

Secondary 4 Preliminary Examinations
Core History (2174/01)
Source-Based Case Study
Suggested Answer Scheme

1(a) Study Source A

What can learn about the Pangkor Treaty from Source A? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Describes or lifts from the source	1
2	Inference – Sub-Message The Pangkor Treaty was a failure because Source A tells me that the “Residents of Perak after the murder of James Birch had to confine their official duties to the offering of “advice” under the same conditions as those which brought Birch to grief.	2
3	Inference I can learn that the Pangkor Treaty was eventually a success as it led to the consolidation of British control in Perak. This is supported by the source which states “It was therefore eventually possible to work out a system whereby the Resident’s actual control could be clothed in the forms of “advice”, financial security achieved, and investment and trade encouraged.” This shows that the Pangkor Treaty allowed the British to fulfil their objectives of ensuring stability to bring about economic growth in Perak.	3-4
4	Inference in Context L3 + after the Perak War, the British appointed Hugh Low as Resident. Low was able to improve relations with the Sultan and introduce the State Council which dramatically improved the administration of the state, ushering in a period of rapid economic growth in Perak.	5

1(b) Study Source B

Why do you think William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah? [5]

Explain your answer.

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Description of Source	1
2	Context only William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah because of the problems of the Residential System,	2
3	Message / Outcome William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah to warn him about his unwillingness to implement the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. OR William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah to force Abdullah to accept direct rule by the British.	3
4	Message and Outcome	4
5	Message + Outcome in Context William Jervois wrote this letter to Sultan Abdullah to warn him about his unwillingness to implement the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. This is supported by the source which states "You have proved himself unable to govern the country by yourself, have not taken the advice of the Resident, nor fulfilled the engagements made at Pangkor, and you are responsible for not having done so." The letter was written on 27 September 1875 at a time when the Residential System was failing as a result of the resistance by the Malay Chiefs and their unwillingness to comply with Birch's actions. As a result, Jervois wanted to adopt direct rule in the form of the Queen's Commissioner system. Thus by threatening Abdullah, Jervois wanted to force Abdullah to adopt the Queen's Commissioner system or face removal by the British.	5

1(c)

Study Sources C and D.

Are you surprised by Source C? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Provenance only	1
2	Surprised based on content of Source C I am surprised by Source C because it tells me that Sultan Abdullah did not follow the Pangkor Treaty / treated his subjects badly.	2-3
3	Surprised based on cross-reference to Source D I am surprised by Source C because it tells me that Sultan Abdullah did not follow the advice of the Resident when the Source states “, he maintains his position simply by the presence of the Resident whose advice he disregards and whose instructions he heeds not. He normally does not act upon the advice of the Resident and only acts when the Resident has held out threats of the Governor's displeasure and the possibility of his being deposed.” This is surprising when I cross refer to Source D which clearly states that the Sultan would need to surrender power to the Resident when it states “whose advice must be asked and acted upon on all questions other than those touching Malay Religion and Custom.” Since Abdullah had signed the Pangkor Treaty, he should have been aware of this term of the treaty, thus it is surprising that he did not follow the terms of the Pangkor Engagement.	4-5
4	Not Surprising - Analysis of the context of Source C. In my final analysis, it is not surprising that Abdullah did not follow the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. Given that there was a delay in the appointment of James Birch as Resident, Abdullah would have consolidated his power and would have been used to acting without the advice of the Resident. Thus it would not have been surprising that he would not ignored the Resident and acted on his own authority.	6

1(d)

Study Sources E and F.

How far does Source F prove that Source E is wrong? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Undeveloped Provenance	1
2	Proves due to content difference Source F proves that Source E is wrong as it contradicts the claims made by E. Source F tells me that the terms of the Pangkor Treaty were ultimately beneficial for Perak as the Residential System would have solved many of Perak's problems when the source states "This is why the only remedy is the intervention of an impartial power in whom all the parties have confidence, and whose word and decision in all matters of dispute will carry authority. This is what the appointment of British Residents representing the British Government would achieve." On the other hand, Source E tells me that the terms of the Pangkor Treaty were ineffective when it states "hindering the industrial development of the countries by removing the guarantee of justice and property security."	2-3
3	Prove/Does not prove based on Cross-reference / Contextual Knowledge Source F is unreliable and cannot prove that Source E is wrong as it is challenged by Source B which tells me that the Pangkor Treaty was ineffective as the Sultan was unwilling to follow the terms of the treaty when it states "You have proved himself unable to govern the country by yourself, have not taken the advice of the Resident, nor fulfilled the engagements made at Pangkor..."	4-5
4	Not reliable – context of Source F In my final analysis, Source F was written at a time when the Pangkor Treaty had just been signed in January. Thus the newspaper was likely to be more optimistic about the possibilities offered by the Pangkor Treaty. It cannot prove Source E wrong as Source E was written after the end of the Perak Wars after the murder of James Birch where all the failings of the Pangkor Treaty had been laid bare. Thus given the difference in context between the two sources, Source F cannot prove that Source E is wrong.	5-6

(e) Study all the sources.

'The Pangkor Treaty was a success for the British.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use. <i>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.</i> Yes Source A – Eventually led to long-term British control Source A supports the statement because it tells me that the Pangkor Treaty was successful in the long-term as it led to British control. This is supported by Source A which states “It was therefore eventually possible to work out a system whereby the Resident’s actual control could be clothed in the forms of “advice”, financial security achieved, and investment and trade encouraged.” This shows that the British were able to make adjustments to the Residential System such that it was eventually acceptable to the Malays and gave them the power to do what they wanted in Malaya. Source D – Led to the installation of British Resident and gave British control over administration Source D supports the statement because it tells me that the Pangkor Treaty helped the British gain control over the administration of Perak. This can be supported by the source which states “ the collection and control of all Revenues and the general administration of the country be regulated under the advice of these Residents” This shows that the British were able to gain control of the administration of the country to make it more efficient and ensure that the British were able to benefit from their control over the state. Source F – Would help to solve Perak’s problems or maintain stability in Perak. Source F supports the statement because it tells me that the Pangkor Treaty would allow the British to install a Resident who would ensure that there was no instability in the Perak. This is supported by the source which tells me” This is why the only remedy is the intervention of an impartial power in whom all the parties have confidence, and whose word and decision in all matters of dispute will carry authority.” Thus by installing a Resident, the British would be able to mediate between parties who had disputes and prevent them from getting out of hand ensuring greater stability in the state of Perak. No Source B – Sultan did not implement terms of the treaty Source B does not support the statement because it tells me that the Sultan did not adhere to the terms of the Pangkor Treaty. This is supported by the source which states “You have proved that you are unable to govern the country by yourself, have not taken the advice of the Resident, nor	2-4

	fulfilled the engagements made at Pangkor, and you are responsible for not having done so." This shows that the Treaty failed as it did not allow the British to assert any control over the Sultan. Source C – Resident lacked power to carry out his powers. Source C does not support the statement because it tells me that the Resident was powerless to control the Sultan. This can be supported by the source which states " He only acts when the Resident has held out threats of the Governor's displeasure and the possibility of his being deposed." This shows that the Resident has virtually no power or influence over the Sultan and had to resort to threats to carry out his duties. Source E – lack of confidence in the Residential System Source E does not support the statement because it tells me that the Residential System that was implemented because of the Pangkor Treaty was ineffective. This is supported by the source which states that " those knowledgeable about the States and the Pangkor Treaty believe this advisory system merely postpones the need for direct rule which would inevitably be necessary after some future action against British subjects or the dignity of British authorities by the natives." This shows that the British had little influence over the actions of the locals through the Residential System which would eventually have to be replaced by direct rule.	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i> <i>For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (ie +1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks must not exceed 8.</i>	5-8

Section B

2	"The extension of French control in Vietnam c.1870s was the result of the French desire to restore their prestige." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	--	------

L1	Identifies/Describes French desire to restore their prestige or how other reasons led to the extension of French control.	1-3
L2	Explains why French desire to restore their prestige or other reasons led to the extension of French control.	4-5
	I agree with the statement that the extension of French control in Vietnam in the 1870s was the French desire to restore their national prestige. Following a humiliating defeat in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871), French national pride was shattered. In the late 19th century, the "race for colonies" had intensified among European powers, and overseas empires were seen as a key measure of a nation's strength. The French government, initially hesitant about colonial conquests, changed its policy to compete. This was heightened by rumours of German designs on Northern Vietnam. The prospect of their Germany, gaining a foothold in a region of French interest was a potential second humiliation that France was determined to avoid. Consequently, France decided to accelerate its expansion into Northern Vietnam. This was a direct response to the need to reassert its status as a great power and was driven by the fear of being outmaneuvered by European rivals like Germany and even Britain, who was expanding its influence in neighbouring Burma. By securing Vietnam, France could project its power globally, demonstrate its recovery from the war, and prevent potential German encroachment into its sphere of influence. Thus, by expanding its empire and preventing German encroachment, the French would be able to regain prestige and restore its reputation as an imperial power.	
L3	Explains why French desire to restore their prestige and other reasons led to the extension of French control.	6-8
	On the other hand, the extension of French control in Vietnam was also driven by the need for new trading bases to access the lucrative China market. Initially, the French aimed to establish a major commercial hub in Vietnam that could rival the British colonial ports of Singapore and Hong Kong, hoping to redirect the profitable China trade through Saigon. They believed that the Mekong River could provide a navigable "back route" into the resource-rich province of Yunnan in Southwest China, which would grant them access to valuable goods like Chinese tea, silk, and textiles. However, expeditions soon revealed that the Mekong was filled with rapids and waterfalls, making it entirely unsuitable for large-scale trade. As a result of this discovery, the French realised that their economic ambitions could not be achieved from their base in Cochin-China alone. Their focus, therefore, shifted northward to the Red River in Tonkin, which was identified as the only viable waterway into China. Consequently, French officials saw the need to adapt to these changing circumstances by seizing control over Northern Vietnam to secure this vital economic lifeline. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 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).	
--	--	--

2	"Hitler's rise to power in Jan 1933 was the result of the Great Depression." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	---	-------------

L1	Identifies/Describes Great Depression or how other reasons led to Hitler's rise to power.	1-3
L2	Explains why Great Depression or other reasons led to Hitler's rise to power.	4-5
	I agree that Hitler's rise to power was the impact of the Great Depression and so many people losing their jobs. When the Wall Street Crash happened in America in October 1929, it caused huge problems everywhere, including Germany. The US called back its loans and took away its investments from Germany. This plunged Germany into a deep economic crisis, meaning huge numbers of people lost their jobs. By 1932, a shocking 6 million Germans, which was 40% of all workers, had no jobs. This affected almost everyone: factory workers, farmers, and even middle-class families. Small businesses closed down, and what Germans earned dropped. People faced hunger, sickness, and many even lost their homes. The Weimar government, which was made up of different political parties working together, seemed unable to fix these problems and looked weak. This made Germans lose faith in their democratic government and want a stronger leader. Because of all this suffering, more Germans started to support extreme groups like the Nazis and the Communists. This meant the Nazis got a lot more votes, putting them in a powerful position where other politicians in the government were willing to make a deal with Hitler, which then allowed him to become Chancellor.	
L3	Explains why Great Depression and other reasons led to Hitler's rise to power.	6-8
	On the other hand, Adolf Hitler's powerful and convincing personality played a big part in winning over the German people. Hitler was an incredibly good and persuasive speaker. He was charming and knew how to understand what his audience was feeling, making him seem very honest to them. During the 1932 Presidential elections, even though he lost, he travelled all around Germany holding big rallies. He seemed like a strong and modern leader. He appeared to be a regular person who understood people and their problems. With people more willing to listen to new ideas because of the tough times during the Great Depression, Hitler used his speaking skills to convince these people to support the Nazis. This led to the Nazis getting many more votes, making them the biggest party in the German parliament. This strong position then made the right-wing politicians in the Weimar government want to make a deal with the Nazis, which allowed Hitler to become the Chancellor. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 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).	

3	"Japan's decision to bomb Pearl Harbour in December 1941 was due to the impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	---	------

L1	Identifies/Describes impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers or how other reasons led to the bombing of Pearl Harbour.	1-3
L2	Explains why impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers or other reasons led to the bombing of Pearl Harbour.	4-5
	I agree with the statement. The impact of World War 2 in Europe also created the opportunity for Japan to attack Southeast Asia. Holland and France under German occupation by 1940, leaving its colonies open to Japanese attack and occupation. The British were engaged in a war with Germany and Italy and was not in a position to stop Japan's expansion into Southeast Asia. This left the Southeast Asian colonies lightly defended giving Japan the advantage in its quest to expand its empire and seize the resources that it needed to continue the war in China. Thus Japan sought to exploit this opportunity as it felt that it was able to defeat the weakened forces of the colonial powers. In order to ensure that it could successfully exploit this opportunity, Japan decided to attack Pearl Harbour so as to eliminate the US Pacific Fleet in order to prevent any potential US interference in its attempts to expand its empire.	
L3	Explains why impact of WW2 in Europe on the colonial powers and other reasons led to the bombing of Pearl Harbour.	6-8
	On the other hand, Japan attacked Pearl Harbour as retaliation against USA for its increasingly hostile policies against Japan. In reaction to Japan's invasion of China, USA cancelled the 1911 commercial treaty with Japan in 1939, followed by a partial trade embargo on steel and scrap iron exports which cut off 80% of Japan's supply of materials to build weapons. This was followed up by USA freezing all Japanese assets in the US and imposing a general trade embargo against Japan in July 1941 in response to Japan's occupation of Vietnam. The actions of USA which deprived Japan of the crucial resources it needed to further its aggression in East Asia angered the Japanese who saw these policies as hostile attempts to frustrate its expansionistic plans. This culminated in the breakdown of the relations as USA and Japan entered into negotiations which failed as Japan could not agree with USA's demands for it to give up all its claims and territories in China and Manchuria. Thus, the actions of USA which seemed to be determined to stop Japanese from achieving its expansionistic ambitions provoked Japan into attacking PH in retaliation against USA. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 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).	

Sec 4 Preliminary Examination 2025
Core History Paper 2 (2174/02)
Suggested Answers
Section A: Source Based Case Study

1a. Study Source A. What can you learn from this source about the Cold War? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Misinterpretation of sources	1
L2	Sub-message Truman was very rude and unwise as a President	2
L3	Main message I can learn that <u>the Cold War was caused by Truman's inexperience and rash personality.</u> He met Molotov when he was only 11 days into his job as President. Despite being warned "that Poland was a sensitive issue of Russian security", he listened to other advisors and used "very tough language" which deeply offended Molotov. Truman then boasted about giving him a "straight punch to the jaw" but at the same time is insecure and asks "Do you think I did right?". Later he is forced to back down but by then "the relationship between the two powers had soured", meaning that they were less of Allies and increasingly rivals. The historian clearly believes that the conflict could have been avoided if Truman had made better decisions.	3-4
L4	L3 + context Eg. According to my contextual knowledge, when Truman was Vice President, Roosevelt did not involve him in foreign policy matters. He lacked Roosevelt's personal relationship with Stalin and wanted to appear strong and challenge the Soviets. As such he was ill-prepared to handle to diplomacy at the end of WW2. For the Soviets, Poland had been an invasion route twice for Germany and therefore a friendly government there was not negotiable, but Truman did not recognise this. Subsequently the Potsdam Conference was known for much friction between the superpowers and the tensions escalated from that point, leading to a full-blown Cold War.	5

1b. Study Source B. Why was the cartoon published? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Lifting from source	1
L2	Sub-message Eg. The USSR was very threatening to Europe	2
L3	Main message OR Outcome	3

	Eg. The cartoon was published to convince people in the West that the Soviet Union's actions caused the Cold War (Message) Eg. The cartoon was published so that Western audiences would support efforts to contain Communism. (Outcome)	
L4	Main message AND Outcome Eg. Eg. The cartoon was published to convince people in the West that the Soviet Union's actions caused the Cold War, so that Western audiences would support efforts to contain Communism. The cartoon portrays the Comintern as a giant, repulsive spider spinning a spiderweb stretching from the USSR to Eastern Europe. Its legs are reaching into Western Europe. The fact that the cartoon deliberately uses the old name of the Cominform (Comintern) highlights the fact that the USSR is carrying out its long-held goals of spreading communism worldwide. The caption "spinning a new web" hints at renewed aggressiveness by the Soviets. Hence the cartoon accuses the Soviets of actively trying to take over Europe and causing tensions with the West.	4
L5	L4 + Context E.g. Source B was published with regards to the formation of Cominform in September 1947 and the "salami tactics" used by the Soviets since 1945 to establish pro-Soviet governments in Eastern Europe after WW2. Using underhanded means like smear tactics, assassinations and interference with elections, a "web" of Soviet control was spun over this area. Cominform was created to control these nations from Moscow, and Germans in the democratic zone feared that the communists would continue to expand their influence westward. Hence this cartoon was drawn to warn of the looming danger.	5

1c. Study Source C How useful is Source C as evidence about the start of the Cold War? Explain your answer. **[6]**

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Useful / Not useful, based on provenance unsupported	1
L2	Useful / Not useful, based on content Eg. Source C is useful as evidence as it shows that the Cold War was caused by the US using its atomic monopoly to intimidate the USSR. Zhukov says "It was clear that the US intended to use the atomic weapon to achieve its Imperialist goals from a position of strength in the Cold War." This is illustrated in the vague way Truman informed Stalin about the bomb, with the implied motivation of scaring him. The Soviets also viewed the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as a demonstration of power to the USSR, "without any military need whatsoever". This means that the USSR was forced to accelerate its nuclear program for self-defence. The resulting arms race and mutual fear of total destruction caused the Cold War.	2-3

L3	L2 + Useful / Not useful, based on cross-referencing of content to other sources/CK Eg. Source C is reliable and useful as it is supported by Source A. Source A shows that Truman chose a posture of confrontation, ignoring advisors who told him to take Soviet perspectives into consideration. He boasted about giving Molotov a verbal “straight punch to the jaw”, showing his harsh attitude and desire for superiority. This matches his behavior in Source C where he obviously uses news about the atomic bomb to intimidate Stalin. OR Source C is reliable and useful as it is supported by my Contextual Knowledge. Truman was new to his role and to Stalin. He was initially was keen to secure Stalin’s support in the war against Japan. However, when he heard of the successful test during the Potsdam Conference, he used it to intimidate Stalin. Since Stalin already knew of it from his spies, he accelerated his own nuclear program which was in progress. Thus Truman’s actions created the start of mutual hostility that led to the Cold War.	4-5
L4	L2 + Not useful, based on critical analysis Eg. Source C is not reliable and thus not useful as evidence because it was a memoir written while the Cold War was still ongoing in 1971. Thus Zhukov would have to uphold Soviet viewpoints or face censorship. He would also want to justify Soviet involvement in the Cold War, portraying it as a heroic struggle against American threats. His bias can be seen in how he accuses the US of sacrificing two Japanese cities purely to intimidate the USSR, when in fact there were serious reasons why it was needed to force a surrender and limit casualties.	6

- 1d. Study Sources D and E.** After reading Source D, does it make Source E surprising? Explain your answer **[6]**

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Surprised / Not surprised, based on lifting	1
L2	Surprised / Not Surprised, based on content Eg. Source D makes me surprised about Source E as they differ in terms of who was to blame for the Cold War. D strongly blames the USA for wanting to take away the “economic and political independence” of Europe and put “under American control the major sources of coal and iron in Europe”, stirring the communists to “be the leaders in the struggle against the new American expansionist plans”. E blames both sides for starting the Cold War due to “mutual fear” and that “each side bears its share of responsibility” for ideological confrontation. Hence Gorbachev sees them as equally responsible, as they provoked each other into a cycle of reaction and escalating hostility.	2-3

	OR Eg. Source D does not make me surprised about Source E as both sources state that it was communist ideology which motivated the USSR to oppose the US. D states that Communists everywhere must take on “the special task of leading the resistance” to America. E blames the “hard core of ideological constructs” that created a “flaw in Soviet foreign policy” and “nourished an atmosphere of confrontation toward the West”.	
L3	L2 + Surprised / Not surprised, based on cross-reference to CK OR Both sides of L2 Eg. Source D makes me surprised about Source E as Source E is challenged by Source F. Source F states that based on the latest historical research, the Soviet Union was really to blame based on Stalin’s paranoia, which “made conflict unavoidable” with Western democracies who believed in a society where all could feel safe. On the other hand, E states that both sides were equally to blame, and that “Which side bears the greater responsibility is a question that has not yet been answered by objective historians in a convincing way”.	4
L4	L2 + Not Surprised – Context of the 2 sources Eg. Source D does not surprise me about Source E due to the context of each source. Source D was spoken in September 1947, in response to the Marshall Plan. It was natural for the Soviet Union to feel threatened as they lacked America’s financial resources to do the same in Europe. Hence Zhdanov would strike an aggressive tone calling for Communist unity against “American imperialism”. Source E was published in 2000, after the fall of the Soviet Union. Even though Gorbachev was an ex-Soviet leader, he could afford be candid at this point and blame both sides since he need not defend the USSR’s point of view. He also had the benefit of hindsight and personally saw the flaws in Communism which led to its long-term stagnation.	5-6

1(e) Study all the sources.

"The Cold War was caused by American actions." How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[8]**

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use. <i>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.</i> Yes Eg. Source A supports the view because it showed that Truman's inexperience and rash decisions caused unnecessary tension between the wartime allies. He ignored warnings that "Poland was a sensitive issue of Russian security" and used "very tough language" to accuse Molotov to his face of breaking agreements. He was ignorant of Roosevelt's agreements with the Soviets and had to back down later. However, the "relationship between the two powers had soured" by then. The source implies that the Soviets were shocked by his attitude and would have not retaliated if Truman had been more diplomatic and aware of foreign relations. Eg. Source C supports the view as it shows that Truman's knowledge of the successful bomb test caused him to sabotage wartime unity at the Potsdam Conference and becoming more hostile to the Soviets. He tried to hint about the bomb to Stalin, hoping to intimidate him. However, this merely spurred the Soviets to "speed things up" and push for atomic parity. This arms race created the mutual fear of destruction leading to the Cold War. Eg. Source D supports the view as it says that the American Marshall Plan was a plot to build a new 'Empire' in Europe, thus requiring all Communists to unite in response. It blames the USA for wanting to take away the "economic and political independence" of Europe and put "under American control the major sources of coal and iron in Europe". Thus the financial might of the US caused Communist movements to feel threatened, igniting an ideological struggle across the continent and beyond. No Eg. Source B does not support the view as it blames Communist expansionism for the war, symbolised by a giant spider spinning a spiderweb stretching from the USSR to Eastern Europe. Its legs are reaching into Western Europe. This means that Soviet "salami tactics" have succeeded in grabbing Eastern Europe, and that they sought expansion into Western democracies. The deliberate reference to the old name of the Cominform (Comintern) highlights the fact that the USSR is carrying out its long-held goals of spreading Communism worldwide. This would force the West to defend itself by seeking to contain Communism, sparking Cold War tension.	2-4

	Eg. Source E does not support the view because it states that both sides were equally to blame, due to “mutual fear” and that “each side bears its share of responsibility” for ideological confrontation. It also notes that the “hard core of ideological constructs” in the USSR created a “flaw in Soviet foreign policy” and “nourished an atmosphere of confrontation toward the West”, which generated a Western response and hence the Cold War. Eg. Source F does not support the view as it states that the Soviet Union was influenced by Stalin’s paranoia and thus inevitably clashed with the US, since he did not trust anyone, let alone a foreign power. Gaddis saw Stalin as “the ultimate narcissist who thought only about his own security”. This “made conflict unavoidable” with Western democracies who believed in a society where all could feel safe. As such the Cold War erupted as Stalin never thought peaceful coexistence was a possibility and acted in a way which provoked the West to respond.	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i> <i>For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (ie +1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks must not exceed 8.</i>	5-8

Sec 4 Preliminary Examinations 2024
Core History (2174/02)
Suggested Answer scheme
Section B: Essays [20m]

2	"Germany was defeated by 1945 because of ineffective leadership." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
L1	Identifies/Describes ineffective leadership or how other reasons led to the defeat of Germany.	1-3
L2	Explains why the ineffective leadership led to the defeat of German or other reasons which led to the defeat of Germany.	4-5
	I agree with this statement that ineffective Leadership contributed Significantly to Germany's Defeat because Germany made several critical errors in its war against the Allies due to an inefficient command structure and Hitler's direct interference in military decisions. Germany's defeat was significantly influenced by Adolf Hitler's critical strategic errors, particularly his direct interference in military decisions at Stalingrad and his unforced declaration of war on the USA. In the Battle of Stalingrad, Hitler overruled German military commanders who advocated for withdrawal, despite the city holding no strategic importance. His insistence on capturing the city led to a massive defeat and the loss of a large German field army, a blow from which Germany was unable to recover, thus granting the advantage to the Soviet Army. <u>This decision meant that Germany had lost the advantage on the Eastern Front, leading to a series of massive Soviet victories, leading to Germany having to retreat from the Eastern Front. This eventually led to the invasion of Germany by the Allies on both Eastern and Western Fronts, by 1945, Germany had been overrun and was unable to continue fighting, leading to its surrender.</u>	
L3	Explains why the ineffective leadership led to the defeat of German or other reasons which led to the defeat of Germany.	6-8
	I disagree with this statement as USA's Overwhelming Resources and Military Strategies was the main reason for the defeat of Germany. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, the USA mobilized its industry to support the war effort, becoming the "Arsenal of Democracy" capable of outproducing both Japan and Germany single-handedly. From 1942 onwards, the United States supplied the Allies with food, raw materials, industrial equipment, weapons and ammunition, ships and aircraft. This enabled the Allies to replace their losses easily as compared to Germany and allowed them to outnumber the Germans. This allowed the Allies to wear the Germans down with their superior industrial capacity to the point where Germany could no longer continue fighting as it lacked the equipment and resources to do so, ultimately leading to Germany's unconditional surrender Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 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).	

3	"US intervention in Korea in 1950 was due to the need to stop the spread of Communism." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	--	------

L1	Identifies/Describes the need to stop the spread of communism or how other reasons led to US intervention in Korea.	1-3
L2	Explains why the need to stop the spread of communism or other reasons led to US intervention in Korea.	4-5
	I agree that US intervention in Korean in 1950 was due to the need to stop the spread of Communism. The fall of China to Communism in 1949 generated immense political pressure on the Truman administration, as the Republican Party criticized them for being weak in combating the spread of communism. This outcry directly led to a significant review of US foreign policy, culminating in the highly influential NSC-68 document. NSC-68 marked a crucial turning point, committing the United States to a more confrontational stance against any perceived Communist threat, advocating for the use of military force to halt its expansion. Consequently, when North Korea openly invaded South Korea in June 1950, the Truman administration felt compelled to intervene, lacking any political justification to withhold support. Failure to act decisively would have been widely interpreted as encouraging further Communist aggression through armed conflict, thereby undermining the newly US influence in Asia and risking a wider domino effect across Asia.	
L3	Explains why the need to stop the spread of communism and other reasons led to US intervention in Korea.	6-8
	I disagree as the USA intervened in Korea in 1950 to uphold its power. As the dominant power in Asia, particularly following its post-war influence in Japan, the United States viewed North Korea's invasion of South Korea which was clearly supported by Soviet weapons and advisors, as a direct and undeniable challenge to its global power and prestige. Given that the USA and European countries had just signed the NATO agreement, it was thus necessary for a strong response to aggression. As a result, this aggressive act necessitated a resolute response from the Truman administration to uphold its standing as a superpower. Failure to act would have severely undermined America's credibility on the international stage and could have been perceived as a weakness, signaling to other nations that the USA was unwilling or unable to protect its allies against armed aggression, thus jeopardizing its influence and position throughout Asia and beyond. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 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).	

3	"The French defeat in the First Indochina War was due to the strength of the Viet Minh." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
----------	---	------

L1	Identifies/Describes the strength of the Viet Minh or how other reasons led to the French defeat in the First Indochina War.	1-3
L2	Explains why the strength of the Viet Minh or other reasons led to the French defeat in the First Indochina War.	4-5
	I agree that the strength of the Viet Minh's effective military tactics contributed to the French defeat in the First Indochina War. By mid-1946, the Viet Minh had developed into a strong army of approximately 100,000 troops, led by General Vo Nguyen Giap. They initially avoided direct battle with superior French forces and waged guerrilla warfare, causing a steady stream of French casualties. As their forces grew stronger, they adopted more aggressive tactics, eventually launching general offensives to retake cities from the French. They learned and adapted tactics from the Soviets, Chinese communists, and the French Resistance. Viet Minh agents also assassinated Vietnamese administrators working for the French and set off bombs. This continuous pressure progressively lowered French morale and forced the French to adopt brutal tactics, such as bombing and burning suspected villages or summary executions, which inadvertently helped the Viet Minh build up their support base among the rural population while the French lost it. The Viet Minh were able to stave off defeat and create time and space to build up an effective fighting force to take on the French. This allowed them to gain momentum and wore the French down resulting in the French realization that the war was unwinnable leading to the French defeat in the First Indochina War.	
L3	Explains why the strength of the Viet Minh or other reasons led to the French defeat in the First Indochina War.	6-8
	I disagree with the statement as ineffective French strategies and their failure to secure or maintain local popular support significantly undermined their war effort. By 1948, the war had reached a stalemate, with the French controlling major cities but struggling to assert control over the rural regions, which were largely under communist influence. French forces became increasingly frustrated and ruthless, resorting to brutal tactics such as bombing and burning villages suspected of harboring Viet Minh, summary executions, and massacres, like the one at Gio Linh in Central Vietnam. Despite increasing American economic and material support, the French were unable to decisively defeat the Viet Minh, even in open warfare, by 1951. The human cost was also unsustainable, with French officers killed outnumbering newly trained officers in 1952. These brutal tactics led to a significant loss of local support for the French. This alienation of the population ironically helped the Viet Minh in building their support base. The French's inability to inflict a decisive defeat on the Viet Minh, even when they were weaker, allowed the Viet Minh valuable time to build up their strength. The heavy casualties and lack of clear progress led to a growing loss of support for the war in France itself, increasing domestic pressure to end the conflict. As a result, the French realised that the war was unsustainable and decided to end the war. Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 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).	