

2025 Prelim humanities History P1 Answer Scheme

1a) Study Source A

What is the message of these cards? Explain your answer? Explain your answer [5m]

L1	Describes source without focus	1m
L2	sub-messages <i>i.e. Makes valid inferences/ comments interpreting the cartoon but misses the main message of the source (2m). Award the 3rd mark if sub-message is fully developed, supported.</i> <i>E.g. The message of these cards is that the United States helping its ally South Korea is the right thing to do. This is evident in the source which states that “the United Nations pitched in to help the South Koreans like your dad would help the folks next door if some bad men were beating them up.” A good neighbour would help another when they are faced with an intruder, hence the United States, through the United Nations, was simply being a good neighbour to South Korea by helping the South to repeal the invasion by the North Koreans. (3)</i> <i>*(Accept any other sub-messages)</i>	2-3m
L3	Identifies the main message of the cartoon. <i>Award the higher mark in the level for fully developed answers.</i> <i>The higher mark should discuss that it was right that the US helped and that MacArthur was the <u>right man to help</u></i> <i>The message of these cards is that the United States helping its ally South Korea is the right thing to do and that General MacArthur was the right man to do the job. This is evident in the source which states that “the United Nations pitched in to help the South Koreans like your dad would help the folks next door if some bad men were beating them up.” And that “Mac has a long military record” who “led the Allied forces to victory”. This can be explained with reference to my contextual knowledge as the United States, under President Truman, has alluded to the “Domino theory” where if one country falls to Communism, the rest will follow. As such, the United States must be committed to help countries resist communists trying to take over the country.</i> <i>Accept contextual knowledge that discusses the Truman doctrine/ policy of containment/Truman’s strong belief that the Comintern was used as part of an international communist conspiracy/the red scare happening in America</i>	4-5m

1b) Study Source B and C.

How far does source B make your surprise by what source C says about the Inchon Landings? Explain your answer. [6m]

Level	Descriptor	Mark
L1	Identifies content in Source B and C which is/is not surprising but no reason given EXAMPLE: Source B makes me <u>surprised / not surprised</u> by what Source C says because the two sources were discussing the landings.	1

L2	Provenance undeveloped Source B makes me unsurprised by what source C says as source B is positive propaganda by the BBC, while source C is from a serious academic war journal.	2
L3	Surprised / Not Surprised based on Content, supported • Award 3m for surprised <u>or</u> not surprised • Award 4m for surprised <u>and</u> not surprised <u>EXAMPLES:</u> <i>I am not surprised as both source B and C agree that the Inchon landings were a spectacular military success which the enemy completely did not expect. This is evident in source B which states that “there has been little resistance from the North Korean People’s Army which are believed to have been taken completely by surprise by the attack.” This is also evident in source C which states that the it “no one can dispute” that the “assault at Inchon” was “brilliant, daring and skillful” which took “the Reds... by surprise”. In both sources, the North Koreans were portrayed as being caught of guard at the sheer audacity of the UN forces and could not find any adequate military response.</i> <u>AND/OR</u> <i>I am surprised as both sources B & C differ in its discussion of Douglas MacArthur’s perspective on the Inchon landings. In source B, MacArthur says that the “navy and Marines have never shone more brightly than this morning” and everything happened “like clockwork”. By using the word “clockwork”, MacArthur suggests that the success of this assault felt inevitable, like a clock passing minute to minute. In Source C however, MacArthur says that “he realised that Inchon is a 5000 to 1 gamble” and that a “thorough study of the obstacles faced... will reveal how great the chances of disaster were.” In source C, the success of the landings was by no means inevitable and MacArthur, even if he claims to be “used to taking those odds”, recognizes the very high risks and the potential for things to go very wrong.</i>	3 – 4
L4	Surprised / Not Surprised based on Content, supported + 3rd Cross-reference <i>I am not surprised as both source B and C agree that the Inchon landings were a spectacular military success which the enemy completely did not expect. This is evident in source B which states that “there has been little resistance from the North Korean People’s Army which are believed to have been taken completely by surprise by the attack.” This is also evident in source C which states that the it “no one can dispute” that the “assault at Inchon” was “brilliant, daring and skillful” which took “the Reds... by surprise”. In both sources, the North Koreans were portrayed as being caught of guard at the sheer audacity of the UN forces and could not find any adequate military response.</i> <u>I can further confirm that Source B makes me unsurprised by what Source C says</u> when I <u>cross-reference</u> this to Source F. Source F confirms Source C’s account as it makes a similar claim that the Inchon landings were a spectacular military success. The source states that “the daring and brilliant landing at Inchon which led to the recapture of all of South Korea”	5

	demonstrates the impact and significance of the Inchon landings, and how it can rightly be called an important turning point in the Korean war.	
L5	Different Perspectives based on Historical Context + Purpose i.e. <i>Explain provenance and the significance of the time period it was written + explain intention/motive with the use of contextual knowledge for both sources (Note: target audience & outcome is necessary to hit the 6th mark)</i> <i>I am not surprised that sources differ when discussing the Inchon landings because of the historical context. In Source B, it was published on 15th September 1950 when the landings were happening and it was live reporting. The news report that the landings were a spectacular success were borne out by the facts as everything did happen with “clockwork coordination” and the enemy was taken “completely by surprised.” The BBC, being a Western publication, will also inevitably be biased in favor of the UN forces, and with its reporting, will persuade British and international readers that confidence and continued support for the UN forces under MacArthur was warranted as things are taking a turn for the better. Source C however, was published in 1954 when the entire outcome of the Inchon landings was already known and the Korean war itself were already over. The source states that the landings while very successful was nevertheless a very high risk operation. This is evident in the source which states that while the landings were “brilliant” “daring” and “skillful”, a “critical analysis of the campaign...through a study of the obstacles which were faced...will reveal how great the chances of disaster were.” The analysis, meant primarily for naval officers in training, was thus similar to an after action review, where objectivity was necessary. This is so that naval officers would be warned that Inchon, given the risks, is not necessarily a textbook example of how to conduct naval warfare, and they have to be careful to draw the right lessons in their future planning as officers.</i>	5 – 6

1c) Study Source D.

How reliable are Truman's claims? Explain your answer.

[6m]

L1	Reliable/ unreliable based on provenance or content, undeveloped Award the higher mark for answers that are more developed (provided some elaboration/ explanation). <i>e.g. Source D is unreliable as Truman dislikes Macarthur, having sacked him and will always find a way to badmouth him. (1 mark)</i> <i>e.g. Source D is reliable as Truman, who is no longer President, will find it possible to speak candidly, about his decisions in the past, as he is no longer constrained by the demands of the office to use more diplomatic language. (2 marks)</i>	[1-2]
L2	Reliable AND/OR unreliable based on content, supported Award the higher mark for identifying reliable and unreliable content, supported. <i>e.g. Source D is reliable in its claim that MacArthur liked to surround himself with Yes men. This is evident in the source which states that, “there was never anyone around to keep him in line. He didn’t have anyone on his staff who wasn’t a bootlicker.” This showed that MacArthur had probably a too high opinion of himself and didn’t like people who disagreed with him.</i>	[2-3]

	AND/OR <i>Source D is reliable in its claim that MacArthur was an incompetent leader. This is evident in the source which states that "I didn't fire him because he was stupid, although he was, but that's not against the law for generals." This showed that Truman does not think highly of MacArthur, considering him a very poor leader, like many other generals.</i>	
L3	Reliable AND/OR unreliable based on content, supported and with cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge Award the higher mark for identifying both reliable and unreliable based on content, with accurate cross-references to confirm and challenge the source respectively. <i>e.g. Source D is reliable in its claim that MacArthur liked to surround himself with Yes men. This is evident in the source which states that, "there was never anyone around to keep him in line. He didn't have anyone on his staff who wasn't a bootlicker." This showed that MacArthur had probably a too high opinion of himself and didn't like people who disagreed with him. This can be confirmed by cross referencing to source E which states that MacArthur's "intelligence chief, General Charles A. Willoughby" was "a sycophant of the general" who "knew what MacArthur wanted" and ensured that "his intelligence reports always blend seamlessly with what MacArthur intended to do in the first place." This demonstrated that his intelligence chief reported what he thought MacArthur would like to hear, rather than what was actually happening on the ground.</i> AND/OR <i>Source D is unreliable in its claim that MacArthur was an incompetent leader. This is evident in the source which states that "I didn't fire him because he was stupid, although he was, but that's not against the law for generals." This showed that Truman does not think highly of MacArthur, considering him a very poor leader, like many other generals. This can be contradicted by source F which states that MacArthur was responsible for the "daring landing at Inchon" and while he certainly should be held responsible for "the miscalculations in pursuing the enemy north" in the end, the "war would end where MacArthur had left it" as "one of history's last frontiers between communism and freedom.". This shows that MacArthur, while certainly making mistakes, should not be summarily dismissed as fundamentally incompetent. Source D seems only to recall MacArthur's failures while not giving him credit where credit is due.</i>	[4-5]
L4	Establish whether the source is reliable/ unreliable by examining bias, purpose and/or intended outcome Award the higher mark for better explained or more complete answers ie writer's intention which discusses deterrence and friendship with Italy. <i>e.g. Source D is unreliable as it was a biased interview designed to make Truman look good and MacArthur look bad. Harry Truman, had been out of office for some time and the Korean war, due to MacArthur, provoked an international reaction with China entering the war, and could have spiraled out of hand. He was the one who made the major, and unpopular decision, to sack MacArthur especially over his decision to provoke the Chinese and causing the Chinese to send reinforcements to help North Korea which necessitated a</i>	[5-6]

	disastrous retreat by UN forces beyond the 38th parallel, and hence would be keen to justify himself. As such, he considered MacArthur as lacking in character and having unsound judgement, thus proving himself to be a danger. This is evident in his use of loaded words in the source which states that he was a showman “wearing sunglasses” like a “nineteen year old second lieutenant”, and also “wouldn’t respect the authority of the President”, and also a very one sided view, considering him “stupid” and “not right in the head”, without crediting any of his achievements. This is to persuade Americans who would watch or read his interviews that Truman dared to make an unpopular but right decision and hence would sympathise and thus view his legacy as a President in a more positive light..	
--	--	--

1d) Study Source F.

How useful is this source in helping us understand the role of General MacArthur in the Korean war? Explain your answer. [5m]

L1	Identifies Useful /Not Useful but no explanation given (no topic statement) but merely lifts source evidence	1m
L2	Useful based on content (facts), supported/ Not Useful based on limitations of source content (vague information such as information too general or insufficient information <u>or</u> false information), supported. Award 2 marks for useful <u>Or</u> not useful in content, supported. Award 3 marks for Useful <u>And</u> not useful in content, supported.	2-3m
L3	Useful based on content (facts), supported + cross-referencing to contextual knowledge or other source to verify OR/AND Not useful based on limitations of source content (vague information such as information too general or insufficient information <u>or</u> false information), supported + <u>cross-contextual knowledge</u> Award 4 marks for useful <u>Or</u> not useful in content supported + cross-referencing. Award 5 marks for Useful <u>And</u> not useful in content, supported + cross-referencing. <i>Useful as it was an accurate and objective summary of the role of Macarthur in the various turning points in the Korean war, be it positive or negative.</i> <i>Limited as it was vague in describing the specific tactics used to reverse defeats on the Battlefield. how for instance, things were reversed.</i> <i>E.g. Source F is <u>useful as evidence of the outcome of the Korean War as it provides factual information</u> that MacArthur was behind many major decisions in the Korean war. This is evident in the source which states that all the defeats and victories in the Korean war from the “daring and brilliant landing at Inchon” to the “headlong retreats from the Yalu River” “can be blamed or credited to MacArthur.” This can be confirmed with reference to source A, which states the the UN forces was “put under command of General Douglas MacArthur” and he “had a long military record” who also “led the Allied forces to victory in the Pacific during the second world war.” MacArthur, who was one of the best known generals of the United States army, thus commanded enormous respect and given a wide powers to make key decisions, that were approved by his superiors, that will impact the outcome</i>	3-4m

	of the Korean war. Hence it would be logical that he owns both the defeats and victories that happened during the war. <u>AND</u> <u>Not useful in content because of limitations of source, supported with evidence + cross reference</u> <u>However</u>, source F <u>is not useful</u> as evidence of understanding MacArthur's role in the Korean war as it did not <u>provide sufficient explanation of the specific decisions he took that contributed to the outcome on the battlefield</u>. This is evident in the source which states that crossing the 38th parallel into North Korea was a "miscalculation" which resulted in a "headlong retreat from the Yalu river". When cross referenced to source E, we would discover the source of the miscalculation, namely the response of the Chinese, where "the presence of a sizeable Chinese intervention force ready to ambush UN forces and cut their supply lines" resulting in a 'rout of the 8th US Army and its South Korean allies'. Source E thus provides elaboration on what exactly the miscalculation entailed, namely not expecting the Chinese to intervene, and having no plan when they did.	
L4	Purpose, supported i.e. Explains extent of usefulness based on motives of the author- who is speaking, target audience, intended outcome). In the process, you must show exaggerated/loaded words, one-sidedness based on missing information, opinion /judgement, supported with evidence. * The twists - Overall doubts Reliability but yet emphasizes on usefulness (based on attitude/perspective/action of the author or based on time in order to obtain the maximum marks. E.g. In terms of purpose, this source is <u>useful</u> as it is <u>objective and balanced and thus reliable</u>. This is because the source was written in 2000 by an American historian, almost 50 years after the Korean war, providing both knowledge of how all the events transpired, and also possessing critical distance for there to be a more objective assessment. The intention/message of the source is to inform/educate readers that MacArthur in his conduct of the Korean war had his strengths and weaknesses, conducting a "daring and brilliant landing at Inchon" but also being "blind to criticism and so insubordinate that Truman was forced to fire him". This is so that readers will come to a balanced view of MacArthur and critically appreciate what he did for South Korea.	5m

1e) Study all the sources.

'General MacArthur was a poor military leader.' How far do these sources support this view?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1m
L2	Yes Or No, supported by valid source use i.e. Finds evidence that the the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact was signed because of British and French actions <u>OR</u> Finds evidence that the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact was signed because of other reasons i.e. Stalin's <u>OR</u> AND Hitler's motives/ambition. <i>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge), and an</i>	2-4m

	additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.	
L3	Yes <u>AND</u> No, supported by valid source use i.e. Finds evidence that the the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact was signed because of British and French actions <u>AND</u> Finds evidence that the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact was signed because of other reasons i.e. Stalin's OR AND Hitler's motives/ambition. <i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and NO supported by valid source use use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e by using contextual knowledge) and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use with explanation up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i> Source A – No <i>Source A does not support the statement that General MacArthur was a poor military leader but instead shows that he was a good military leader. The source states that "Mac has a long military record. But you know him best as the general who led the Allied forces to victory in the Pacific during the Second World War." This can be explained with reference to my contextual knowledge as MacArthur had been a key player in the United States victory over Japan in World War II, declaring "I shall return" and reconquering the Philippines. Before the outbreak of the Korean War, MacArthur was military governor of Japan which had unconditionally surrendered, and these instances demonstrates his distinguished military record and capabilities.</i> <i>(Accept any other relevant contextual knowledge about General MacArthur)</i> <u>Award and extra mark for questioning the reliability/sufficiency of the Source</u> <i>However, the reliability of the source can be questioned as it was written in 1951, when the Korean war was seen by the USA as part of the global struggle to fight communism. Hence the source is biased towards the US forces and MacArthur as it was a one sided view, declaring both the cause righteous and the person in charge capable. This is to persuade children that they should remain confident in the American way of life and continue to support a capitalist and democratic ideology.</i> Source B – No <i>Source B does not support the view that MacArthur was a poor military leader, instead showing that he was a good leader. The source describes MacArthur's prowess in planning, describing the Inchon landings as "the largest assembled anywhere since World War II" and describing it has having "clockwork coordination" which took the North Koreans "completely by surprise". This can be explained with reference to my contextual knowledge as the UN forces had been previously pushed to a corner of South Korea known as the Pusan Perimeter and were fighting desperately to survive. The North Koreans had expected victory to come when they occupy Pusan. The UN forces' success criteria was to either hold ground or to push back the North Koreans from where there were. An audacious amphibious landing seems out of the question. Instead, MacArthur decided that a counterattack was necessary and possible as the enemy's supply lines were stretched and hence the UN forces should</i>	5-8m

seize such an opportunity. He had planned the counterattack secretly and at the right time, unleashed it on the North Koreans with devastating consequences.

Source C - No

Source C disagrees with the statement that MacArthur was a poor military leader to some extent. The source recognises MacArthur's plan to assault Inchon as "brilliant, daring and skillful" and that he had indeed taken the enemy by surprise "opposition would be light was correct." However, the source also seems to suggest that there was a certain recklessness to his plan, with himself saying that the odds were "5000 to 1 gamble" and cautioning that luck seems to also be a factor in the success of Inchon. This can be explained with reference to my contextual knowledge as in 1954, the Korean War has just concluded with a stalemate and a negotiated armistice. Since the outcome was known and it was far from ideal, and the person involved in the outcome was MacArthur, it would be inevitable that dramatic victories, like that of the Inchon landing, would be put side by side with other dramatic defeats like the retreat from the Yalu river and a more critical lens applied to victories, so as to avoid future overconfidence.

**Source C – Consider answers which say Yes when they argue that a 5000 to 1 gamble can be considered reckless and a mark of a poor leader.*

Source D - Yes

Source D supports the view that MacArthur was a poor military leader. The source was critical of MacArthur's character and tactics. It negatively describes MacArthur as "always playacting... like a nineteen-year-old second lieutenant" who was simultaneously "stupid" and surrounded himself with "bootlickers" and who thinks so highly of himself that he "wouldn't respect the authority of the President." This can be explained with reference to my contextual knowledge as MacArthur had assured Truman that crossing the 38th parallel and attacking the North Koreans is sound military strategy and the Chinese would not intervene. In the end, the Chinese did. MacArthur was subsequently suggesting the use of tactical nuclear weapons and appeared insubordinate to Truman his superior who turned down his plans. This source by Truman is thus unsurprisingly very critical of MacArthur.

Award an extra mark for questioning reliability/insufficiency of source

However, Source D cannot be taken at face values because this source is very biased against MacArthur. Truman had made the decision of firing MacArthur and it was a highly unpopular one causing his polling to crash and it was a significant reason why he did not seek a 2nd term as President. Therefore, he attempts to persuade the American public through a very one sided view that MacArthur was highly over-rated and reckless, so that the public will view his decision and his legacy as president in a more favorable light.

Source E – Yes

Source E supports the view that MacArthur was a poor military leader. The source was critical of MacArthur's stubbornness and poor judgment when he "dismissed these reports" of "the presence of a sizeable Chinese intervention force ready to ambush UN forces and cut their supply lines." This resulted in a military catastrophe when the UN forces were driven "from the Yalu River...down to below the 38th parallel... costing the lives of thousands of American and South Korean soldiers." This can be explained with reference to my contextual knowledge as the Chinese had been warning repeatedly that they

	<i>will take any threat to their territory very seriously especially when UN forces attempted to pursue North Korean forces across the Yalu river, but MacArthur had ignored their warnings believing that they were simply bluffing.</i> Source F- Yes and No Source F is both supportive and critical of the view that MacArthur was a poor military leader. The source considered his decision to land at Inchon a “daring and brilliant” one and because of his foresight, he saved South Korea and “the border that still stands as one of history’s last frontiers between communism and freedom.” In that sense, he was a capable leader. <i>However, the source also states that he was responsible for the “headlong retreats from the Yalu river” and was “vain, blind to criticism and so insubordinate that Truman was forced to fire him”, hence he was certainly not without his flaws. This can be explained with reference to my contextual knowledge as the source was written in 2000 by an American historian, almost 50 years after the Korean war, providing both knowledge of how all the events transpired, namely that the Korean war ended in a stalemate and an armistice which had held even after the end of the cold war. A stalemate while not total victory, nevertheless achieved Truman’s initial objective, namely, to save South Korea. In that regard, MacArthur did play an important role and his legacy should be assessed on this actual outcome.</i>	
--	---	--

For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark must not exceed 8 Notes:

- To score L2/L3 there must be source use, i.e. direct reference to source content.
- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote.
- Simply writing about the issues in the sources is not enough.
- Higher marks in L2/L3 to award on number of sources used.

Section B (SEQ) Suggested Answer Scheme

2. ‘The main reason why the Weimar government was unpopular with the German people was because it signed the Treaty of Versailles.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.’ [10]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> - Describes why the specific clauses in the Treaty of Versailles damaged Germany. - System of proportional representation - Mishandling of the Ruhr crisis - Ideological opposition from the left and right wing.	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m

L3	Explains Yes and No	6-8m
	Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason). Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). <u>I agree that one reason why the Weimar government became unpopular between 1919 -1924 was because many Germans resented the Weimar government for signing the TOV. They saw the Weimar government as stabbing the Germans in the back ('stab-in-the back' theory').</u> Many Germans blamed the German politicians for making the German army surrender and subsequently signing the armistice. This was because the war had ended before the German army had been defeated and therefore Germans felt that the Weimar government had betrayed Germany. Thus, many supported extremist parties such as the Nazi party. In addition, <u>The Weimar Republic was also seen as the “November Criminals”</u> and associated with the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. Germans called the treaty a diktat because it had been imposed on Germany; therefore, it was an unfair treaty. For instance, Germany had to accept total blame for starting WWI and as a result, had to pay heavy war reparations and give up many of her colonies. The former made Germany bankrupt and the latter affected German national pride because having colonies was a reflection of the extent of the German Empire. <u>MAKE THE LINK NOW →Therefore, the Weimar government became unpopular while opposition parties like the Nazi party became prominent parties between the period 1919 - 1924 because the Nazi Party vowed to break the Treaty of Versailles and restore Germany’s former glory.</u> <u>Another reason why the Weimar government became unpopular was because of the political weaknesses of the Weimar government.</u> The Weimar government practiced proportional representation, which resulted in no one party gaining an overall majority and governments were made up of coalition governments. <u>These coalitions</u> tended to <u>split</u> apart during a crisis, and they initially could not solve many of Germany’s post-war problems. <u>MAKE THE LINK NOW → Subsequently, many Germans found extremist parties (such as the Nazi party) appealing as they promised to establish a strong central government.</u> The <u>inability of the Weimar government to solve the post-war economic problems was another reason why the Weimar government became unpopular between 1919-1924.</u>Germany’s economic problems were severe because under the TOV, Germany was forced to pay reparations amounting to 6600 million pounds as well as to give up the Saar and Alsace-Lorraine, which were heavy industrial areas. The Weimar government could not keep up with the payments, which eventually led to France taking over coal production in the Ruhr, Germany’s main industrial area. This led to a shortage of food and prices went up. The Weimar government tried to solve the problem by printing more money, but this led to hyper-inflation and the value of the	

	mark depreciated making the people's savings worthless. MAKE THE LINK NOW → Many people became poor, especially the middle classes who then began to support the opposition parties that promised to take them out of the economic crisis. <u>Only for argumentative Essay : Suggested Conclusion: (Identify root cause vs factors which are a result/offshoot of root cause</u> I disagree that most important reason why the Weimar government became unpopular between 1919 - 1924 was because of the resentment towards the Weimar government for signing the Treaty of Versailles but rather it was because of the political weaknesses of the Weimar government. This was the <u>root cause</u> that had led to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles and subsequently resulted in the loss of German supremacy and pride. Essentially, the Weimar government had given in to the Allied powers by signing the Armistice and were subsequently responsible for accepting the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Moreover, the economic problems Germany faced was also because of the weaknesses of the Weimar government as the government had defaulted in their reparation payments to the French which resulted in the Ruhr crisis and further weakened Germany by 1923. Thus it was under such circumstances that Nazi power was able to rise and become prominent as Hitler took the opportunity to expound on the weaknesses of the Weimar government. *Accept any valid arguments.	
--	---	--

3. "Japan attacked Pearl Harbor because they saw USA as a threat to their Co-Prosperity Plan." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> - Describes US embargo on oil - Wanted to take advantage of defeat of Allied powers in Europe, leaving colonies vulnerable. - Expansionist foreign policy since the 1930s - Raw materials in Southeast Asia	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i> I agree that <u>one reason why Japan attacked Pearl Harbor was because USA seen as a threat to Japan's Co-Prosperity Plan (to control the whole of Asia)</u> In 1940, the war in Europe gave Japan a chance to fully launch its Co-Prosperity Plan in Asia. Germany had defeated Holland and France. Britain thus had to deploy their forces from their colonies in Asia to fight Hitler in	6-8m

Europe. Therefore, the only power which was a threat to Japan's territorial ambition was USA's naval fleet in the Pacific. **MAKE THE LINK NOW**→ It was thought that by destroying the naval fleet, the USA would need time to rebuild the fleet. In turn Japan would gain a 2 year supremacy at sea so that they could achieve their aims and goals unhindered that is, seize territories for their empire. Thus Japan attacked Pearl Harbour.

Another reason why Japan attacked Pearl Harbor was to obtain raw materials especially oil from South-East Asia to continue its war efforts.(China) The USA had responded towards Japanese aggression in the 1930's by adopting a firmer policy towards Japan. For example, in 1939, USA ended its 'Treaty of Commerce' with Japan when Japan invaded China and subsequently placed an embargo on shipment of arms on Japan. In 1940, with the invasion of Indo-China, USA placed an embargo on raw materials *** (oil) on Japan. **MAKE THE LINK NOW**→ Japan thus felt the economic pressure as USA was the biggest supplier to Japan outside of Asia of scarp iron, steel, oil and other essential commodities. Of greater importance was the fact that Japan's oil reserves could thus only last 2 years. **Japan had to get rid of the presence of USA in the Pacific in order to continue to obtain raw materials and oil from Malaya and Singapore for its continued wartime efforts. As a result, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor.**

Another reason why Japan attacked Pearl Harbor was to retaliate against the West for their discriminatory policies towards Japan. Japan had resented the USA for treating them as an inferior race as seen for example in **the refusal of the West to include the racial equality clause in the League of Nations in 1919**. The Japanese viewed this as blatant discrimination against the Asian races. **Moreover,** the **1922 Washington Naval Conference saw the West putting an unequal quota on Japan's building of warships whereby for every 5 ships Britain and USA built, Japan could only build 3**. The Japanese saw this as having double standards whereby it was alright for the West to concentrate on building up their status as a superpower but not for Japan to do so. **This resentment increased in 1924 when the US government placed strict controls on the number of foreigners settling in the USA**. Before 1924, there was a 5 % quota for Asian immigrants coming into USA. However, in 1924, USA revised this law and totally banned Japanese immigration. These controls were much stricter for Asian immigrants than for immigrants of other groups. The Japanese were very insulted by this decision. **Consequently, because of all the above discriminatory policies, Japan wanted to seek revenge and show Japanese might and power by attacking Pearl Harbor.**

Suggested Conclusion

I agree that **the main reason why Japan attacked Pearl Harbour was because USA was seen as a threat to Japan's Co-Prosperity Plan**. The Japanese had to bomb Pearl Harbour in order to gain sea superiority. In turn the Japanese could proceed to achieve their goal of conquering land in S.E.A and ultimately establishing themselves as masters of Asia. Moreover, bombing Pearl Harbour in order to obtain raw materials for their continuing war effort was not the most important reason as it was part of the Co-Prosperity Plan. **It was a trigger factor and the immediate cause for the invasion of Pearl Harbour**. In a similar vein, the need to bomb Pearl Harbour in order to seek revenge against the West discriminatory policies was also an offshoot of the Co-Prosperity Plan. This was so as the bombing of Pearl Harbour would allow Japan to proceed

with their aim of getting rid of the presence of foreign rule in Asia and ultimately build an Empire in Asia. Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). (Accept any logical/plausible answers)	
---	--

4. 'The Tet offensive was the main reason for the shifting sentiments in the United States towards the Vietnam war. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10m]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> • Describes what happened during the Tet offensive • Role of the US media in the Vietnam war • Unpopularity of the South Vietnamese regime • Rising US casualties and inability to defeat Vietcong even before Tet.	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i> I agree that one reason for the shifting in sentiments in the United States towards the Vietnam War was developments of the Tet Offensive in January 1968 . From 1965 to 1967, the official view in the US was that the war was going reasonably well. As the fight against the Viet Cong insurgency had no clear territorial goals to capture, the USA and South Vietnamese forces used “body count” as a means of measuring success. The goal was instead to kill as many Viet Cong soldiers as possible to wear the enemy down. However, this confidence was shattered early in 1968 during the Vietnamese year(Tet) holiday when the Viet Cong fighters attacked over 100 cities and other military targets commonly known as the Tet Offensive. There was bitter fighting over the city of Hue and around the US military base at the Khe Sanh in the northern part of South Vietnam. The Tet Offensive was costly for the Communists, with the Viet Cong badly weakened, having lost around 10,000 experienced fighters. Furthermore, the people of South Vietnam did not rise up and join the Viet Cong to fight alongside them against the USA/South Vietnamese troops as they had originally hoped for. ***However, ironically, although the end result indicated a US/South Vietnam success military wise and a Viet Cong failure, it was in fact a ***turning point	6-8m

because this incident turned the tide for American sentiments towards the Vietnam War in general. In short, the American population were against American involvement in a war which was based on ideological conflict rather than territorial gains/defence. Fundamentally, the attack (Tet Offensive) called into question the effectiveness of US involvement in Vietnam as it not only took them by surprise but more significantly, despite US sending 500,000 troops to Vietnam and spending \$20 billion annually, the Communist were still able to launch a major psychological setback for USA in which it exposed the weaknesses and vulnerabilities of the US/South Vietnamese troops.

Further, to recapture the towns captured, large amounts of artillery and air power were used, resulting in **extensive civilian casualties**.

(Make the Link→ This single development had a tremendous effect in shifting American sentiments which was swiftly manifested as polls conducted in the aftermath of the Offensive showed as sharp decline in public support for the Vietnam War and increasing calls for de-escalation with withdrawal of US troops from Vietnam. For example, faced with mounting criticism and pressure from both the American public as well as his own Democratic Party, the American President Lyndon Johnson announced he would not seek re-election. Moreover, his administration began to scale back bombing campaigns and sought peace negotiations with North Vietnam. This shift continue under the next President , Nixon, who pursued a policy of "Vietnamization" aimed at gradually withdrawing American troops and transferring combat responsibilities to South Vietnamese forces, which eventually led to the final exit of the last US forces from Vietnam by 29 March 1973.

Another reason for the shifting sentiments in the United States towards the Vietnam, War was the role of the media. Widely and graphically covered in the media, the Vietnam War is often called "the first television war". With the increasing proliferation of television sets in American households, it meant more Americans had access to news media coverage and receiving updates on the war. As such the Vietnam War became an important part of the average Americans' daily routing. Moreover, advances in technology meant that television crew could bring lightweight cameras very close to the conflict zones. Journalists reporting from the frontlines depicting details of the developments of the war and powerful images were beamed into homes across USA. Initially, the relationship between the US government and the media was relatively good as the government wanted to win domestic support for the Vietnam War. Journalists accredited by MACV (i.e. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam) would get access to war zones, interviews and regular reports. In return, they were expected to not reveal any information which would help the enemy. *** by 1968, the tone of reporting on Vietnam was beginning to change e.g. the Tet Offensive in Jan 1968 led the journalist to abandon their restrain. It convinced many journalists that USA could not win the war and many publicly criticised USA's war efforts in Vietnam on national television. ***In the same year, with more media coverage of the war, more Americans were shocked as more revelations of US atrocities in the Vietnam War started to unfold in front of the television sets at home and other major mainstream media. For example, images and graphics of the My Lai Massacre in which US soldiers massacred between 347 and 504 unarmed South Vietnamese civilians including women, children and the elderly, shocked the American public ***thus lead to rising war American public sentiments against the war. (Elaboration: Another example was the graphic images publicised in the mainstream media such as the iconic photograph named "Saigon Execution" where a Viet Cong General was held at gunpoint and late executed by a South Vietnamese general turned the American public against their government's war efforts, with some calling the photograph "the picture that lost the war".)

(Make the Link) ***Overwhelmed by gory images and detailed reports from the ground, they were in disbelief and started to change their perception/sentiments. Some believed that this swung public opinion on the US involvement in the Vietnam War (i.e. the American public started to pressure the US govt through

street demonstrations and protest to withdraw/stop the war because they saw the Americans as 'baby killers', which was shameful and disgraceful.

Another reason for the shifting of sentiments in the United States towards the Vietnam War was the Americans' change in attitude. They began to feel weary about the protracted war. By 1968, there was a drastic change in media r from the previous USA was winning the war and it would end soon" to success (or ending) which seemed nowhere in sight. Many Americans were tired of being bombarded with negative media news coverage on the Vietnam War daily and they started to feel disillusioned and lose their trust in the government in terms of their handling of the Vietnam War. It had been over a decade since the American involvement in the Vietnam War and the public began to question, in the first place, US objective in fighting a "foreign war" which entailed sending more and more American soldiers to die. Furthermore, a protracted war would mean more American soldiers had to be drafted to fight in Vietnam. Subsequently, many young men resorted to resisting being drafted e.g. for those who could, they enrolled themselves in colleges just to avoid being sent to Vietnam but for those who could not afford it, they turned to protests. This rising tide of anti-war sentiments saw no signs of abating, but instead public protest increased both in scale and in intensity, particularly at universities. For example. In the first half of 1968, there were over 100 demonstrations involving 40,000 students against the Vietnam War. Some public figures lent their star-power as well. e.g. Martin Luther King, Muhammad Ali and Bob Dylan which emboldened and intensified public protest

I disagree that the Tet Offensive was the main reason for the shifting sentiments in the US towards the Vietnam war as it was merely a trigger factor. Undeniably it brought to light the weaknesses of US military in Vietnam but this information/revelation could not have been disseminated and made known to the American public without the help of the media. Moreover, the Tet Offensive was all by a development that happened in Vietnam and was used and magnified by the media. Thus the role of the media can be said to be the main reason as is the the root factor and thus arguably more important than developments of the Tet Offensive. Essentially, media served as the primary tool through which the American public experienced the war. Sustained and pervasive media influence over time had the ability to influence and shape public perception and drive political change.

Or

I agree that the Tet Offensive was the main reason for shifting sentiments in the US towards the Vietnam war as it was the root cause. Thus the role of the media was an offshoot of the root cause as the media was able to report the atrocities and gore because of the developments of the Tet offensive if not there would be no other event at that point of time during the Cold War era to show such brutal battles by the US. Thus the media served as the primary tool through which the American public experienced the war. Sustained and pervasive media influence over time had the ability to influence and shape public perception and drive political change was only possible with the developments of the Tet offensive.

Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.

The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).

(Accept any logical/plausible answers)