

Answers to SBQ

1a	Study Source A. What can you learn from the source about British attitude towards colonialism in the 19th century. Explain your answer. L1: Sub message [1] I can learn from the source that the British were keen to colonise other states. L2: Message without evidence [2] I can learn from the source that the British attitude towards colonialism was paternalistic. The British saw the locals as uncivilised and less capable , thus they were in need of British guidance. L3: Main message [3-4] with evidence from the source. Award the higher mark for a more well-explained answer. I can learn from the source that the British attitude towards colonialism was paternalistic. The British saw the locals as uncivilised and less capable, thus they were in need of British guidance. This can be seen from the cartoon where a British leader was drawn standing tall and confident which suggests a sense of British dominance and superiority over the locals. The locals were drawn smaller and half-naked which reinforced the mindset that they were backwards and in need of British guidance. L4: Reason based on purpose [5] L3 + The purpose of the cartoon is to criticise the hypocrisy of the British rule. The British believed that they were helping the locals as seen in the big British flag in the background but in fact the British were not there to 'help' the natives of Malaya, but were there to exploit them as seen by the tools held in the hands of the British soldiers in the cartoon. The cartoonist wants to provide a clear understanding to the audience reading the cartoon that the British interference in the state was more for their own interest. Thus, they should not support the British actions in the Malay states.	5
----	--	---

1b	Study Sources B and C.	6
	Having read Source B, are you surprised by Source C? Explain your answer	
	L1: Answers based on provenance/ source type [1]	
	Eg I am surprise/not surprise because of the provenance of the 2 sources. Source B is taken from Sir Andrew Clarke's letter to the Colonial Secretary Lord Kimberley while Source C is taken from Frank Swettenham's book.	
	L2: Answers based on difference in content with no common statement [2]	
	L3; Answers based on similarity in content with common statement clearly stated and explained [3-4]	
	Eg Having read Source B, I am surprised by Source C as both sources have different views on the reasons for British intervention in the Malay states. Source B states that the reason for British intervention was the fear of foreign intervention. This can be seen from, "However, it would be a serious matter to us if any other European Power were to obtain a footing on the Peninsula and control these states." There was this fear that if the British government refused to intervene, some other foreign power might do so and hence have control of the Malay states. Source C, however believes that it was a sense of duty from the motives of humanity alone that motives British intervention in the Malay states. This is evident from, "The duty was imperative from motives of humanity alone" This shows that Swettenham believed that the British as the dominant power has the duty to put a stop to the messy affairs in the Malay states and save the locals from themselves.	
	L4: L3 + Answers based on difference in provenance and hence their purpose clearly explained [5-6]	
	L3 + Having read Source B, I am not entirely surprised by Source C as the 2 sources are perspectives of 2 different British officials writing in their different capacity. Source B was Clarke's letter to Lord Kimberley was an appeal for the Colonial Office to change the policy in the Malay states from non-intervention to intervention. Clarke was the new man appointed as Governor of the Straits Settlements. He was writing to Kimberley, the Colonial Secretary. He would have to respond to the appeals of the Straits community because their investments in the Malay states were quite intensive and in danger because of the anarchy in the Malay states. He highlighted concerns over political instability, economic opportunities, and the threat of rival European powers expanding their influence in the Malay states. His letter aimed to convince the Colonial Secretary of the need to change the policy to intervention. Source C, on the other hand is an extract taken from Frank Swettenham's book. Swettenham was a prominent British colonial administrator and held various position of importance in British Malaya. He played a key role in extending British influence in the Malay states. The book was probably written in his retirement from office. The extract taken from his book was his interpretation of the reason for British intervention. Swettenham was one of the numerous individuals who believed that the Western powers had a moral duty to bring peace and order to the Malay states. Source C aimed to convince the readers of his book that the British intervention was driven purely by a sense of moral responsibility and to bring order to the disgraceful state of affairs in the Malay states. He was trying to defend and justify British intervention in the Malay states. Hence, having read Source B, I am not entirely	

	surprised by Source C as they were perspective of British officials who had wrote In their different capacity.	
--	--	--

c	Study Source C. How useful is the source in helping you understand the motivation for British intervention in Perak? Explain your answer. L1: Undeveloped provenance [1] L2: Useful/not useful for what it tells about the reason for British intervention in Perak [2 – 3] <i>Award 2 marks for one aspect [useful OR not useful] and Award 3 marks for both aspects [ie useful and not useful]</i> The source is useful as it tells me that the British intervened in Perak because of a request for help from a native ruler. The source is a letter from Raja Abdullah to appeal to the British for help to restore order and governance in Perak. This is evident from, “..... to aid us by inquiring into these disturbances with authority, so that they may cease, and be settled properly and with justice.” This shows that Abdullah requested the British help to settle the disturbances in the state. OR/AND The source is limited as it does not tell me that the British intervened in Perak because of other reasons (can draw from contextual knowledge or the view of other source. Choose one) Eg It does not show the view of Source B which is Clarke’s letter to the Colonial Secretary Lord Kimberley. Source B states that the British intervened in Perak because of their fear of other powers coming into the Malay states. Source B states that the British intervened in Perak because of their fear of other powers coming into the Malay states. This is evident from, “However, it would be a serious matter to us if any other European Power were to obtain a footing on the Peninsula and control these states.” This shows that the British intervened in Perak because of their fear of another European power coming into the same area. This shows that the British intervened in Perak to safeguard their own interest. Source C - for humanitarian reason (White men’s burden) L3: Answers which argue that the source is not useful based on assertions about Raja Abdullah’s motives [4] The source is limited as it is Raja Abdullah’s letter to ask the British for help. It does not show view the real reason why Abdullah wrote the letter to Sir Andrew Clarke. Abdullah was embroiled in a succession dispute in Perak. He was one of the 3 claimants to the throne. He hoped to get the support of the British to secure the throne. Hence, the letter was motivated by his self-interest. This point can be supported by contextual knowledge.	
---	--	--

	L4: Answers which attempt to evaluate what is said by cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge. [5] (Answers which address just reliability and not utility should be given L2: 3 marks) The source is useful as it tells me that the British intervened in Perak because of a request for help from a native ruler. The source is a letter from Raja Abdullah to appeal to the British for help to restore order and governance in Perak. This is evident from, “..... to aid us by inquiring into these disturbances with authority, so that they may cease, and be settled properly and with justice.” This shows that Abdullah requested the British help to settle the disturbances in the state. Source D’s point can be supported by my contextual knowledge which states that Raja Abdullah wrote to the British for help. His letter brought the British into Perak with the signing of the Pangkor Treaty. (can cross-ref to contextual knowledge to show contradiction) L5: Answers which evaluate the source as in L4 but argue that the source is useful by evaluating Raja Abdullah’s purpose in context. [6] The source is useful to a large extent in helping me understand the reason behind British intervention in Perak. The letter provided the British with a formal invitation to intervene in Perak. In his letter, Raja Abdullah appealed to the British for help to restore order and governance in Perak. He expressed a desire to place Perak under British protection and requested the appointment of a British official to advise him on administrative matters. The purpose of the source was motivated by his own personal ambition, to claim the throne in Perak. To secure his position, bring order to his state and to leverage on British support.	
--	--	--

1d	Study Source E. Why do think the journal article was published? Explain your answer. L1: Describe the source without addressing the reason [1] The journal article was written by a Malay historian L2: Answers which misinterpreted the source [2] The source was published to show that the British were keen to extend their influence over the Malay states, to bring order to the states. L3: Answers based on the content of the source but not explained. [3] The source was published to criticise the British for interfering in the Malay states to secure their own economic interest. L4: Answers which shows clear understanding and explains the main message. Award 4 marks for one element of the main message, and 5 marks for two elements of the main message. The source was published to criticise the British for interfering in the Malay states to secure their own economic interest. The source claims that British intervention in the Malay states was to secure their own economic stakes. This can be seen from, 'It is essential to reiterate that there had never been a genuine 'civil war' or 'anarchy' among the Perak Malays in the 1870s until the involvement of external parties, which had ulterior motives.' This shows that the British portrayed the local governance of the Malay rulers as chaotic and ineffective, using this narrative to justify their intervention. However, the source argues that this depiction was exaggerated to legitimize British colonial ambitions.	5
----	--	---

e	Study all sources. ‘British intervention in the Malay states was to protect their own interest.’ How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. L1: Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use [1] L2: Yes or No, supported by valid source use [2-4] (Award 1 mark for each source use up to a maximum of 4 marks) L3: Yes and No, supported by valid source use [5-8] (Award 5 marks for 1Y and 1N, and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks.) Eg Source A does not support the view – white men burden Eg Source C does not support the view – for humanitarian reasons/white men’s burden. Source C does not support the view. It states, “ The duty was imperative from motives of humanity alone..” This shows that Swettenham believed that the British as the dominant power has the duty to put a stop to the messy affairs in the Malay states and save the locals from themselves. Hence, the source does not support the view as it shows that British intervention in the Malay states was motivated by a sense of duty being the more superior race and not because of their own self-interest. Eg Source D does not support the view – intervene because was asked to bring order to Perak. Eg Source F does not support the view – British intervened because invited by the Straits community to intervene to bring order to the Malay states. Eg Source B supports the view – fear of other European powers from coming into the Malay states, hence it was to protect their own selfish interest. This can be seen from, “However, it would be a serious matter to us if any other European Power were to obtain a footing on the Peninsula and control these states.” There was this fear that if the British government refused to intervene, some other foreign power might do so and hence have control of the Malay states. Hence, the source supports the view that British intervention was to protect their own interest. Eg Source E supports the view - British intervention in Perak was primarily driven by economic and strategic interests. Bonus of two marks (ie +1, +1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc but the total for the question must not exceed 8.	8
---	--	---

Answers to Sections B : Essays

2	‘The main reason for the extension of French influence into Vietnam was because of the economic gains.’ How far do you agree? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes but without focus on the question. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Eg French extended their influence into Vietnam because of economic gains, and also for the prestige of their country and also to civilize the Vietnamese.	1-3
L2	Explain the given factor OR Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of a factor OR explanation of other factor(s) and an additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	Explain the given factor AND other factor(s) <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of a factor AND an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 mark.</i> Eg The French extended their influence into Vietnam because of the economic gains that they stood to gain from Vietnam. In Europe, there was an increase in the demand for raw materials and cash crops due to the intensification of the Industrial Revolution after the mid 1850s. Vietnam had valuable mineral resources eg zinc, tin and coal. These raw materials were needed for the manufacturing French goods, Beyond raw materials, Vietnam also offered the possibility of trade opportunities. The French hoped to gain access to China via Vietnam. Vietnam’s rich resources and trading opportunities would generate more economic gains for France and made the French want to extend their control in Vietnam. AND Eg The French also wanted to extend their influence in Vietnam because of fear of competition from other European powers. Britain had been France’s key competitor for territories in SEA. The British occupied Burma and the Malay states. The French became concerned that the British would try to gain access to China through Burma and	6-8

	possibly expand their control into Siam. The French hoped to extend their control into Vietnam and explore alternative trading route into China. Hence, fear that other European powers like Britain would beat them to it pushed the French to extend their influence into Vietnam. Can also accept The French also extended their influence into Vietnam to restore the prestige of France after their defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. The French also extended their influence into Vietnam because of their belief in the 'civilising mission'. <i>(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 the different factors.)</i> <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks : ie L3/6 +2; L3/8 + 2</i>	
--	---	--

3	'The Treaty of Versailles was an unfair treaty.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes but without focus on the question. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Eg The TOV was a unfair treaty because of the harsh reparation sum, the strict military restrictions and the territorial losses imposed on Germany by the Allied Powers.	1-3
L2	Explain the given factor OR Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of a factor OR explanation of other factor(s) and an additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	Explain the given factor AND Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given factor AND an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 mark.</i> Eg The TOV was an unfair treaty. It was an unfair treaty because of the War Guilt Clause. Under Article of 231 of the TOV, Germany had to accept total blame for starting the war. This clause placed full responsibility for World War I on Germany and with it the huge reparation sum, the strict military restrictions and the vast territorial loses that Germany had to accept. The Germans found the treaty unfair as the causes of the war were complex and not solely Germany's fault. It was a complex system of alliance that brought about the war and Germany should not be made to bear the full responsibility for the war. The TOV was an unfair treaty because the Germans were not represented at the Versailles. The terms of the treaty were decided by the Allied powers and were announced to the Germans. The Germans were not part of the negotiation, and they were forced to sign the treaty or face an invasion within 24 hours. The Germans felt that it was unfair and they should have been represented at the Paris Peace Conference as they were not defeated at World War 1, they chose to stop fighting. Hence, the Germans felt that the treaty was unfair, and they should be given the opportunity to be part of the negotiation and should not be forced to sign the treaty. The TOV was an unfair treaty as the military terms of the treaty were harsh. The German forces had to be reduced to well below the pre-war levels. The army was limited to 100,000 men, Conscription was banned.	6-8

	There was to be no armoured vehicles, submarines or aircrafts. The navy could only have 6 battleships. Rhineland was to be demilitarized. The Germans felt that the TOV was unfair as no other members of the Allied Powers were disarmed to the same extent and the German military was so severely limited leaving the country very vulnerable to outside attacks. Can also accept, explain TOV unfair because of the reparation sum or the territorial losses. AND The Treaty of Versailles was not unfair. The treaty which the Germans imposed on Russia when Russia wanted to get out of World War One was even harsher. When the Russians wanted to leave World War One, the Germans imposed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on Russia. Under the treaty, the Russians were forced to give the Germans large areas of prime agricultural land, industrial areas and much of its coal mines. It also lost a third of its population and resources such as oil and iron stores. In addition, Russia was required to pay 6 billion marks in reparation to the Germans. Hence, the Treaty of Versailles was not entirely unfair to the German when we look at the terms Germany imposed on the Russians. The Treaty of Versailles was not unfair. Some terms were not unfair. The return of Alsace-Lorraine to France was not an unfair term as the territory belonged to France. Alsace-Lorraine was given to Germany after the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussia War, The return of Alsace-Lorraine to France was seen as a fair term as it was seen as restoring the territory to the rightful owner. The setting up of the League of Nations, an international body to help countries resolve disputes, was also seen as a not an unfair term. Unlike the other terms, the set up of the League was constructive, offering hope for future peace. It was a term was seen as fair and was a positive term of the Treaty of Versailles for Germany. Hence, not all the terms of the TOV was unfair. <i>(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 the different factors.)</i> <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks : ie L3/6 +2; L3/8 + 2</i>	
--	---	--

4	'The main cause of Japan's expansionist policy in the 1930s was because of the failure of the League of Nations.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes but without focus on the question. Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more. Japan embarked on her expansionist policy in the 1930s because of the failure of the League of Nations, the economic problems that Japan faced and the unfair attitude of the Western Powers towards Japan.	1-3
L2	Explain the given factor OR Explain 2 other factors Award 4 marks for an explanation of a factor OR explanation of other factor(s) and an additional mark for additional factor(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.	4-5
L3	Explain the given factor AND Explain 2 other factors <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given factor AND an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 mark</i> Japan embarked on the expansionist policy in the 1930s because of the failure of the League of Nations. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, China appealed to the League of Nations for support. The League took no immediate actions to stop Japan. It set up the Lytton Commission to look into China's appeal. A year later, the Lytton Report was presented. It was clear that Japan had acted unlawfully and Manchuria should be returned to China. The Lytton Commission condemned Japan's action and demanded that Japan withdraw from Manchuria. However, instead of withdrawing from Manchuria, Japan announced that they intended to occupy more of China. Japan rejected the Lytton Report and resigned from the League. The League's slow response and the failure to impose sanctions to punish Japan's aggression further emboldened Japan and encouraged the country to pursue its expansionist policy in SEA. AND Japan embarked on the expansionist policy in the 1930s also because of her economic problems. In the 1930s, Japan faced economic problems which were worsened by the Great Depression. Her shrinking export markets crumbled under rising protectionism during the period of the Depression years, triggering widespread unemployment,	6-8

	particularly in rural Japan. Japan also lacked essential raw materials such as oil, iron ore, coal, and rubber for her growing industries. These resources were critical for sustaining both Japan's economy and military ambitions. Japan needed to find the raw materials that her industries needed and the markets for her finished products. The invasion of resource-rich Manchuria in 1931 gave Japan access to coal and iron. Hence, Japan saw the expansionist policy was the only viable path to economic survival. It would give her the raw materials and the markets that she badly needed. Japan also embarked on her expansionist policy because of the unfair attitude of the European powers. Western powers' discrimination against her which fuelled Japan's ambitions to build an empire to rival the West. Eg the ratio decided at the Washington Naval Treaty was seen by the Japanese as discriminatory and unfair. Britain's criticism of Japan's invasion of Manchuria seemed hypocritical considering the many colonies that the British had established throughout Asia. All of these were seen as Western powers' unfair attitude towards the Japanese and were used by the militarists to push for an expansionist policy in the 1930s. Can also accept : Japan also embarked on her expansionist policy because of the rise of militarism in Japan. Japan also embarked on her expansionist policy because she wanted to be recognised as a world power. <i>(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 the different factors.)</i> <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks : ie L3/6 +2; L3/8 + 2</i>	
--	--	--

Answer Scheme

Section A: Source-based Questions

Qn	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Study Source A. What is the message of the source? Explain your answer.	5
L1	Describes the cartoon, or misinterpretation e.g. The message of the source is that the Soviet Union is a fortress which shows that they are protected. <i>OR</i> The purpose of the cartoon is to convince the people of the Soviet Union that they were protected.	1
L2	Sub-messages Award 2 marks if no support from the source is provided. e.g. The message of the source is that the Soviet Union needed security. The source shows Russia as a fortress surrounded by walls. The text on the walls reads "We want friendly states around us". This suggests that the Soviet Union were using the friendly states to ensure the security.	2-3
L3	Main message Award the higher mark for answers that are more developed. e.g. The message of the source is that the Soviet Union is using the need for buffer states as a means for endless expansion. The source shows Russia as a fortress surrounded by walls. The text on the first wall reads "We want friendly states around us", however the walls continue and the last walls states "And so on without end." This suggests that the Soviet Union will never stop needing buffer states which also indicates that it was more of an aggressive action rather than a defensive one.	4-5

Qn	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Study Source B. How useful is this source in helping us understand why Poland became communist after WWII? Explain your answer.	6
L1	Undeveloped provenance e.g. The source is useful because it was from 1945 and is about Polish leaders from other political parties.	1
L2	Useful/not useful based on content, supported with evidence Award the higher mark for a more developed answer or both sides (useful and not useful) e.g. The source is useful in telling me that non-communist political leaders had disappeared. Source B states that "list of 16 Poles reported as having disappeared included nearly all the leading figures of the Polish underground movement." <i>Award 3 marks for responses that cover useful AND not useful.</i>	2-3
L3	Useful/not useful based on source content, supported with evidence and cross-reference	4-5

	Award 5m for two-sided responses with valid cross-reference. e.g. The source is useful in telling me that non-communist political leaders had disappeared. Source B states that “list of 16 Poles reported as having disappeared included nearly all the leading figures of the Polish underground movement.” AND/OR e.g. The source is limited in telling me how the communists in Poland took over power as it does not mention anything about the communist parties. From the background information, I know that Stalin used salami tactics to help the communist take power. The background information states “by gradually dividing and weakening non-communist parties as well as arresting political opponents.” This would help the communists take power as their opponents would have been significantly weakened.	
L4	L3 + answers that evaluate the source’s purpose in context or purpose e.g. L3 + The source was a statement by the British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden. Although the Soviet Union is not explicitly mentioned, it suggests that the Soviet Union had violated the post-war agreements at Yalta and is an appeal that they should fulfill the promises made then. (i.e. Eden wants the Soviet Union to stop their actions.)	6

Qn	Answer	Marks
1(c)	Study Sources C and D. How far does Source D prove that Churchill (Source C) was mistaken about Soviet intentions? Explain your answer.	6
L1	Answers based on undeveloped provenance e.g. Source D cannot prove Source C wrong because it is from Stalin hence should not be trusted.	1
L2	Sources agree, hence Source D doesn’t prove Source C mistaken. Supported with relevant evidence. e.g. Source D doesn’t prove Source C wrong as they both agree that the communists were gaining power in Eastern Europe.	2
L3	Sources disagree, hence Source D does prove Source C mistaken. Supported with relevant evidence. e.g. Source D does prove Source C is mistaken in telling us Soviet intentions in Eastern Europe. The sources disagree on the reason why the communists were gaining power in Eastern Europe. Source C states that the reason was because the communists had imposed their will and states that the communists “have been raised to pre-eminence and power beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control”. However, Source D states that it is because of “The influence of the Communist Parties is growing because in the worst years of fascist domination in Europe the Communists were trustworthy, brave, self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime, for the freedom of the people” This suggests that communism was the choice of the people of Eastern Europe.	3

L4	Identifies agreement and/or disagreement and uses cross-reference to decide who is wrong. e.g. Source D does not prove Churchill is mistaken even though they disagree on the reason why the communists were gaining power in Eastern Europe. Source C states that the reason was because the communists had imposed their will and states that the communists “have been raised to pre-eminence and power beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control”. However, Source D states that it is because of “The influence of the Communist Parties is growing because in the worst years of fascist domination in Europe the Communists were trustworthy, brave, self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime, for the freedom of the people”. However, Source D is challenged by Source F which states that “in elections in Hungary and other states, the communist performance was very poor.” This suggested that the people of Eastern Europe did not choose communism.	4-5
L5	L4 + Evaluates the author’s purpose in Source D to decide whether the source can prove Source C wrong. e.g. L4 + Source D cannot prove Source C mistaken as Stalin was trying to convince the Soviet people that the rise of communism in Eastern Europe was justified / defend Soviet foreign policy. Hence, as Source D is unreliable in its purpose, it cannot prove Source C wrong in helping us understand Soviet intentions in Eastern Europe.	6

Qn	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Study Source E. Why was this source published at that time? Explain your answer.	5
L1	Answers question without relevant support or with irrelevant inference. e.g. The source was published in order to show that the US, Britain and France were working together on the Marshall Plan.	1
L2	Reason why the source was published, unsupported or with irrelevant support. e.g. The source was published in order to show that the US, Britain and France were destroying the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam.	2
L3	Reason why the source was published, supported. Award 4m for responses that are more developed. e.g. The source was published in order to show the people of the Soviet Union that the US, Britain and France were destroying the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam. The source shows the US, Britain and France using a battering ram to break down a door labelled “Yalta and Potsdam.” This suggests that the Marshall Plan violates the agreements drawn during those conferences and undermines post-war peace.	3-4
L4	L3 + evaluates the context (Marshall Plan) in relation to the target audience e.g. L3 + The source is to justify why the Soviet Union rejected the Marshall Plan. The source shows that the Marshall Plan isn’t about economic assistance but a	5

	potential threat/way for the West to dominate Europe/communist bloc/Soviet Union or threaten peace. (also possible: wanted to convince the people of the Soviet Union that Marshall assistance was a trick by using the Yalta and Potsdam agreements and leveraging on the emotional pull of the war that devastated the country)	
--	--	--

Qn	Answer	Marks																					
1(e)	“The Cold War was due to Western hostility towards the Soviet Union.” How far do the sources support this view? Explain your answer.	8																					
L1	Writes about hypothesis, no valid source use	1																					
L2	YES or NO supported by valid source use Award 1 mark for each source up to the maximum of 4 marks. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Source</th><th>Support</th><th>Does not support</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td><td></td><td>X</td></tr> <tr> <td>B</td><td></td><td>X</td></tr> <tr> <td>C</td><td></td><td>X</td></tr> <tr> <td>D</td><td>X</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>E</td><td>X</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>F</td><td>X</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> e.g. Source A does not support this view as it suggests the Cold War happened because the Soviet Union was aggressively expanding in Eastern Europe. The source shows the Soviet Union building many walls around their ‘fortress’ and that it was neverending. e.g. Source B does not support the view as it blames the Soviet Union for having violated the Yalta agreement. Source B states that the actions of the Soviet Union had prevented “a Government truly representative of Polish democratic political life and the Polish people.” e.g. Source C does not support the view as it states that it was the Soviets that were hostile instead. Source C states that “Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in some cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow.” e.g. Source D supports the view as it states that “Mr Churchill crudely and impudently slanders both Moscow and the neighbours of the USSr”. Hence, suggesting that the West was hostile towards the Soviet Union. e.g. Source E supports the view as it shows that the Western powers, US, Britain and France were using a battering ram labelled Marshall Plan to shatter the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. This suggests that the West was acting in a way that was hostile towards the Soviet Union as their actions were affecting post-war peace. e.g. Source F supports the view as it suggests the West was hostile towards the USSR. Source F states that the “Roosevelt’s death saw the United States pursue a tougher policy towards their former ally” which led to the Soviet reacting defensively.	Source	Support	Does not support	A		X	B		X	C		X	D	X		E	X		F	X		2-4
Source	Support	Does not support																					
A		X																					
B		X																					
C		X																					
D	X																						
E	X																						
F	X																						

L3	YES and NO supported by valid source use Refer to sample responses in L2 Bonus of up to two marks (i.e. +1,+1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc but the total for the question must not exceed 8. e.g. However, although Source E supports the view one must note that it hardly a reliable source. Source E is a Soviet cartoon that wants to convince the people of the Soviet Union/communist bloc that the West was threatening post-war peace. It wanted to undermine the economic assistance provided by the Marshall Plan. Hence, what it says cannot be used to support the fact that the Western powers were indeed hostile towards the Soviet Union.	5-8
-----------	--	------------

Section B: Structured Essay Questions

Qn	Answer	Marks
2	'Soviet resistance was the main reason why Germany was defeated in WWII' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes Soviet resistance or other reasons for German defeat <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> E.g. The Soviets had successfully reorganised themselves during the course of the war. The Soviets had developed effective new weapons and radio communications were adopted and radios were placed in all tanks and aircraft. The officers in the Red Army also did not face much interference as Stalin gave them greater freedom and independence to act. Other events: American efforts, German military weakness, etc	1-3
L2	Explains how Soviet resistance led to defeat OR Explains how other reason(s) contributed to the defeat of Germany <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reason(s) and/or additional supporting detail to a maximum of 5 marks. Marker's may also use their discretion to award up to a maximum of 5 marks based on quality of explanation.</i> E.g. Effective resistance efforts from the Soviets were one of the reasons why the Germans were defeated in WWII. The Soviet Union was able to reorganise and recover after Operation Barbarossa and put up a fierce resistance that turned the tide of war against the Germans. As part of their turnaround, the Soviets created specialist tank armies and an air force that had new, effective weapons which could be produced in large numbers. This ensured that the Soviet troops were well-equipped. As German losses mounted during battles like Stalingrad, the Germans were also unable to recover due to their lack of manpower and resources. Morale plummeted as a result of these heavy losses and the Germans were also effectively forced to retreat from the Soviet Union as well as the Eastern Front. OR E.g. American supremacy contributed to key German losses in various military battles and were an important contributor to German defeat. For example, the Americans were able to gain control of shipping routes across the Atlantic to Britain during the Battle of the Atlantic. The Americans managed to overcome the threats posed by German U-boats by using intelligence and radar technology to sink German U-boats. American supremacy was also shown in their ability to quickly build cargo ships to continue sending supplies. Their industrial capabilities ensured that cargo ships that were sunk by the Germans were quickly replaced. The supply route across the Atlantic was a crucial lifeline for the Allied forces in Europe and ensured that Britain and the USSR continued to have the resources to fend off German forces too. Thus, American supremacy in the Battle of the Atlantic led to losses of German equipment and manpower while further strengthening the Allied effort against the Germans as well. Other reasons: German weaknesses/mistakes during the war (i.e. second front)	4-5
L3	Explains how Soviet resistance AND other reason(s) contributed to the defeat of Germany.	6-8

	<i>Award 6marks for an explanation of how Soviet resistance and another reason that led to the defeat of Germany, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Refer to L2 for paragraph examples. Award an additional 1 or 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors. <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 1 or 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/7+1; L3/8+1; L3/9+1, etc).</i> E.g. Overall, American supremacy was the main reason why Germany was defeated in World War II. American industrial capabilities far surpassed the Germans and were key in ensuring the Americans had the upperhand in the war. Additionally, while the Soviets also had vast resources and strong industrial capabilities, they were also bolstered heavily by the Americans. American dominance on the battlefield led to key strategic defeats that the Germans could never recover from as well. This illustrates just how important American efforts were in sealing German defeat during WWII..	+1/+2
--	---	-------

Qn	Answer	Marks
3	‘The success of the Alliance Party were the main reason for Malayan independence in 1957.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes success of the Alliance Party or other reasons for decolonization of Malaya. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> E.g. United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) was formed in 1946 to safeguard Malau interests and oppose the Malayan Union scheme. UMNO later became the leading force in Malayan politics after they succeeded in persuading the British to replace the Malayan Union with the Federation of Malaya that was more aligned with the interests of the Malay community. They later formed the Alliance Party with the Malayan Chinese Association (MCA) and Malayan Indian Congress (MIC) which won a landslide victory in the federal elections, British perceived it as the Alliance Party earning the right to govern Malaya from the people. Other reasons: Changes to British colonial policies/British fear of communism, Malayan Emergency/Malayan Communist Party, Japanese Occupation encouraging local movements. <i>Marker’s note: Students who are not able to articulate the success of the Alliance Party but only aims will be kept at L1.</i>	1-3
L2	Explains how the success of the Alliance Party contributed to the decolonization of British Malaya OR Explains how other reason(s) contributed to the decolonization of British Malaya. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reason(s) and/or additional supporting detail to a maximum of 5 marks. Marker’s may also use their discretion to award up to a maximum of 5 marks based on quality of explanation.</i> E.g. The success of the Alliance Party helped Malaya gain independence as it showed that they had the mandate of the Malayan people. UMNO had sought the Malayan	4-5

	Chinese Association (MCA) for a partnership in the 1952 Municipal elections signaling the first collaboration between the two communal political parties. Later on Malayan Indian Congress (MIC) joined them, forming the Alliance Party to contest the federal elections. They won in a landslide victory and formed a federal government under Chief Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman. The landslide victory was significant as it showed that the people of Malaya supported and trusted the Alliance. This put them in a better position when negotiating with the British during the Merdeka Talks. The British became more willing to grant independence to Malaya OR E.g. British fear of communism led them to make changes that contributed to Malaya gaining independence in 1957. Fearful of a Communist take-over of Malaya by the Malayan Communist Party (MCP), the British engaged in battle with the MCP militarily and psychologically. To invalidate MCP's claim of bringing about independence to Malaya, the British sought to nurture a locally elected government made up of anti-communist leaders who were credible and acceptable to the people. They allowed Malayan leaders to gain administrative experience, introduced elections, and worked with UMNO to establish a stable government through collaborating with other ethnic parties. These actions demonstrated the British commitment to Malayan independence, weakening the local support for MCP and prepared local leaders for self-governance. With the MCP declining in influence and feeling confident in the ability of the local leaders to govern Malaya, the British granted Malaya independence in 1957, ending their colonial rule.	
L3	Explains how the success of the Alliance Party AND other reason(s) contributed to the decolonization of British Malaya. <i>Award 6marks for an explanation of how UMNO's efforts AND other reason(s) contributed to the decolonization of British Malaya, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Refer to L2 for paragraph examples. Award an additional 1 or 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors. <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 1 or 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/7+1; L3/8+1; L3/9+1, etc).</i> E.g. Overall, I disagree that the success of the Alliance Party was the main reason for the end of British colonial rule in Malaya. While their success proved to the British that they had the mandate of the people and that they were able to allay concerns of inter-ethnic tensions, I think the British efforts to stop the communist insurgency ultimately made it possible for the Alliance to be successful. The British implemented political reforms to prepare these local leaders and worked closely with UMNO to gradually gain independence. However, this was all driven by the fear of the Communists gaining popular support amongst the locals especially the Chinese community. The British commitment to this was the most important reason why the Alliance was able to be successful in the first place and paved the way for Malayan independence.	6-8 +1/+2

Qn	Answer	Marks
4	“American public opposition to the Vietnam War was the main reason for American troop withdrawal in 1973”. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	10

L1	Identifies/Describes the American public opposition or other reasons for American withdrawal from Vietnam <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> E.g. American withdrawal from Vietnam was also because of the extensive media coverage showing American atrocities in Vietnam. This led to public outrage over the war and widespread protests in the streets.	1-3
L2	Explains how American public opposition led to American withdrawal from Vietnam OR Explains how other reason(s) contributed to American withdrawal in Vietnam. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reason(s) and/or additional supporting detail to a maximum of 5 marks. Marker's may also use their discretion to award up to a maximum of 5 marks based on quality of explanation.</i> E.g. The lack of support from the American public led to American withdrawal from Vietnam as the government faced immense pressure to end their involvement. There was widespread media coverage on American involvement in the Vietnam War. The American public was horrified after the media released the atrocities committed by the American soldiers in Vietnam. For example, after the My Lai Massacre, they were outraged that US soldiers brutally murdered unarmed civilians – including women and children. Furthermore, measures like the military draft contributed even more to these anti-war sentiments. This led to widespread protests against US involvement in the war. The lack of support from the American public made it difficult for the US government to continue with the Vietnam war and was one of the reasons for their withdrawal. OR E.g. The high cost of war was also another reason that led to American troop withdrawal in Vietnam as they could no longer afford the war. The Vietnam War was a costly affair and had lasted much longer than the Americans had anticipated. The Americans were spending \$20 billion a year on the war. Furthermore, during this period there were growing needs domestically as a result of the civil rights movement and other costs related to the arms race and the Cold War. On top of that, oil prices were rising. Hence, this motivated American troop withdrawal as the economic costs made it difficult to sustain their continued involvement in Vietnam. Other reasons: Lack of support from congress, military stalemate, influence of Nixon	4-5
L3	Explains how Viet Minh's efforts AND other reason(s) contributed to the decolonization of French Vietnam. <i>Award 6marks for an explanation of how Viet Minh's efforts AND other reason(s) contributed to the decolonization of French Vietnam, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Refer to L2 for paragraph examples. Award an additional 1 or 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors. <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 1 or 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/7+1; L3/8+1; L3/9+1, etc).</i>	6-8 +1/+2

	E.g. The most important reason for American withdrawal in Vietnam was the lack of support from the American public. It led to widespread anti-war protests which disrupted people's daily lives and portrayed the Americans negatively to the rest of the world Furthermore, it is of note that members of Congress relied on the votes and support of their voters as well. As these voters were against the war, it would place pressure on Congress to support American withdrawal from the war as well.	
--	--	--