9.3	1.6
10.	C	12.1	16.4	44.7	26.6
11.	B	12.4	70.4	10.0	7.1
12.	C	4.5	4.4	85.2	5.6
13.	B	13.6	51.6	21.1	13.5
14.	D	32.6	2.3	8.2	56.9
15.	D	5.7	19.4	9.9	65.0
16.	A	77.3	5.0	13.0	4.8
17.	A	79.7	3.8	16.0	0.5
18.	A	84.4	1.8	5.4	8.3
19.	A	73.9	3.5	8.5	14.0
20.	C	7.0	7.5	73.6	11.8
21.	D	14.2	10.9	5.0	69.9
22.	A	91.2	4.0	1.3	3.5
23.	C	6.0	4.0	85.5	4.5
24.	C	33.6	8.6	40.2	17.6
25.	A	73.9	7.5	3.4	15.1
26.	B	6.4	74.1	3.6	15.8
27.	C	4.6	7.2	85.2	2.9

**TABLE 1**  
**WORLD HISTORY 3201 ITEM ANALYSIS**  
**SELECTED-RESPONSE PART 1**

Item	Answer	Responses			
		A	B	C	D
		%	%	%	%
28.	A	78.3	9.7	10.4	1.4
29.	D	4.1	18.8	7.3	69.6
30.	B	8.8	81.2	6.3	3.6
31.	A	86.5	3.3	7.5	2.8
32.	A & C	64.4	19.1	9.8	6.5
33.	A	96.3	1.2	1.3	1.2
34.	C	2.0	0.9	94.9	2.1
35.	B	12.5	79.7	4.8	3.0
36.	B	11.3	84.3	2.8	1.6
37.	C	11.7	1.7	77.4	9.0
38.	A	85.3	7.2	6.7	0.9
39.	A	76.2	11.4	5.3	7.2
40.	B	11.7	66.7	11.2	10.3
41.	A	77.3	1.2	6.7	14.7
42.	C	8.6	6.9	72.0	12.0
43.	A	91.3	3.8	4.0	0.7
44.	C	7.6	7.0	63.2	21.9
45.	A	48.8	5.6	27.6	17.6
46.	C	4.9	3.0	69.8	22.0
47.	C	8.7	2.0	88.4	0.8
48.	D	0.9	3.3	2.8	92.9
<b>Complete either set of 49 or 50, depending on the unit studied.</b>					
49.	B	15.1	77.3	6.4	0.9
50.	C	1.2	6.7	88.1	3.7

**TABLE 11**  
**WORLD HISTORY 3201 ITEM ANALYSIS**  
**CONSTRUCTED -RESPONSE PART 11**

Item	Students Completing Item	Value	Average
<b>PART II - Do <u>ALL</u> questions in this section</b>			
51	1331	5	2.7
52	1331	5	2.4
53	1331	10	5.8
54	1331	10	4.1
55	1331	5	2.5
56	1331	5	1.8
57	1331	5	2.5
<b>Complete either 58 or 59 depending on the unit studied.</b>			
<b>UNIT 5.1 - India, Egypt, and South Africa</b>			
58	1331	5	2.1
<b>UNIT 5.2 - Middle East</b>			
59	1331	5	2.3

**TABLE 11**  
**HISTOIRE MONDIALE 3231 ITEM ANALYSIS**  
**CONSTRUCTED -RESPONSE PART 11**

Item	Students Completing Item	Value	Average
<b>PART II - Do <u>ALL</u> questions in this section</b>			
51	331	5	3.0
52	331	5	2.9
53	331	10	5.2
54	331	10	3.9
55	331	5	3.0
56	331	5	1.5
57	331	5	2.2
<b>Complete either 58 or 59 depending on the unit studied.</b>			
<b>UNIT 5.1 - India, Egypt, and South Africa</b>			
58	331	5	2.4
<b>UNIT 5.2 - Middle East</b>			
59	331	5	2.9