

**Marking and Answer Scheme
S4 Prelim Exam 2025**

SECTION A: Source-Based Questions

1a. Study Source A. How useful is this source to understanding USA's policy after World War II? Explain your answer? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Description	Marks
L1	States source is useful, based on undeveloped provenance E.g. Source A is useful to understanding Soviet Union policy in Europe after World War 2 as it was Soviet Deputy Premier G. M. Malenkov in 1947.	1m
L2	States source is useful/not useful, based on source content <i>*Award 3m if response considers how the source was useful AND not useful</i> E.g. Source A is useful as it provides how the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan were perceived as a threat by the Soviet Union. The source claims that the US was pursuing “a policy of world domination” and that these policies were aimed at establishing “the domination of American imperialism in Europe.” This helps us understand how US foreign aid and containment policies were seen not as support for European recovery, but as a threat by the USSR. It shows that US policy was interpreted as aggressive and expansionist by the Soviet leadership, which influenced how the Cold War tensions developed. OR/AND Source A is not useful as the source is limited because it does not explain the details of how the US policies were implemented, their impact, or the reactions they generated in the West. According to my contextual knowledge the Marshall Plan provided economic aid to help European countries rebuild after World War II but the Soviet Union viewed it as an expansionist tool used by the United States to spread capitalism and contain communism. In Greece, the US supported the royalist government during the civil war against communist forces, while in Turkey, it provided aid to strengthen the country's military and economy, countering Soviet influence in the region. From the Soviet perspective, US involvement in both countries was seen as direct interference and part of a broader strategy to extend American political and economic control in Europe.	2 – 3m
L3	States source is useful/not useful, based on source reliability using purpose E.g. Source A is not useful because of its purpose, which reduces its reliability. The source was likely produced by the Soviet government official with the intention of justifying Soviet actions and criticising the United States. This can be seen in the way it accuses the USA of pursuing “a policy of world domination” while presenting Soviet policies as being solely for “safeguarding the security of her state interests.” Given that the purpose was to defend the USSR's foreign policy during the early Cold War period and promote its image as peaceful, the source is likely biased. Therefore, its	4m

	selective and propagandistic nature limits its usefulness in understanding the Soviet Union's actual role.	
L4	States source is useful and not useful, based on evaluation of source reliability, perspective or typicality of source, with source details L2 sample AND Overall, Source A is not useful due to its lack of reliability. Source A is a speech delivered by Soviet Deputy Premier G. M. Malenkov in 1947, who was a senior leader in Stalin's government. As a key official, his views would reflect the Soviet Union's official stance rather than a neutral or independent perspective. His speech accuses the United States of pursuing "a policy of world domination" and labels the Marshall Plan as a tool of "American imperialism in Europe." These sweeping claims reflect strong anti-American bias typical of Soviet propaganda during the early Cold War. The purpose of the speech was likely to defend Soviet actions and justify its policies to both domestic and international audiences. Since it was made in public at a time when Cold War tensions were increasing, it was likely intended to rally support against Western initiatives rather than to provide an accurate or balanced view. As such, it lacks objectivity and is not typical of a neutral or internal Soviet assessment, making it unreliable and of limited usefulness in understanding the actual motives behind Soviet foreign policy.	5m

1b. How far does Source B prove Source C is wrong about causes of tension in post war Europe? Explain your answer. [6]

Level	Description	Marks
L1	States prove/does not prove, based on undeveloped provenance <i>*Award 2m for responses with more details</i> E.g. Source B would prove Source wrong as it was a speech by Vyshinsky, who was the Soviet deputy foreign minister. He would naturally not agree with the French President who was not its ally.	1 - 2m
L2	States prove/does not prove, based on content details <i>*Award 3m for responses to shows how the source proves and does not prove Source C was wrong</i> E.g. Source B does prove Source C wrong as they disagree about the causes of tension in postwar Europe. Source C claims that the Soviet Union acted to “maintain peace and security,” and blames the United States for creating “new tensions” through the Marshall Plan and military alliances. However, Source B contradicts this by stating that totalitarian regimes had been “forced upon [people] against their will” in countries like Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria, showing that it was actually the Soviet Union that was using coercion in violation of the Yalta Agreement. This challenges Source C’s portrayal of Soviet actions as purely defensive, suggesting instead that they were part of a broader strategy to dominate Eastern Europe and suppress democratic freedoms. OR/AND Source B does not prove Source C wrong because both sources emphasise the importance of self- determination/security in postwar Europe. Source B mentions the need to support “free peoples resisting subjugation,” reflecting the United States’ desire to protect democratic nations in Europe and that it is their responsibility. Similarly, Source C highlights that Soviet measures were “defensive, intended to protect its security and maintain peace,” showing that the Soviet Union acted out of a need to secure its borders and influence. This similarity reveals that both superpowers saw their actions as necessary for defence and protection of Europe.	2 - 3m
L3	States prove/does not prove, based on cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge <i>*Award 5m if responses cover how Source B proves and does not prove Source C’s claims</i> E.g. Source B does prove Source C wrong as they disagree about the causes of tension in postwar Europe. Source C claims that the Soviet Union acted to “maintain peace and security,” and for the good of the Eastern European countries and blames the United States for creating “new tensions” through the Marshall Plan and military alliances. However, Source B contradicts this by stating that totalitarian regimes had been “forced upon [people]	4 – 5m

	against their will” in countries like Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria, showing that it was the Soviet Union that was using coercion in violation of the Yalta Agreement. This challenges Source C’s portrayal of Soviet actions as purely defensive, suggesting instead that they were part of a broader strategy to dominate Eastern Europe and suppress democratic freedoms. When cross-referenced to Source E, it was stated that the Soviet Union’s actions were expansionist. Source E mentioned “They seek to weaken the power and influence of Western powers through patient, persistent pressure. In this situation, the United States must pursue a policy of firm containment, to block every expansionist move they make and to expose the falsities of Soviet propaganda”. Thus, this suggests that Soviet Union’s actions were not purely defensive but rather for their own selfish reason to spread communism to Europe. OR/AND Source B and Source C do not fully prove each other wrong because both align with contextual knowledge about the causes of tension in postwar Europe. Source B highlights the imposition of totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe, which is supported by contextual knowledge of Soviet dominance over countries like Poland and Romania through coercion and political pressure. Meanwhile, Source C’s claim that Western policies such as the Marshall Plan and military alliances increased Soviet fears is also supported by the reality that the Soviet Union viewed these moves as threats to its security. This shared reflection of each side’s concerns shows that tensions were fueled by mutual distrust and actions, meaning neither source entirely disproves the other.	
L4	States prove / does not prove, based on evaluation of the Source B’s purpose L3 sample and Overall, Source B cannot prove Source C was wrong due to its purpose as it is not reliable. Source B’s purpose was to convince the American public and Congress to support U.S. intervention by portraying the Soviet Union as an aggressive oppressor threatening freedom in Europe. This can be seen from Source B’s emphasis that totalitarian regimes were “forced upon” countries like Poland and Romania, presenting the situation as a clear struggle between “free institutions” and “terror and oppression.” This tells us that the speech aimed to justify U.S. involvement in foreign conflicts and contain communism. However, this perspective ignores Soviet security concerns and Western actions such as exclusion from the Marshall Plan, which contributed to tensions. Thus, Source B was created to rally support for American policy, making it biased and unable to fully disprove the claims in Source C.	6m

1c. Study Source D. Does the cartoonist support the formation of NATO in 1949? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Description	Marks
L1	Describe the cartoon, no interpretation Source D shows a large bear labelled “Moscow” baring its teeth aggressively while its tail is wagging and labelled “Peace Gestures.” A smaller figure labelled “Western World” watches the bear cautiously.	1m
L2	Inference of cartoonist position, based on provenance of cartoon E.g. The cartoonist of Source D likely supported the formation of NATO and did not trust the Soviet Union. Since it was published in an American newspaper in 1952, the cartoon reflects the West’s suspicion of Soviet intentions during the Cold War.	2m
L3	Inference of cartoonist’s position, based on source main message on the formation of NATO E.g. The cartoonist of Source D supported the formation on NATO as the source suggests that the Soviet Union is pretending to promote peace but is secretly threatening violence and domination. This can be seen in the source which shows Soviet Union seemingly promoting peace gestures (represented by the small wagging tail) but in reality, the bear which is bigger is seen to be fierce and aggressive. [3m] E.g. The cartoonist of Source D supported the formation on NATO as the source suggests that the Soviet Union is pretending to promote peace but is secretly threatening violence and domination. It portrays the USSR as two-faced—offering diplomacy on one side while hiding aggressive intentions on the other. This can be seen in the source which shows Soviet Union seemingly promoting peace gestures (represented by the small wagging tail) but in reality, the bear which is bigger is seen to be fierce and aggressive. [4m]	3-4m
L4	Inference of cartoonist’s position, based on source main message and tone, supported by source details and contextual knowledge. E.g. Source D’s cartoonist would have supported the formation of NATO based on the main message and tone of the source. From Source D, we can infer that the Soviet Union was pretending to offer peace while actually being aggressive and threatening. This can be seen from the large bear labeled “Moscow” that is baring its teeth and appears hostile, even though its tail is wagging with the label “Peace Gestures.” From the source, we can tell its tone is mocking and suspicious, since it shows the Soviet Union trying to appear friendly, but in reality, looking dangerous and untrustworthy. As the cartoon was published in 1952, a few years after NATO was formed in 1949, we know that NATO was created in response to the growing threat of Soviet	5m

	expansion, especially after Stalin broke promises made at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences by taking control of Eastern European countries through intimidation and installing communist governments. The Berlin Blockade of 1948–49 also made the West feel the need for a strong military alliance to defend against possible Soviet attacks. The cartoonist appeared to support NATO as a necessary protection for the Western world against Soviet deception and aggression.	
--	--	--

1d. Study Source E. How surprised are you by the source? Explain your answer. [6m]

Level	Description	Marks
L1	States surprise/not surprised, based on provenance E.g. I am not surprised by Source E because it was written by George Kennan, a U.S. diplomat. Since he was from America, he is likely to be anti-communist and portray the Soviet Union in a negative way.	1m
L2	States surprise/not surprised, based on source inferences, supported by source details. E.g. Source E does not surprise me as it suggests that the Soviet Union wanted to expand its influence and could not live peacefully with the capitalist world. This can be seen from Source E which mentions “they believe there can be no peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world.” This shows that the Soviets were seen as aggressive and constantly trying to challenge the West.	2m
L3	States surprise/not surprised, based on cross reference to other sources or contextual knowledge. E.g. Source E is surprising because it presents the Soviet Union as the main aggressor, while ignoring how its actions might be viewed as defensive. In Source E, it is argued that the Soviet Union believes there can be “no peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world” and is deliberately applying “persistent pressure” to weaken the West, which justifies an American policy of containment. This makes the Soviet Union seem purely expansionist and ideologically hostile. However, Source A provides a contrasting Soviet perspective, claiming that it is the USA that is pursuing a policy of world domination through measures like the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Source A argues that these American policies are examples of “American imperialism,” and that the Soviet Union’s actions are taken to safeguard its own security and maintain peace. From contextual knowledge, we know that the Soviet Union had been invaded multiple times in the previous decades and suffered enormous losses in World War II. Stalin wanted a buffer zone in Eastern Europe to prevent future invasions. Therefore, when we cross-reference Source E with Source A, it becomes clear that Source E focuses only on Soviet aggression while ignoring they may have perceived its own actions as defensive responses to American influence in Europe. OR Source E is not surprising because it presents the Soviet Union as aggressive and expansionist, saying that they believe “there can be no peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world.” This makes it seem like the Soviet Union was always planning to attack or dominate other countries. However, from contextual knowledge, we know that the Soviet Union had just suffered huge losses in World War II — over 20 million deaths — and had been invaded twice by Germany in the past 30 years. Stalin wanted to create a buffer zone of friendly governments in Eastern Europe, like in	3m

	Poland and Romania, to protect the USSR from future attacks. This shows that some of the Soviet actions may have been defensive rather than purely aggressive, which makes Kennan's claims seem one-sided and therefore surprising.	
L4	States surprise and not surprised, based on cross reference to other sources or contextual knowledge. E.g. Source E is surprising because it presents the Soviet Union as the main aggressor, while ignoring how its actions might be viewed as defensive. In Source E, it is argued that the Soviet Union believes there can be "no peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world" and is deliberately applying "persistent pressure" to weaken the West, which justifies an American policy of containment. This makes the Soviet Union seem purely expansionist and ideologically hostile. However, Source A provides a contrasting Soviet perspective, claiming that it is the USA that is pursuing a policy of world domination through measures like the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Source A argues that these American policies are examples of "American imperialism," and that the Soviet Union's actions are taken to safeguard its own security and maintain peace. From contextual knowledge, we know that the Soviet Union had been invaded multiple times in the previous decades and suffered enormous losses in World War II. Stalin wanted a buffer zone in Eastern Europe to prevent future invasions. Therefore, when we cross-reference Source E with Source A, it becomes clear that Source E focuses only on Soviet aggression while ignoring they may have perceived its own actions as defensive responses to American influence in Europe. AND Source E is not surprising because it presents the Soviet Union as aggressive and expansionist, saying that they believe "there can be no peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world." This makes it seem like the Soviet Union was always planning to attack or dominate other countries. However, from contextual knowledge, we know that the Soviet Union had just suffered huge losses in World War II — over 20 million deaths — and had been invaded twice by Germany in the past 30 years. Stalin wanted to create a buffer zone of friendly governments in Eastern Europe, like in Poland and Romania, to protect the USSR from future attacks. This shows that some of the Soviet actions may have been defensive rather than purely aggressive, which makes Kennan's claims seem one-sided and therefore surprising.	4m
L5	States surprise and not surprised, based on cross reference to other sources or contextual knowledge AND detailed analysis of provenance. *Award 6m for responses that provided contextual details to explain the purpose. E.g. I am not surprised by Source E, given its provenance and the context in which it was written. The source is a 1946 telegram by George Kennan, a senior American diplomat stationed in Moscow, sent to policymakers in Washington. The purpose of the telegram was to alert the American government to what Kennan believed were the long-term intentions of the	5-6m

	Soviet Union and to convince American leaders to adopt a tougher stance against communist expansionism. Kennan argued that the USSR could not peacefully coexist with the capitalist world and was attempting to expand its influence. This would have influenced USA to adopt the containment policy, which aimed to stop the spread of communism without direct military conflict. Source E mentioned that the Soviet Union wanted to "weaken the power and influence of Western powers". It reflects the anti-Soviet sentiment rising in the USA at the time and the desire to protect American interests abroad. According to my contextual knowledge, this telegram played a major role in shaping the American foreign policy during the early Cold War years. At the time, relations between the USA and the Soviet Union were rapidly deteriorating, especially after disagreements at Yalta and Potsdam over the future of Eastern Europe.	
--	--	--

1e. Study all the sources.

"The Soviet Union was only trying to protect itself after World War II.' How far do the sources support this statement? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level	Description	Mark Range
L1	Writes about hypothesis, no valid source use. E.g. It appeared that the Soviet Union was trying to protect itself and across the whole of Europe, starting with Eastern Europe from American containment policy.	1m
L2	Uses information from the source(s) to support or challenge the hypothesis. <i>* Award 2m for 1 source used to support or challenge the hypothesis. Award an additional mark for each subsequent source used.</i> E.g. Source A supports the view as the Soviet Deputy Premier claims that the United States pursued a policy of expansion through the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, while the Soviet Union's actions were aimed at "safeguarding the security of her state interests, and the maintenance of peace." This suggests the USSR saw itself as responding defensively to American aggression.	2 – 4m
L3	Uses information from the sources to support and challenge the hypothesis, explained with valid source use. <i>* Award 5m for 2 sources used to support and challenge the hypothesis, and an additional mark for each subsequent source, up to a maximum of 7m</i> E.g. L2 sample AND	5 – 8m

	Source B challenges the view as in President Truman's speech, he accuses the Soviet Union of imposing "totalitarian regimes" on Eastern European countries like Poland and Romania "against their will," portraying the USSR as an oppressor spreading communism through coercion and fear.	
+2m	Award an additional bonus mark for the use of contextual knowledge to a source in relation to its reliability, without exceeding 8 marks. E.g. Source F is an unreliable source as it was published by the Soviet Union and its Eastern European members in 1949. It is likely that this declaration was created to promote a positive image of the Soviet-led economic collaboration, emphasizing unity and mutual support within the socialist bloc. This served to justify Soviet control over Eastern Europe and to counter Western criticism, especially from the United States, which viewed the Soviet Union as aggressive. The source presents COMECON as a cooperative and peaceful effort, but in reality, it was also a tool to maintain Soviet dominance over its satellite states. Therefore, Source F cannot be fully trusted as it reflects Soviet propaganda designed to legitimize their political and economic control in the postwar years.	

Overall breakdown of responses of the 6 sources:

Support hypothesis		Challenge hypothesis	
Source A ○ Soviet Deputy Premier Malenkov claims that the United States pursued a policy of expansion through the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, while the Soviet Union's actions were aimed at "safeguarding the security of her state interests, and the maintenance of peace." This suggests the USSR saw itself as responding defensively to American aggression.		Source B ○ President Truman's speech, accuses the Soviet Union of imposing "totalitarian regimes" on Eastern European countries like Poland and Romania "against their will," portraying the USSR as an oppressor spreading communism through coercion and fear.	
Source C ○ Soviet government acted "in the interests of maintaining peace and security" and that Soviet measures were "defensive" in reaction to Western provocations such as economic and military alliances.		Source D ○ An American cartoon from the postwar years suggests that the Soviet Union is pretending to promote peace but is still threatening violence and domination against the western world. ○ This can be seen from the source which shows a bear that represents Moscow looking fierce with the captions "GR-R"	

		and wagging its tail which looks smaller and with the caption “peace gestures”. ○ This likely depicts the Soviet Union as a menacing threat, reinforcing Western fears of Soviet expansion and domination.	
	Source F ○ Soviet-led COMECON initiative as an effort to promote economic cooperation and reduce vulnerabilities to external pressures, indicating a focus on protecting the socialist bloc and rebuilding after the war. Together, these sources portray the USSR as motivated primarily by security concerns or gains for them materially.	Source E ○ George Kennan’s telegram describes the USSR’s worldview as rooted in insecurity but actively seeking to “weaken the power and influence of Western powers through patient, persistent pressure,” suggesting a deliberate and strategic push to expand Soviet influence rather than merely defend. These sources depict the USSR as an expansionist power, undermining the assertion.	

SECTION B: Essays

2. 'The most beneficial of Hitler's policies between 1933 and 1939, to the people of Germany, were his economic policies.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Level of Response Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the impacts of Hitler's policies on the people of Germany (1m for ID 1 reason, 2m for ID 2 or more reasons. 2m for describing 1 reason. 3m for describing 2 or more reasons.) E.g. Hitler's economic policies led to many jobs created which solved unemployment. [1m] E.g. Hitler's economic policies led to many jobs created which solved unemployment. Hitler's political policies brought about benefits to people. [2m] E.g. Hitler's economic policies led to many jobs created which solved unemployment. Hitler provided jobs for many of the unemployed Germans jobless due to the Great Depression. His political policies brought about benefits to people. [3m]	1 – 3m
L2	Explain given factor OR Explain other factors(s) benefited the Germans * 4m for explanation of 1 factor, additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail to a maximum of 5m E.g. I agree with the statement because the economic policies of Hitler greatly benefited the people of Germany. By carrying out huge projects to build public facilities and infrastructure like highways and government buildings, Hitler provided jobs for many of the unemployed Germans jobless due to the Great Depression. This enabled them to have incomes to not just support their families but also has a knock on effect of providing business and jobs for other people who depended on them like shopkeepers and transport workers. [5m]	4 – 5m
L3	Explains given factor AND other factor(s) *6m for explanation of given factor and another factor and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a max of 8 E.g.	6 – 8m

	[L2 plus] I disagree with the statement because the political impacts of Hitler's rule brought much benefits to the people of Germany. His Enabling Act put an end to the chaos of the Weimar Republic's party politics where the Chancellor changed frequently and the threats of revolution was high. The government was thus more ready to deal with external challenges and also internal disorder and enabled peace and stability in Germany until 1939. [6m] This can be seen by the way he arrested the Communists and banned their party, bringing all labour unions under the DAF which ensured that the German economy will no longer be paralyzed by strikes organized by them in the past and the Germans can continue to enjoy a better standard of living due to this economic growth. [7m]	
	Award an additional 2m (to a maximum of 10m) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors) i.e. In conclusion, I disagree that the economic policies benefited the German people the most. This is because it was due to the political policies of maintaining a one party state that enabled Hitler to carry out his economic policies without hindrance and delays. This in turn enabled the German people too benefit quickly from his economic policies. (+2)	Up to 10m

3. 'The main reason the Allies won the Second World War in Europe was due to the strength of the USA' How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.[10]

Level	Level of Response Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the strength of the USA or other reasons for the victory of the Allies in Europe (1m for ID 1 reason, 2m for ID 2 or more reasons. 2m for describing 1 reason. 3m for describing 2 or more reasons.) E.g. The Allies won the war because they were very strong and had the help from the USA. [1m] E.g. American economic and superiority enabled them to sustain a long war against Germany and Japan simultaneously while also helping to supply their allies with war materials. [2m] E.g. American economic and superiority enabled them to sustain a long war against Germany and Japan simultaneously while also helping to supply their allies with war materials. American strategic bombing against Germany, they made it difficult for the Germans to build and replace their losses. By launching invasions of Italy and France together with the British, they pull German forces away from the Eastern Front. [3m]	1 – 3m
L2	Explain given factor OR Explain other factors(s) led to the victory of the Allies in Europe * 4m for explanation of 1 factor, additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail to a maximum of 5m) E.g. I agree with the statement. American economic and superiority enabled them to sustain a long war against Germany and Japan simultaneously while also helping to supply their allies with war materials. It was American economic power with its unmatched resources and industries that wore down the weapons and manpower of Germany which they could not afford to lose and were unable to replace, eventually leading to the wearing down of their armed forces and their eventual defeat. [4m] I also agree with this statement because American military power played a large part in defeating the European Axis. By their strategic bombing against Germany, they made it difficult for the Germans to build and replace their losses. By launching invasions of Italy and France together with the British, they pull German forces away from the Eastern Front which enabled the USSR to defeat them more easily	4 – 5m

	and lead to their eventual defeat. [5m]	
L3	Explains given factor AND other factor(s) * 6m for explanation of given factor and another factor and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a max of 8. E.g. [L2 plus] I disagree with the statement. The USSR also played a vital role in the Allied victory as they were the ones who took on the most powerful Axis country, Germany, and at the cost of much manpower and resources, fighting costly but victorious battles like Moscow, Stalingrad and Kursk that managed to grind the powerful German army down on the Eastern front until its eventual defeat. The USSR was responsible for more than 60 percent of all German casualties in the war, far more than any other of the allied powers. This clearly shows the huge role that the USSR played to cause the eventual defeat of Germany. [6m] I also disagreed to this factor as German mistakes also resulted in their own defeat. By deciding to invade the USSR, Germany took on a huge power that they could not easily defeat due to its size and resources. The USSR was actually friendly to Germany before the invasion, supplying Germany with resources and ensuring that Germany could focus on one front. When Hitler betrayed this in 1941, he made a powerful and resilient enemy who was capable of fighting a prolonged war. [7m]	6 – 8m
	Award an additional 2m (to a maximum of 10m) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors) E.g. Ultimately, it was American strength that proved decisive. It was America which provided massive amounts of supplies to the USSR (and also UK) which enabled them to fight on against Germany. The Americans not just did the fighting themselves, they also enabled their allies to fight on. Thus, American strength is the most important reason why the Allies won World War Two. (+2)	Up to 10m

4. 'The main reason that led to the victory of the Communists in the Vietnam War was the support of the Vietnamese people.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Level	Level of Response Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes support of the Vietnamese as a factor in Communist victory in the Vietnam War. (1m for ID 1 reason, 2m for ID 2 or more reasons. 2m for describing 1 reason. 3m for describing 2 or more reasons.) E.g. Vietnam was able to achieve reunification in 1975 mainly because of the support of the Vietnamese both in North and South Vietnam. [1m] e.g. Vietnam was able to achieve reunification in 1975 mainly because of the support of the Vietnamese both in North and South Vietnam. Their leaders and people were united as one to fight on despite horrific loses against the Americans. The Communist government in North Vietnam and Communist cadres of the NLF in South Vietnam carried out land and other reforms. [2m] e.g. Vietnam was able to achieve reunification in 1975 mainly because of the support of the Vietnamese both in North and South Vietnam. Their leaders and people were united as one to fight on despite horrific loses against the Americans. The Communist government in North Vietnam and Communist cadres of the NLF in South Vietnam carried out land and other reforms. I also disagree with this statement because American policies and actions in South Vietnam (and also those of the South Vietnamese government supported by them) alienated most of the people there and turn them towards the Communists. [3m]	1 – 3m
L2	Explain given factor OR Explain other factors(s) led to Communist victory (4m for explanation of 1 factor, additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail to a maximum of 5m) E.g. I agree with the statement. Vietnam was able to achieve reunification in 1975 mainly because of the support of the Vietnamese both in North and South Vietnam which was why their leaders and people were united as one to fight on despite horrific loses against the Americans. This was possible because the Communists government in North Vietnam and Communist cadres of the NLF in South Vietnam carried out land and other reforms to improve the lives of the Vietnamese people. This was unlike what the Americans and South Vietnamese government was doing which was of little help and in fact often harmed the Vietnamese. [4m]	4 – 5m

L3	Explains given factor AND other factor(s) (6m for explanation of given factor and another factor and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a max of 8) E.g. L2 plus I disagree with the statement. North Vietnam and the Viet Cong would find it hard to fight against the might of the US military if the people of the USA had supported the war and the war had dragged on. Because the US government could not convince its people of the need to fight and die in Vietnam, they were unable to sustain their war efforts there and had to withdraw by 1973 which paved the way for the reunification in 1975. Thus the most important factor that led to Communist victory in the Vietnam War was due to the lack of domestic support of the war in the USA. [6m] I also disagree with this statement because American policies and actions in South Vietnam (and also those of the South Vietnamese government supported by them) alienated most of the people there and turn them towards the Communists. By moving them into strategic hamlets, they uprooted many Vietnamese from the land that they and their ancestors had stayed on and bonded with for centuries, The Phoenix Programme instilled fear and terror into the South Vietnamese when people used it to accuse those they had grudges against. Free Fire Zones where indiscriminate bombings were carried out on South Vietnamese farms and villages caused much damage to the farmland treasured by the Southern farmers and lead to deaths. Massacres like the one at My Lai also exposed the cruelty and brutality of American soldiers who slaughtered women and children by labelling them all as Communists. These made it impossible for the South Vietnamese to support the South Vietnamese government and the Americans propping them up, causing many to turn to the Communists instead which enabled them to become stronger and eventually win the war.	6 – 8m
	Award an additional 2m (to a maximum of 10m) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors) i.e. Ultimately, I agree with the statement. The support of the Vietnamese and the support and supplies that entailed, was what enabled the Communists to fight a protracted war with the USA and it is because of this war that dragged on that drained the morale and resolve of the American public which led to their decreasing support of the war and eventual withdrawal which led to Communist victory in 1975. (+2)	Up to 10m

