

Setters: Ms Chua Wai Yi, Mr Khoo Kay Yong and Mr Leo Hock Leng

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

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

1 (a) Study Source A.

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

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How far does Source B make you surprised by what Churchill did in Source C? Explain your answer. [6]

(c) Study Sources D and E.

How far would Kennan have agreed with Wallace in Source D? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Source F.

Why do you think USSR published this cartoon in 1947? Explain your answer. [5]

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

‘Cold War came about mainly due to the emergence of USA as a superpower.’
How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

The Cold War

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Cold War was a decades-long period of geopolitical tension and ideological rivalry between the USA and the USSR, emerging after 1945 when World War II ended. With traditional European powers weakened by the war, the USA and the USSR rose as superpowers. Their wartime alliance quickly dissolved due to fundamentally incompatible ideologies and deep distrust. In Yalta (February 1945) and in Potsdam (July-August 1945), both powers had differing views about what the postwar world should be like. Relations also worsened after Potsdam due to the dropping of the atomic bomb on Japan and the postwar developments in Eastern Europe. By 1946 Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania all had Communist governments which owed their loyalty to Stalin. Churchill described the border between Soviet-controlled countries and the West as an iron curtain. To contain the spread of communism in Europe, Truman introduced the Truman Doctrine in March 1947.

Why did the Cold War come about?

Source A: *A British cartoon published in 1941, with the caption 'Love conquers all'. The figure in the middle is Stalin being charmed by Roosevelt (USA) and Churchill (Britain). Hitler is depicted as cupid, whose arrows cause people to fall in love. The quiver that Hitler carries is entitled 'The Common Danger'.*



Source B: *From the Atlantic Charter, an agreement made between Churchill and Roosevelt, 14th August 1941, few months before US declared war on Japan. This Charter outlined the war aims and shared vision of post-WWII world between US and Britain.*

First, our countries seek no expansion nor territorial gains;

Second, we desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, we respect the right of all peoples to self-determine and choose the form of government under which they will live; and we wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, we will endeavour with due respect for our existing obligations to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Source C: *From an account of Churchill's trip to Moscow to discuss with Stalin various post-war problem in October 1944. This account only came out in 1954 with the publication of Churchill's history of WWII.*

The moment was apt for business, so I said, 'Let us settle about our affairs in the Balkans. Your armies are in Romania and Bulgaria. We have interests, missions and agents there. So far as Britain and Russia are concerned, how would it do for you to have ninety per cent control in Romania, for us to have ninety per cent of the say in Greece, and fifty-fifty about in Yugoslavia?' While this was being translated, I wrote out on a half-sheet of paper:

Romania

Russia 90%

The others 10%

Greece

Great Britain 90%

Russia 10%

Yugoslavia 50-50%

Hungary 50-50%

Bulgaria

Russia 75%

The others 25%

I pushed this to Stalin, he took his pencil and made a large tick upon it, and it was all settled.

Source D: *From a political rally speech by US Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace, September 1946. Wallace regarded the expansion of American trade as vital if another depression was to be avoided.*

To achieve lasting peace, we must study how the Russian character was formed – by invasions of Mongols, Germans, Poles, Swedes, and French.

We must realise that we are reckoning with a force which cannot be handled successfully by a 'Get tough with Russia.' 'Getting tough' never brought anything real and lasting - whether for schoolyard bullies or businessmen or world powers. The tougher we get, the tougher the Russians will get.

We most earnestly want peace with Russia - but we want to be met halfway. We want cooperation. And I believe that we can get cooperation once Russia understands that our primary objective is neither saving the British Empire nor purchasing oil in the Near East with the lives of American soldiers.

Source E: *An article from George Kennan, who also wrote the 'Long Telegram', published in July 1947.*

It is clear that the main element of any United States policy towards the Soviet Union must be that of a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies. The United States cannot expect in the foreseeable future to enjoy political intimacy with the Soviet regime. It must continue to regard the Soviet Union as a rival, not a partner, in the political arena. It must continue to expect that Soviet policies will reflect no abstract love of peace and stability, no real faith in the possibility of a permanent happy coexistence of the Socialist and capitalist worlds, but rather a cautious, persistent pressure towards the disruption and weakening of all rival influence and rival power.

Source F: A Soviet cartoon published in 1947, with the caption 'Eishenhower* is defending himself.' The cartoon shows an American asking Eishenhower: "What's the problem, general? Why such military activity in this uninhabited region?" Eisenhower: "How? Can't you see which enemy forces are located here? It's the place where threat to American freedom comes from."



Places in the cartoon:

СЕВЕРНЫЙ ПОЛЮС – North Pole

АЛАСКА - Alaska

КАНАДА - Canada

*General Eisenhower was the Supreme Allied Commander who was responsible for the invasion of Western Europe in WWII. In 1947, US established Alaskan Command to defend Alaska and protect the US from potential Soviet attacks through the Arctic region, given its proximity to USSR.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2 'Japan attacked Pearl Harbour in 1941 because of its intention to expand its Empire.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- 3 'Declining morale among US military forces in Vietnam between 1965 to 1968 was the most important reason why the US government wanted to withdraw from Vietnam.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- 4 'Soviet economic stagnation was the main reason for the loss of Soviet control over Eastern Europe.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A	Walsh, Ben <u>GCSE Modern World History</u> , 2009. Hodder Education, London.
Source B	McCauley, Martin <u>Origins of the Cold War 1941 - 1949</u> , 2008. Pearson Education, United Kingdom.
Source C	McCauley, Martin <u>Origins of the Cold War 1941 - 1949</u> , 2008. Pearson Education, United Kingdom.
Source D	McCauley, Martin <u>Origins of the Cold War 1941 - 1949</u> , 2008. Pearson Education, United Kingdom.
Source E	McCauley, Martin <u>Origins of the Cold War 1941 - 1949</u> , 2008. Pearson Education, United Kingdom.
Source F	Walsh, Ben <u>GCSE Modern World History</u> , 2009. Hodder Education, London.

End of Paper

This document is intended for internal circulation in Victoria School only. No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the Victoria School Internal Exams Committee.

VICTORIA SCHOOL

SEC 4 WORLD HISTORY PR 2024 SUGGESTED ANSWERS

1a) Study Source A.

What is the message of the cartoon? Explain your answer.

L1/ Content only [1] or misinterpret [2]

It shows Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt coming together for a talk. [1]

The message of the cartoon is Hitler is sowing discord. [2]

L2 Identifies sub-messages [3]

i.e. makes valid comments interpreting the cartoon but misses the main message of the source.

Stalin was in trouble and being helped by Roosevelt and Churchill. [3]

The Grand Alliance coming together during WWII. [3]

Hitler was the common enemy in WWII. [3]

L3 Identifies the main message of the cartoon [4-5]

Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers.

Main message (focus on Hitler and all three)

e.g. as positive - 3 are coming together against Hitler [4]

e.g. last resort - 3 coming together only because of Hitler [4]

e.g. as temporal / marriage of convenience / irony / citing cartoonist's doubt or scepticism [5]

The Grand Alliance had come together to deal with Hitler who was the common enemy. [4]

The message of the cartoon is that the wartime alliance of Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt was a strategic one rather than a bond of brotherhood. Hitler is shown as cupid – a god of love – bringing the otherwise distrustful leaders together. Hitler was the common danger which united the three leaders together in a marriage of convenience. [5]

b) Study Sources B and C.

How far does Source B make you surprised by what Churchill did in Source C? Explain your answer.

L1 Answers based on undeveloped provenance [1-2]

Source B does not make me surprised about what Churchill did in Source C because it was his job to sign treaties as the PM of Britain.

Source B makes me surprised about what Churchill did in Source C as in B he was signing the charter with US but in C he was signing with USSR.

L2: They disagree, Source B makes me surprise based on content [3]

L2: Although Source B makes me surprise based on content, not surprise due to different in context

Source B makes me surprised about what Churchill did in Source C because in B Churchill supported ideals such as democratic principles, individual freedoms, and self-determination for countries that would be liberated after the war but in Source C he was going against these

principles and secretly cutting out spheres of influence with Stalin, ignoring the interests of the people in Greece, Bulgaria and other parts of Europe. [3]

However, I am not surprised as the Atlantic Charter was agreed in 1941 when Britain needed the support of USA while C was in 1944 when Churchill met Stalin when the Allies knew they were winning. [4]

L3 Identifies the disagreement, but uses cross-reference to decide what is/not surprising [5]

Source B does not make me surprised about what Churchill did in Source C because when I cross-refer to my CK, USA would always support freedom, liberty and self-determination just like how Wilson supported the League of Nations and I am not surprised by Churchill because the British also had interests in Greece and they wanted to maintain influence in the region. [5]

Source B does not make me surprised about what Churchill did in Source C because when I cross-refer to my CK, Churchill had vested interest in Greece and supported the Greek monarchy and pressed for a coalition government that would prevent communism from taking over the Mediterranean country. [5]

L4 As in L2 but also uses evaluation of B's and Cs contexts and purposes to decide that it's not surprising [5-6]

Source B does not make me surprised about what Churchill did in Source C because the Atlantic charter was signed in 1941 even before USA joined the war. Churchill was at the mercy of US at that time as US was supplying Britain with all the resources and weapons to fight the Nazis. By signing the Charter, Churchill hoped to get US to be directly involved in the war so that the British would not have to fight the Germans alone on the Western Front. In the case of Source C, Churchill's action was understandable and not surprising as he was trying to secretly appease Stalin as the war was coming to an end and he knew that the Red Army were firmly entrenched in Eastern Europe. By drawing specific sphere of influence, he hoped that USSR would not further expand their influence elsewhere such as Greece. Hence, he was ready to sacrifice his democratic ideals with USA and secure the British interests after WWII. [6]

c) Study Sources D and E.

How far would Kennan have agreed with Wallace in Source D? Explain your answer.

L1 Misinterpret [1]

L2 Provenance / mismatch [2]

L3 Agree or disagree based on content [3-4]

L4 Agree and disagree based on content [5]

Agree that confrontational approach with Russia would not work.

Disagree on whether US should cooperate or treat Russia as a rival.

L5 Disagree based on purpose or context [6]

They would never agree as Kennan was the author of the "Long Telegram" and "X Article". He saw the USSR as inherently expansionist and driven by a combination of Marxist-Leninist ideology and traditional Russian insecurity. He believed that the Soviets perceived themselves surrounded by hostile capitalist powers and that peaceful coexistence was impossible in the long run. Geo-politically, by 1947, large part of Eastern Europe had already come under Soviet control thus justifying Kennan's concerns about USSR. In contrast, Wallace had a more

conciliatory view of the Soviet Union. He believed that the Soviets' actions were largely driven by their legitimate security concerns, particularly after suffering immense casualties in World War II. He emphasised understanding their historical context and fears. Lastly as the Secretary of Commerce, he would be more concerned about keeping the economy of US in good health rather than being embroiled in the geo-political struggle in Europe.

1b) Study Source F.

Why do you think USSR published this cartoon in 1947? Explain your answer.

L1 Sub-message [1]

L2 Specific context of 1947 [2]

It was right after US established Alaskan Command to defend Alaska and protect the US from potential Soviet attacks through the Arctic region, given its proximity to USSR.

L3 Main message and reason based on purpose [3-4]

USSR published this cartoon to show their displeasure. [3]

USSR published this to criticise the US for their actions in the Arctic. [3]

USSR published this to mock the US for their over-reactions of sending surveillance in the Arctic as they clearly did not see themselves as threats. [4]

L4 As in L3/4m and specific context of emergence of Cold War and use of propaganda [5]

In the atmosphere of tension and recrimination and as part of its propaganda war against US, USSR took the opportunity to denounce US and their policy against the Soviets.

e) Study all the sources

'Cold War came about mainly due to the emergence of USA as a superpower.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

L1 Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use [1]

L2 Yes OR No, supported by valid source use [2-4]

(Award 1 mark for each source use up to a maximum of 4 marks)

L3 Yes AND No, supported by valid source use [5-8]

(Award 5 marks for 1Y and 1N, and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks)

Source A – No

Source A does not support the CW came about due to the rise of US as a superpower. Instead it was pre-existing ideological mistrust that made it difficult to work together resulting in more tension relations between the two sides. In A, the western powers are shown reaching out to Stalin putting aside ideological differences to reach an alliance. However, this alliance was a marriage of convenience to fight Hitler's aggression. In Source A, Hitler represented by cupid, was a common enemy of WWII, that brought these ideological rivals together. However, once Hitler was defeated, the underlying ideological mistrust will reemerge to create suspicion and confrontation between two ideological opposing sides.

Source B – No

Source B supports the CW came about due to the rise of US as a superpower because the Atlantic Charter's emphasis on democratic principles, individual freedoms, and

self-determination, in contrast to the totalitarian and expansionist ideology of communism of the Soviet Union. The Charter laid down the aims of the alliance and clear ideological principle of Western values that the USA will champion after WW2 as a superpower. These democratic values will inadvertently clash with the USSR's focus on totalitarian control and suppression of freedom. Newly formed countries in Eastern Europe and Asia will find themselves caught up in the tension and rivalry between the values championed by the two new superpowers.

Source C – No

Source C does not support because Cold War came about the emergence of the US as a superpower. Instead, it was the aggression and expansion of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe craving out sphere of influence in Romania and Bulgaria that made Churchill worried and desperate to contain Stalin's expansion by making the Percentages Agreement. These actions by Stalin in setting up proxy states to create a buffer between USSR and the West as part of his search for security will inevitably confirm US fears of communism as sinister threat that has to be contain. These attempts to contain communism will lead to political and economic measures to advance democratic institutions and programmes that will result in more tension and division in Europe thus leading to Cold war.

Source D – Yes

Source D does support the CW came about due to the rise of US as a superpower as Source D shows Wallace the Commerce secretary proposing to work with the USSR on improving trading relations. He says the US wants cooperation and wants to be met halfway. This suggests that the US is using capitalist approaches in its dealings with the USSR. Even though Wallace comes across as not wanting confrontation, US is speaking confidently like a superpower wanting their way. This is likely to trigger alarm bells on Stalin's side to buffer against the USA introducing anti-communist measures that will create more tension between the two sides.

Source D – No

Wallace is coming across as non-confrontation, preferring to engaged in cooperation even though as a superpower, the US could be more imposing.

Source E – Yes

Source E supports CW came about due to the rise of the US as a superpower because E shows Kennan advocated for a policy of "containment" to curb the spread of communism. As a superpower, Kennan believes the US must champion democracy and this means a "long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies" through the "application of counterforce at a series of shifting geographical and political points." He believed this approach, primarily through political, economic, and psychological means, would eventually lead to the internal collapse of the Soviet system, which he saw as inherently flawed. Together with Churchill's Iron Curtain speech, it was Kennan's words that convinced Truman that containment was the right policy for US as a superpower to deal with USSR making Cold War a reality as these two superpowers compete and rival each other.

Source F – Yes

Source F supports. Source F shows US as a military superpower with all guns and forces ready to take down the Arctic. Historically, after WWII, US had the most sophisticated weapons, best air force and the strongest navy in the world, it was due to such a prowess that made US hawkish against the USSR as they saw each other as rivals. Due to this stance and an unavoidable arm race in the making, that was how Cold War came about.

Source F – No

It could be said F is unreliable as it is a Soviet cartoon trying to exaggerate the threat US posed to seemingly innocent USSR to turn US into the overbearing villain whose attempts to attack communism has gone overboard to gain sympathy and portray itself as victim of US aggression.

SECTION B Essays

L1 Identifies/Describes [1-3]

L2 Explains one side of the statement [4-5]

L3 Explains both sides of the statement [6-8]

*add up to 2 bonus marks for a balanced conclusion

2	'Japan attacked Pearl Harbour in 1941 because of its intention to expand its Empire.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
---	--	------

Japan attacked Pearl Harbour in 1941 because of its intention to expand its Empire. Japan's imperial ambitions in the Pacific and Southeast Asia were a primary driver behind the attack on Pearl Harbour, and the United States stood directly in the way of these aspirations. In 1940, Japan launched a programme called the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. It was aimed primarily at the people in the various Asian territories which Japan controlled. The emphasis was on the goal of ridding Asia of the influence of the United States and other Western powers. The message was that the people of Asia should unite behind Japan, which would lead this campaign to drive foreigners out of Asia, and that Japan would protect the people of Asia and rule them fairly. In reality, the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere was more of a programme for Japan to use the massive resources of its empire in Asia to prepare for war with the intention to extend its Empire. As Japan sought to establish its "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere," aiming to secure vital natural resources and expand its political influence, it recognised that any significant move into resource-rich territories like the Dutch East Indies or British Malaya would inevitably provoke a strong response from the United States. The U.S. Pacific Fleet, strategically based at Pearl Harbour, represented the most formidable naval power in the region and a direct threat to Japan's planned conquest and control of these territories. Therefore, the attack on Pearl Harbour was conceived as a pre-emptive strike, designed to cripple the American fleet, buy Japan crucial time to consolidate its territorial gains, and establish a defensive perimeter, thereby removing the immediate and most potent obstacle to its aggressive expansionist agenda.

The severe economic pressure exerted by the United States, coupled with the failure of diplomatic negotiations, significantly propelled Japan towards the attack on Pearl Harbour. Japan's burgeoning industrial and military machine was heavily reliant on imported raw materials, particularly oil, which was predominantly supplied by the U.S. As Japan pursued its expansionist policies in China and Southeast Asia, the United States responded with escalating economic sanctions, culminating in a devastating oil embargo and the freezing of Japanese assets in mid-1941. This cut off vital supplies, threatening to cripple Japan's economy and war effort within months. Faced with the stark choice of either abandoning its imperial ambitions—a humiliation deemed unacceptable—or securing alternative resource-rich territories by force, Japan saw military action as its only recourse. Despite ongoing negotiations, the U.S. remained firm on its demands for Japan to withdraw from conquered territories, leading Japanese leaders to conclude that diplomacy had failed and a decisive military strike was necessary to break the economic stranglehold and secure the resources vital for its survival and continued expansion.

Worsening relations with the US was also another factor that led to Japan's strike on Pearl Harbour. In the 1920s, the relationship between Japan and the United States was generally good. However, as a result of the Great Depression, the United States introduced a range of tariffs in 1930 to protect its own economy. In 1937, tensions between Japan and the United States rose once again with Japan's invasion of China. The United States condemned Japan's actions and provided financial and military aid to the Chinese leader, Chiang Kai-shek. The United States also saw Japan was both an economic and political rival that challenged its interests in Asia-Pacific. The 1937 invasion of China prompted the US government to take a progressively harder line on Japan. President Roosevelt was worried about Japan's growing ambitions and wanted to keep its expansion in check. Thus, he announced a series of financial and economic measures designed to halt Japan's aggressive foreign policy. The initial sanctions proved to be ineffective, and Japan subsequently occupied French Indochina in 1940. In response, an embargo was placed on raw materials such as steel and iron in October 1940. After the failure of negotiations between the United States and Japan, and the refusal of Japan to withdraw from China and Indochina, an oil embargo was imposed in August 1941. Furthermore, Roosevelt resurrected a law from WWI, Trading with the Enemy Act, which seized Japanese assets in the United States, making it unable to buy essential goods. The United States policy was an attempt to strangle Japan financially. Probably the most serious impact was that Roosevelt's measures would cut off almost 90 percent of Japan's oil supplies. For a modern economy, this was damaging. For a modern army, air force and navy, this was crippling - ships, planes and tanks were useless without fuel. The United States demanded that Japanese troops withdraw from China and promise not to threaten any territories belonging to the United States or its allies (particularly Britain). As the US demands and sanctions were completely unacceptable to the Japanese as they felt bullied, hence the only alternative seemed to be a conflict with the United States. But the United States was an economic giant, thus to take down US they would need to deliver a quick knockout blow by attacking Pearl Harbour so that they could seize the territories and resources of SEA and take on US.

Lastly, the confluence of events in Europe provided Japan with a perceived window of opportunity that heavily influenced its decision to attack Pearl Harbour. With France and Holland fallen, and Britain fully engaged in a desperate struggle against Germany, the colonial powers that once dominated resource-rich Southeast Asia were effectively neutralised, leaving their vast territories and vital raw materials largely undefended. This presented an irresistible chance for Japan to seize the oil, rubber, and tin it desperately needed without facing significant colonial resistance. Furthermore, the Soviet Union's deep entanglement in a war with Nazi Germany following Operation Barbarossa eliminated the long-standing threat to Japan's northern flank, freeing up military resources and strategic focus for a southward expansion into the Pacific and Southeast Asia without the risk of a two-front war. Japan's decision to attack Pearl Harbour was significantly influenced by the perception of favourable conditions in Europe and the weakness of the existing international order, which presented what they believed to be a fleeting window of opportunity for their imperial ambitions.

In conclusion, While the Japan's broader expansionist ambitions and the favorable conditions created by the European war were significant, the declining relations with US and **US economic sanctions, particularly the oil embargo, stand out as the most immediate and critical reason** for Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor. The embargo presented Japan with an existential crisis, threatening to cripple its military and economy within months due to a lack of vital raw materials. This dire situation forced Japan's hand, making the acquisition of new resource-rich territories in Southeast Asia a matter of national survival. While the European conflict certainly opened a perceived window of opportunity by weakening colonial powers, and the US Pacific Fleet was indeed a formidable obstacle to any southward advance, it was the direct and suffocating pressure of the embargo that compelled Japan to launch a desperate, pre-emptive strike against Pearl Harbour, aiming to neutralize the US fleet long enough to seize the resources it urgently needed.

3	'Declining morale among US military forces in Vietnam between 1965 to 1968 was the most important reason why the US government wanted to withdraw from Vietnam.' How far do you agree with this view? Explain your answer.	[10]
Declining morale among US military forces in Vietnam between 1965 to 1968 was the most important reason why the US government decided to end its involvement in Vietnam because it made it more difficult for the US forces to achieve any decisive victories in their confrontation, resulted in more American casualties, made the war unpopular in the US, forced the Johnson administration's look for war to end the war in Vietnam. US forces suffered declining morale fighting under unfamiliar conditions and hostile terrain, harassed by booby traps and guerilla warfare from an unseen enemy. Conscription brought in young and inexperienced troops forces to fight far away in a country they knew little about, supposedly to defeat communism but experiencing nothing but difficult battles and rising number of those killed in action. From the first big battle between the NVA and the US troops at Ia Drang, to the battle at Khe Sanh and Dak To prevent NVA troops from invading across the DMZ, US troops despite their superior firepower was unable to achieve decisive victory to force the DRV to abandon its aim to topple the South Vietnam regime, expel the US and unify the North and South. The biggest event that deal a blow to US morale was the Tet Offensive in 1968 when 80,000 VC and NVA forces attacked more than 100 cities including US combat base at Khe Sanh, big cities like Hue and the US Embassy in Sai Gon. Despite having 500,000 US troops at the height of US involvement and spending \$20 billion a year, the communists were able to surprise the US forces. This failure to achieve decisive victories but instead suffering surprising attacks made the US troops ask difficult questions about how honest the administration and the military leadership has been with US combatants. The administration has been saying the war was going reasonably well but instead young men were sent to the war front to the risk losing life and limb for a cause no one was sure about. Declining morale led to unwillingness of soldiers to fight the war, preferring to search and avoid, conduct zippo missions burning down villages and killing civilians in the name of the war of body counts. Soldiers even resorted to fragging officers who led demoralised troops into aimless missions like Battle of Hamburger Hill. Veterans opposed the war, and conscripts burned their drafts fueled protests in many big cities, created civil unrest, eroded confidence in the government, divided the people, embarrassed the US government which had been saying the war was going well. The strategic shock of the Tet Offensive made US troops question their involvement, prompted Johnson to replace McNamara as Defence Secretary and dismiss General Westmoreland with leaders who opposed escalation, so that he could seek ways to start peace talks with the DRV to find ways to exit Vietnam. Another reason that made the US want to end their involvement in Vietnam was due to rising anti-war sentiments in the home front due to the negative media portrayals of the war. Media coverage of major battles convinced most Americans back home that the war was unwinnable. Live TV broadcast of the Tet Offensive showed US casualties and chaos in the cities of Sai Gon. Graphic media publications of events such as the shooting of the VC by the Saigon police chief, or photos of the Napalm girl, revelations of troop atrocities such as the My Lai Massacre shocked the domestic audience into questioning the humanity of the war and the ethics of US troops. Many journalists and correspondents such as Walter Cronkite of CBS and Neil Sheehan and David Halberstam of the New York Times began to question the war and voice criticism of US political and military leadership of US involvement. Their views influenced public opinion negatively and triggered mass protests by veterans and anti-war activists at high profile political events such as the Democratic National Convention. These protests embarrassed the US government, made the administration lose credibility and in an election year in 1968, allowed candidates vying for the presidency to openly criticise the government and campaigned for ending the war. Johnson was forced by the scale of the protests and the division of opinions in		

his administration to declare a bombing halt, explore peace talks and decided not to run for a second term as President as a way of finding an exit from Vietnam.

Another reason for the US government's decision to end its involvement in Vietnam because of the victory of Richard Nixon in the 1968 Presidential election. The Tet Offensive was calculated to cause embarrassment to the Johnson administration in an election year. Faced with a politically charged atmosphere of rising war sentiment and strong media criticism, Johnson's decision not to run for President as tantamount to an admission his involvement in Vietnam was a failure. Presidential hopefuls Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon campaigned on the promise of US withdrawal for them to stand a chance with an electorate disdainful of US involvement and feeling the credibility gap. When Nixon became President in 1968, he and his National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger immediately opened the Paris Peace talks with the DRV while implementing a policy of Vietnamisation, transferring responsibility for fighting the war to the ARVN while drawing down close to 400,000 US troops by 1971. The Paris Peace Accords was signed in 1973 and the last American troops left in the same year.

Declining morale was not the most important factor that influenced the government's decision to withdraw from Vietnam. The administration had been mostly tone deaf to the misery of the military instead only finding ways to save face and prevent from admitting failure. It was only when the scale and shock of the Tet Offensive was broadcast to the living room of the average American whose sons and brothers had been casualties of the war, the administration was willing to admit the war was unwinnable and unsustainable and a peace exit was the best way to end their involvement.

4	'Economic stagnation led to the collapse of Soviet power in Eastern Europe.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
---	---	------

Economic stagnation was a fundamental and arguably the most significant factor that led to the erosion of the USSR's control over Eastern Europe in the 1980s. The centrally planned command economies of the Soviet Union and its satellite states, while initially achieving some post-war growth, proved increasingly inefficient, inflexible, and unable to innovate compared to Western market economies. Firstly, the rigid central planning system, prioritizing heavy industry and military production over consumer goods, led to chronic shortages of everyday items, poor quality products, and a lack of variety. Factories produced what they were told, not what consumers wanted or what the market demanded, resulting in waste and inefficiency. There was little incentive for innovation or improved productivity, as competition was absent and individual enterprise stifled. Secondly, as Western countries experienced a consumer revolution, citizens in Eastern Europe faced long queues for basic necessities, limited access to modern technology, and a general decline in living standards relative to their Western counterparts. This widening "prosperity gap" became increasingly apparent through limited media exposure and personal accounts, fueling widespread disillusionment and resentment towards the communist regimes. The Soviet Union itself suffered from this stagnation (often termed the "Era of Stagnation" under Brezhnev), with declining growth rates, falling oil production (a key export), and a heavy military burden from the Cold War arms race. This meant Moscow had fewer resources to subsidize the struggling economies of its Eastern European allies or provide them with aid, exacerbating their own economic woes. The system of Comecon, designed for economic integration, largely failed to foster real competitiveness or innovation within the bloc. Lastly, the promise of communism was to deliver a superior economic and social system. When it demonstrably failed to provide even basic goods and a decent quality of life, the communist parties in Eastern Europe began to lose their legitimacy in the eyes of their populations. This economic dissatisfaction fostered a fertile ground for dissent and reform movements, challenging the very authority of the Soviet-backed governments. When Mikhail Gorbachev

came to power in the mid-1980s, he recognized the dire state of the Soviet economy and attempted reforms like *perestroika* (economic restructuring) and *glasnost* (openness). However, these reforms, while intended to revitalize the system, instead exposed its deep-seated flaws and further emboldened the discontent. As Moscow's ability and willingness to prop up these failing economies and suppress dissent militarily waned, the economic grievances translated into widespread protests and ultimately, the peaceful revolutions of 1989 that swept away communist rule across Eastern Europe.

Mikhail Gorbachev's foreign policies were instrumental in ending the USSR's control over Eastern Europe in the 1980s by fundamentally altering Moscow's approach to its satellite states. Recognizing that the Soviet Union could no longer afford the economic and political burden of maintaining its empire through coercion, Gorbachev introduced a "New Thinking" in foreign policy that prioritized disengagement from costly commitments and improving relations with the West. A crucial manifestation of this was the **Sinatra Doctrine**, a humorous but profoundly impactful policy articulated in 1989. In essence, it signified a stark departure from the Brezhnev Doctrine, which had previously justified Soviet military intervention to preserve communist rule in Eastern Europe. By explicitly signaling that Warsaw Pact nations were now free to "go their own way"—like Frank Sinatra's famous song—Gorbachev effectively removed the threat of Soviet tanks crushing dissent. This gave Eastern European reform movements and opposition groups the crucial space and confidence to push for democratic change, leading directly to the largely peaceful revolutions of 1989 that saw the collapse of communist regimes across the region.

The Solidarity movement in Poland served as a powerful catalyst for the end of Soviet control over Eastern Europe by demonstrating the potential for organized popular resistance against communist rule and inspiring similar movements across the bloc. Beginning as a genuine workers' uprising against economic hardship and political repression in the early 1980s, Solidarity, led by Lech Wałęsa, quickly evolved into a broad-based social and political movement, uniting diverse segments of Polish society under the banner of independent trade unionism. Despite initial suppression under martial law, Solidarity's persistent defiance, its moral authority bolstered by the Catholic Church, and its ability to mobilize millions fundamentally challenged the legitimacy of the communist regime and, by extension, Moscow's authority. Its eventual re-legalization and participation in roundtable talks in 1989, culminating in semi-free elections and the formation of a non-communist government, sent a resounding signal of the Soviet system's vulnerability. This success directly emboldened reformists and protesters in other Eastern European nations, showing that change was possible and that Moscow might not intervene. Thus, inspired by Poland's example, citizens in **Hungary** pushed for multi-party elections, **East Germany** saw massive demonstrations leading to the fall of the Berlin Wall, **Czechoslovakia's** Velvet Revolution peacefully ousted its communist government, and even in **Romania**, a violent uprising eventually toppled the Ceausescu regime, all riding the wave of defiance first prominently stirred by Solidarity. All these ended Soviet control over Eastern Europe as Gorbachev decided that these countries should be free to choose their own governments thus leading to the collapse of the Warsaw Pact.

Among economic stagnation, Gorbachev's foreign policies, and the Solidarity movement, **Gorbachev's foreign policies, particularly the implementation of the Sinatra Doctrine, played the most decisive and direct role** in ending the USSR's control over Eastern Europe. While economic stagnation provided the underlying fertile ground for widespread popular discontent and delegitimized communist regimes, and the Solidarity movement offered a powerful example of successful popular resistance, it was Gorbachev's explicit decision to withdraw the implicit threat of Soviet military intervention that directly enabled the peaceful revolutions of 1989. Without Moscow's assurance that it would not use force to prop up failing communist governments, as it had done in Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968), the reform movements, however widespread, might have been violently suppressed. Thus, while

the economic woes created the will for change and Solidarity demonstrated the way, it was Gorbachev's shift in foreign policy that ultimately provided the crucial political space for Eastern European nations to break free from Soviet dominance without fear of reprisal.