

Prelim History Core Paper 1, 2025
Section A (SBQ): Suggested Answer Scheme

1 (a) Study Source A.

Are you surprised by what Gladstone says?

[5]

L1	Identifies content which is/is not surprising but no reason given.	1m
L2	Provenance: Not surprised because he is the British Liberal Party leader and therefore dare to speak his mind.	2m
L3	*Surprised OR Not surprised, explained based on facts or differences/contradiction then verify by cross-referencing to contextual knowledge/other sources e.g. Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answer using contextual knowledge. <i>I am surprised that in Source A, Gladstone is telling the members of British parliament that they <u>should continue with a policy of non-intervention</u> despite new economic developments which would actually entail them to seek new resources and territory because of foreign competition as he clearly states that, "In the early 1870s, the accelerated pace of Industrial development in Britain and Europe increased the competition for foreign markets and raw materials. British business in Southeast Asia flourished in the trade boom which followed the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 regardless of the possible checks and trade barriers which might result from the expansion of interests from other foreign powers in Southeast Asia, especially the Malay Peninsula." <u>3m</u></i> <u>Cross-reference/Elaborate using CK</u> <u>Essentially, with the Industrial Revolution, and the Opening of the Suez Canal</u> Britain would thus face competition from European powers, like Germany seeking foreign colonies not only for economic but also political objectives especially in Southeast Asia. As such <u>one would expect</u> Britain to embark on territorial expansion to obtain raw materials for their industrial programme before other European powers <u>could do so as well as to find new markets to sell their manufactured goods.</u> Moreover, In Malaya there was civil unrest <u>and thus it did not only make Malaya vulnerable to foreign intervention but also disrupted the very lucrative tin trade and investments there.</u> Thus, it is surprising that Gladstone goes on to state that, "The British government are not alarmed by this, and we are still not in favour of annexation of territory or the imposition of direct rule because we believed more in free trade and economic benefits which is more profitable <u>as compared to acquiring territories and colonies as they would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy.</u>" <u>4m</u>	3-4m
L4	Surprised/Not Surprised based on Historical Context+ Intention +evidence+ target audience intended outcome, explained. <u>I am not surprise by what Gladstone said in Source A based on historical context.</u> Fundamental, this speech was made by Liberal Party leader Gladstone in the <u>year 1872.</u> By the early 1870s, with the "opening of the Sues Canal", the political climate was changing in Britain and Europe, where the British saw other European powers, like Germany seeking foreign colonies not only for economic but also political objectives especially in Southeast Asia. Moreover, In Malaya there was civil unrest and thus it did not only make Malaya vulnerable to foreign intervention but also disrupted the very lucrative tin trade and investments there. However, <u>Prior to 1874 the</u>	4-5m

	British followed their policy of non-intervention in Malay States as their interests in these states were basically commercial and not political. <u>Thus despite the above developments in terms of intense rivalry for territory to seek resources/power/prestige, I am not surprised by the Liberal Party leader Gladstone's speech to his party members as he wanted to justify and defend British government policy of non-intervention in the Malay States in order to primarily focus on profitable trade with them.</u> Essentially, his argument is that they should continue with a policy of non-intervention because <u>Interference in local politics and civil wars would mean, "...they would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy". As such I am not surprised</u> that Gladstone wanted to convince his party members <u>to continue to support</u> the government's direction of placing greater emphasis on trade rather than intervention into the Malay States in acquiring more territories.	
--	---	--

- 1(b) Study Sources B and C.
How similar are the sources? Explain your answer.

[6]

L1	Similar/different in Topic/provenance/ Describes/Lift Source Content	1m
L2	Similar Or Different in content, unsupported Award 2 marks for similar <u>Or</u> different in source content, unsupported. Award 3 marks for agree <u>And</u> different in source unsupported.	2-3m
L3	Similar and Different, supported Award 4 marks for Similar Or different in content, supported Award 5 marks for Similar And different supported <u>Similarity-</u> e.g. <u>Both sources B and C are similar in stating that the British intervened in the Malay States because it was in a state of anarchy</u> implying that the Malay rulers were unable to bring about peace and stability (Malay rule being a problem based on unenlightened leadership). Source C states that, "The present state of affairs in the Malay Peninsula is that the richest part of it is in the hands of the lawlessness and the turbulent." Similarly Source B states that, "The rich tin mines of the district of Larut had attracted large numbers of Chinese, whose rival factions were fighting with one another, creating much chaos." AND <u>Differences:</u> e.g. However, both sources B and C are different with regards to the chief reason for British intervention in the Malay States. The Malay Historian states that the main/reason/root cause for British intervention was to gain resources to gain profits and not for humanitarian reasons as Source C states that, "the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays." On the other hand, Source B tells us that the main reason for British intervention was because they were concern about the welfare of the Malays as opposed to economic reasons as Lord Kimberly stated that, "It is for humanitarian reasons alone that we have to intervene; and though it would be highly beneficial to British interest and British trade, this cannot be the primary reason."	4-5m
L4	Purpose - based on motive/purpose e.g. Both Sources B and C are have different intentions/motives. Source B is written from a British official's point of view, and the purpose of the writer was to criticize the Malay rulers for not being able to solve the disorders in their states in order to justify the need for British intervention and as such glorifies the British as saviours in order to justify the need to intervene in the Malay States not for their own selfish economic interest but solely for " humanitarian reasons alone ", as "It is our hope to save the Malays from themselves and give them the blessings of peace and justice." In addition, Lord Kimberly has a condescending attitude towards the Malays and portray the Malays as inferior and unable to take care of themselves; thus, is indirectly mocking and looking down on the Malays, as he states that British intervention was to "put a stop to this disgraceful state of affairs". Thus, he wanted to convince the British politicians that British intervention in the Malay States was the right thing to do and thus they should be supportive of it. On the other hand, in Source C it is more historical in nature/ matter of fact. The Malay historian writing in 1982 would have done research and thus the purpose of source C was to debunk British's claims that, " according to the	5-6m

	<i>British, the purpose of expansion was to protect and advance the sovereign Malay rulers and their people. This then was the official myth which was to legitimize British interest, expansion and rule right up until Merdeka in 1957.” Basically he wanted to enlighten the reader using historical evidence that the British had used humanitarian reasons as an excuse to intervene in the Malay states for the purpose of Empire building when he states that, “The truth of the matter was that the British began to follow a policy of Imperialism from 1873 onwards. Thus, the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays. Consequently, this led to the establishment of the Residential system, which was meant to be indirect rule, but in practice, became direct rule in order for the British to fulfil its primary goals.”</i>	
--	--	--

- 1 C) Study Source D.
What can you learn from this source about British intervention in the Malay States?
Explain your answer. [5]

L1	Inference, Unsupported	1m
L2	Inference, supported Award the higher mark for fully developed answers i.e. elaborating using contextual knowledge. <u>Inference 1</u> <i>I can learn from Source D that the British intervened in the Malay states because there was political anarchy in Perak. This was so based on the rivalry between the Secret Societies/The Secret Societies were fighting over the tin mines in Larut which resulted in violence and chaos in Perak because, “arms and ammunition were sent up the Larut River and at last a desperate attack was made upon the faction...” and this ultimately this led to political instability as “some of Malay chiefs became involved in this disputes” while they themselves were fighting over the succession to the throne. Thus, the British wanted to intervene in the Malay States to establish law and order/for humanitarian reason.</i>	2-3m
L3	2nd inference, supported Award 4 marks for 2nd inference, supported. Award the higher mark for fully developed answers i.e. the 5 th mark for elaborating using contextual knowledge. <u>Inference 2:</u> <i>I can also learn from Source D that the British intervened in the Malay states because of the economic instability brough about by the social unrest in Larut, Perak. This is evident as Source D states that, “many a times, robbery , murder or any other crimes committed in these places are not investigated and offenders are not punished,”. Hence because lawlessness and chaos prevailed in Perak, “Subsequently, the Straits merchants and the British traders had asked the British to intervene on their behalf”, as it disrupted their trading activities because of the succession disputes and Chinese Secret Society quarrels.</i>	4-5m

1(d) Study Sources E and F.

How far does what Carnarvon says in Source F prove what Jervois says in Source E wrong? Explain your answer.

L1	Yes it proves or not it does not but gives no reason Or No basis of comparison	1m
L2	Yes or/and No explained, supported by source content ONLY without any cross-referencing Award 2 marks for showing it can prove by highlighting reliability of source content i.e. similar facts/truths and comparing it with the other source. <i>e.g. Finds evidence in Source E to prove Carnarvon's claims in Source F claims is not wrong but actually correct by pointing <u>out reliability of Source E</u>, i.e. has factual information and that this evidence/facts is similar to Source F i.e. they corroborate</i> <u>OR</u> Award 3 marks for pointing that Source F does prove that F is wrong by highlighting and comparing Source E's factual evidence as opposed to the limitations/ false perceptions in Source F's content i.e. inaccurate facts/assumptions or insufficient information and comparing with the other source. <i>e.g Finds evidence in Source E which contradict Source F because Source F is based on false perceptions/ inaccurate information whereas Source E provides facts about the same issue</i>	2-3m
L3	Yes And NO – explained & supported by source content + <u>cross contextual knowledge/other sources</u> i.e. Award the higher mark for more developed answers which proves Source E's claims are correct and F's claims are wrong through cross-referencing to contextual knowledge Award 4 marks for showing it can prove by highlighting reliability of source content i.e. similar facts/truths and comparing it with the other source + cross-referencing. <i>i.e. Finds evidence in Source E to prove Carnarvon's claims in Source F claims is correct by pointing out reliability of Source E, i.e. has factual information and that this evidence is similar to Source F i.e. they corroborate + cross-contextual knowledge/other sources to verify and validate both are correct</i> <u>AND</u> Award 5 marks for finding evidence in Source F which prove Source E was wrong + cross-referencing <i>i.e. Finds evidence /facts in Source F which contradict Source E, showing Source D has limitations based on source content and inaccurate information based on a false/wrong assumption/perception about the same issue + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge to verify and validate Source C's reliability as opposed to Source E's limitation's or/and false perceptions.</i>	4-5m

Source F cannot prove Source E is wrong but can prove it is correct based

E.g. What Carnarvon says in Source F does not prove that what Jervois says in Source E is wrong but in fact was correct because they provide similar facts/their content match in terms of both acknowledging the fact that the British government's desire was to intervene in the Malay States in order to set up a Residential system whereby the Resident was **merely to assists the Sultan by giving advise as to the running of the state thus it was meant to be indirect rule.** In Source F, Carnarvon states that, "The essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers who would advise and assist them in the government of the country." This is similarly implied in Source E when Jervois states that, "Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request ..." From my contextual knowledge, I know that one of the terms of the Pangkor Engagement was for the Sultan to accept a British Resident to who would provide advise on all matters accept Malay Customs and Religion.

AND

Award 5 marks for showing does not prove by highlighting **limitations and/or false assumptions** of source E content i.e. **missing background information of why the Residents had become very powerful and/or inaccurate information based on own personal perception & judgment of author and contrasting it with Source F which states accurate information based on official British policy.** Then cross –reference to contextual knowledge to verify Source E is inaccurate and Source F is accurate.

However Source F can prove Source E is wrong:

However, what Carnarvon says in Source F does prove that what Jervois said in Source E is wrong because they contradict each other in terms of whether politically, the British government meant in reality to establish indirect rule as opposed to direct rule/the role of the Resident. For Jervois he claims that the British official stand right from the beginning was to establish direct rule. This is so as Jervois states in Source F that from his observation after visiting 'Perak , Selangor and Sungei Ujong" that it was obvious that in **reality British intervention was more of direct rule** as, "When I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned" **However, the factual description by Jervois is not useful as evidence to show that British rule in Malaya was actually one of direct rule because it is limited in nature as Jervois does not give background details to explain the circumstances that led to this preexisting situation i.e. of the Residence having more powers than the Sultan/Malay chiefs.** Moreover, the subsequent **claims made by Jervois** that "I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here" **is inaccurate and cannot be taken as the general official consensus by the British government as it Jervois own belief/assumption based on what he himself perceived to be true.** This can be proven by Source F, when Carnarvon replies to Jervois in a letter by clarifying and making it very clear that **British stand on intervention was officially not one of direct rule but indirect rule when he states that, "It was no doubt expected that such an officer would exercise very great influence in the country, but the position a Resident was to occupy would be very**

	different from that of a Controller.... You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of the advice, was really one of direct or actual government”. (CR to contextual knowledge) <u>I know that what Carnarvon states is reliable and factually true and what Jervois said is wrong</u> because, British colonial rule in Malaya was in reality meant to be one of indirect rule but in practice/in the process, it unintentionally ended up being direct rule because the British Residents were not given proper instructions and directions by the British Colonial office on how to go about governing the states, thus leading them to unintentionally overstepping their boundary as an adviser to the Sultan/Malay Chiefs. Moreover, the Governor of the Straits Settlements was too far away to check on the powers of the Resident, which ultimately lead the Residents to acquire more powers than the Sultan. All these were not explained by Jervois. Make the Link→ Thus what Carnarvon says in F does prove what Jervois says in E is wrong because it is inaccurate in his claims regarding British official stand in terms of the role of the British resident/ British policy towards the Malay States.	
L4	Purpose, supported (Note here need to elaborate more on historical context + contextual knowledge when for both sources) Can use Source F’s purpose to prove whether Source E is wrong by explaining Source F’s purpose is an objective view and therefore can be used to prove Source E was biased by comparing Source E and F’s purpose. Note: In this instance, the emphasis is on historical context, explained. <u>What Carnarvon says in Source F can prove that Jervois was wrong in Source E about whether the establishment of British rule was meant to be direct or indirect based on the motive/purpose of the authors.</u> Source F is a letter from Carnarvon written on 20th May in 1876, in response to Jervois report to him on 10th Feb 1876. <u>Carnarvon basically writes back to Jervois to clarify/present his disagreement towards Jervois’ stand</u> as he states that “You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of advice, was really one of direct or actual government. Carnarvon goes on to clarify the initial intent and objective of implementing the Residential System, and to explain the reason as to why British involvement should be kept to the minimum possible as he states that, “the essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers that would assist them in the government of the country,” and that “would be very different from that of a Controller.” Essentially, Carnarvon wanted to enlighten Jervois that he has been wrong/incorrect in his perceptions/assessment that the British official stand had always been one of direct rule; and thus he should not continue to encourage greater British involvement in the affairs of the Malay states but instead change his direction and come in line with the approved British policy of indirect rule/minimal involvement. However, Source E was a <u>subjective report</u> from Jervois to Carnarvon on 10th Feb 1876, 2 months after the murder of Birch and whom Carnarvon was viewed by many as indirectly responsible. This was because in May 1875, Jervois became the new Governor of the Straits Settlement, he wanted the	6m

	powers of the Sultan and the chiefs be reduced by giving the Sultan the title of Queen's Commissioners and rule the state in the name of the Sultan. Without approval from the Colonial Office, Jervois asked the Malay chiefs to accept his proposal, but they refused. Jervois threatened to depose Abdullah who then had to sign a letter requesting greater British control over Perak. This was drafted by Birch on 1 Oct 1875, which then antagonized Sultan Abdullah and the Malay Chiefs leading to Birch murder. Thus, Source E is a biased source and therefore unreliable because when Jervois writes to Carnarvon, his main intention was to justify and defend in a subjective way that the Residential System was right from the beginning meant to allow the Resident to have absolute powers over the Malay Chiefs/Sultans, but it was never made clear. This is clear when he states that, "When I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned,..." and subsequently he makes a sweeping statement based on an unfounded claim (a claim not backed up with official documents/evidence) that, "I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here". Jervois wanted to convince Carnarvon that he was not to be blamed for antagonizing the Malay chiefs by wanting the Resident to have more powers because, as far as he was concerned, the establishment of British rule in Malaya was always intended to be one of direct rule and that they should continue to pursue such a policy.	
--	---	--

e) Use **all** the sources.

'The British intervened in the Malay States for on self-interest.' How far do these sources support this statement? Explain your answer.

[8]

L1	<i>Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.</i> <i>Yes, the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest.</i> <i>Or</i> <i>No, the British intervened in the Malay States for other reasons e.g. For humanitarian reason or the locals invited them/ask them to do so/ or they did not want to intervene at all</i>	1m
L2	<i>Yes Or No, supported by valid source use i.e.</i> <i>Yes, the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest.</i> <i>OR</i> <i>No, the British intervened in the Malay States based on the interest/needs of the locals or they did not want to intervene at all.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge), and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source us up to a maximum of 4 marks.</i>	2-4m
L3	<i>Both sides of L3</i> <i>Yes <u>AND</u> No, supported by valid source use i.e.</i> <i>Yes, the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest.</i> <i>AND</i> <i>No, the British intervened in the Malay States based on the interest/needs of the locals or they did not want to intervene at all.</i> <i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and NO supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge) and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use with explanation up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i> <u>Source A- No</u> <i>Source A does not support the statement that the British intervened in the Malay States for self-interest. In fact, it shows that the British <u>did not want to intervene in the Malay states because of their self-interest on not wanting to lose money.</u> This is so despite being able to justify the need to intervene because, "Britain and Europe in the 1870s were facing a growth in their economic needs which cause competition among the European powers to meet the demands of their manufacturing sectors", including facing an "accelerated pace of Industrial development". Essentially, Gladstone states that they were, "not alarmed by this", because at this period of time i.e. 1872, the British <u>needed to continue with its policy of non-intervention in the Malay States</u> because they believed more in free trade and economic benefits which is more profitable" and intervention, "would incur high costs to administer and might be a drain on the British economy." I know that in 1872, there was an increase rivalry among European powers eyeing for territories in SEA to increase their power and prestige but the British realized that there were quarrels within and among the Malay States so there did not want to get involved as it would mean a drain of their own resources to solve their problems.</i>	5-8m

Source B – No but questions reliability/limitations of source

Source B does not support the statement that British to intervened in the Malay states based on self-interest but based on the interest of the locals for humanitarian reasons, “It is the duty of the British government, as the dominant power, to interfere in the Malay States and put a stop to this disgraceful state of affairs. The present state of affairs in the Malay Peninsula is that the richest part of it is in the hands of the lawlessness and the turbulent.” He continued to state that, “It is therefore our hope to save the Malays from themselves and give them the blessings of peace and justice.” **This implied that because of the succession disputes and the Chinese Secret society quarrels leading to civil war, there was chaos in the Malay states; and since the Malay rulers were unenlightened leaders who were unable a to restore law and order in order to bring about stability in Perak, Lord Kimberly was proposing that the British intervene in the Malay states based on humanitarian reasons as the British believed in the “White Man’s burden” whereby it was up to the superior white man to interfere in the affairs of the lowly/inferior Asian people in order to help establish law and order for the sake and welfare of the Malays thus implying they were doing the local Malays a favour/ portraying themselves as saviours by intervening on their own accord.**

Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source

However, this source cannot be trusted as this is a one-sided view. Lord Kimberly attempts to justify British intervention in the Malay States primarily based on humanitarian reasons but left out crucial detailed information/downplays/does not highlight or place emphasis on the fact that the British at that period of time was embarking on Empire building and hence had the desire for economic exploitation and to gain political prestige by colonizing Southeast Asian countries. Thus, Lord Kimberly fails to explicitly highlight this point as it was the main/chief reason for British wanting to intervene in the Malay States. This is can be inferred when Lord Kimberly states that , “It is the duty forced upon Britain as the dominant power to interfere in the Malay States” and “that the richest part of it is in the hands of the lawlessness and the turbulent”, thus indirectly indicating that British wanted to intervene in the Malay states on their own accord in order to protect their trading interest and compete with other European powers for power and glory through territorial gains as this was the period of intense rivalry with other European powers and hence chanced on the opportunity to do based on the suffering of the Malays people due to the turmoil in the Malay States.

Source C- To a certain extent (No and Yes)

Source C supports the view only to a certain extent that the British intervened in the Malay states based on self-interest. This is so as **on the one hand**, the Malay Historian in Source C states that “according to the British, the purpose of expansion was to protect and advance the sovereign Malay rulers and their people. This then was the official myth which was to legitimize British interest, expansion and rule right up until Merdeka in 1957. The truth of the matter was that the British began to follow a policy of Imperialism from 1973 onwards. Thus, the primary reason for intervention was for economic exploitation leading to political prestige rather than for the interest of the Malays.” **This clearly shows that the Malay Historian challenges and rebuts Britain’s official historical stand that they intervened in and occupied the Malay states until Malaya independence because of humanitarian reasons as this justification is false as it was in reality more for economic gains like obtaining resources like rubber and tin not only for profits but to gain more political power/advantage because of the rivalry among the European powers for territory at the period of time.**

On the other hand, Source C does not support the view that the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest but rather based on the interest of the

locals as they were asked to do so by the ruler of Perak, Sultan Abdullah. Source A states that, "In the official version of the story, the British heroically intervened in the Chinese dispute at the request of Sultan Abdullah. The rich tin mines of the district of Larut had attracted large numbers of Chinese, whose rival factions were fighting with one another, creating much chaos. **This clearly implied that the Chinese Secret Society quarrels between the Ghee Hin and the Hai Sans had caused lawlessness and economic instability resulting in Sultan Abdullah writing to Sir Andrew Clarke to ask for assistance to help restore law and order because of unenlightened leadership.**

Source D- No

Source D does not support the view that the British intervened in the Malay States based on self-interest but rather based on the interest/ of the Straits Chinese merchants and British traders as they had **appealed to the British to intervene**. Source D states that, "In the autumn of 1872, the Ghee Hins who had been expelled, and had spent their time in warlike preparations against the Hai Sans, made an effort to regain their position." **This implied that there was rivalry between the Secret Societies/The Secret Societies were fighting over the tin mines in Larut which resulted in violence and anarchy in Perak** because, "arms and ammunition were sent up the Larut River and at last a desperate attack was made upon the faction..." and this ultimately this led to **political instability** as "some of Malay chiefs became involved in this dispute" and as such the Malay rulers were unable to maintain law and order hence disrupting trade.

OR

Source D also states that "many a times, robbery, murder or any other crimes committed in these places were not investigated and the offenders in most cases escaped punishment" **which implied that lawlessness and chaos prevailed in Perak and subsequently, the social unrest brought about economic instability in Larut as it disrupted the trading activities, thus,** "Subsequently, the Straits Merchants and the British traders had asked the British to intervene on their behalf."

Source E- To a certain extent – (Yes And No)

On the one hand, Source E does support the view that the British **wanted to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest. I know this as the British officer, Jervois writes to Carnarvon in Source F and states that,** "Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request, it has been found from the very start that such a course has been impossible," because, **"when I arrived here in May last year, I found that each Resident was practically running the government of the state to which he was assigned, and I certainly always believed that this was understood to be the case in the Colonial Office, as it certainly was to everyone out here"**. Hence, Jervois is implying that the British government all along planned to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest and took the opportunity to do so when Sultan Abdullah asked them to intervene to solve the succession disputes and Chinese Secret Society quarrels. Jervois is pointing out that the fact of the matter was that, **in theory, the British was supposed to intervened in the Malay States to establish indirect rule through the Residential System, but in reality, this never happened, because, he had seen first-hand/ with this own eyes, that in practice, the British had established direct rule with the ultimate goal of running/governing the Malay states, in order to exploit the rich economic resources of the state.**

On the other hand, Source E does not support the view that the British **wanted to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest but rather based on the interest of the locals living in Perak as it states that ,** "Even if the Government had ever considered that the Residents should confine their attention to merely giving

	<i>advice based on Sultan Abdullah's request," it implies that Sultan Abdullah had asked the British to intervene as Raja Abdullah had written a letter to Sir Andrew Clarke asking for a man of sufficient ability to show them a good system of government Or Abdullah had requested British assistance in administering the state so that under peaceful conditions, Perak would be opened to bring in revenue. In 1873, there was further economic instability in the Malay States such as piracy off the coast of the peninsula which was a continuing problem.</i> <u>Source F- No but questions reliability/limitations of source</u> <i>Source F does not support the view that the British wanted to intervene in the Malay States based on self-interest but based on the interest of the local Malay rulers because Carnarvon states that, "The essence of the scheme for appointing Residents was that the native chiefs wanted to receive British officers who would advise and assist them in the government of the country." This implied that the Malay rulers had requested for the British to send a British officer who would reside in the state and guide them in running the affairs of the state which was in chaos because of the Chinese Secret Society Quarrels and the Succession disputes which plagued Perak.</i> <u>Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source</u> <i>However, this cannot be trusted as Carnarvon is lying when he denies Jervois claims in Source E that the British had knowledge/were aware that the English version of the Pangkor Engagement implied that the Sultans had lost their political powers and were subordinate to the British Resident which further meant that the British government were waiting to intervene in the Malay States on their own accord, for their own self-interest in order to establish direct British colonial rule in Malaya based on their policy of Empire building, but waited for an excuse to do. Essentially, what Carnarvon states is false when he states that, "but the position a Resident was to occupy would be very different from that of a Controller. I am by no means prepared to admit the correctness of your statement that the Pangkor Engagement virtually threw the government of the country into the hands of the Resident. You are under a complete misunderstanding in stating that the Colonial Office understood that the system pursued towards these native states, though apparently one of the advice, was really one of direct or actual government." This is so because in reality, the Resident made all the decisions, and the Sultans became mere figureheads and only in charge of Malay customs and traditions.</i> For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark must not exceed 8.	
--	--	--

Notes:

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

Section B (SEQ) Suggested Answer Scheme

2. 'The main reason why the Vietnamese were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was due to the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.[10]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree to a certain extent that the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers and the French people. <i>AND</i> EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: The country of Vietnam was a very backward and impoverished state based on the tyranny and ignorance of despotism. For example, there was internal instability and chaos in Northern Vietnam as it was affected by events in China. After the collapse of the Taiping Rebellion against the Qing Dynasty in 1864, Chinese refugees fled south to northern Vietnam and organized themselves into mercenary armies.	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i> Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). I agree to a certain extent that the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the <u>unenlightened leadership of the local rulers and the Indonesian people</u>. The country of Vietnam was a <u>very backward and impoverished state</u> based on the tyranny and ignorance of despotism. For example, there <u>was internal instability and chaos in Northern Vietnam as it was affected by events in China</u>. After the collapse of the Taiping Rebellion against the Qing Dynasty in 1864, Chinese refugees fled south to northern Vietnam and organized themselves into mercenary armies. An example would be the Black Flags who attracted a large following. By 1970's they had grown significantly. They were sometimes employed by the Vietnamese court to put down rebellions and rival armies. Backed by the court, they also operated as bandits along the course of the Red River harassing trading vessels for taxes.	6-8m

ELABORATION: They became involved in rebellions and the Vietnamese court requested China for help. However, some of the Chinese soldiers joined the bandits.

Make the Link Now→ This alarmed the French officials in Cochín-China who were afraid that they would lose N. Vietnam to the Chinese. Some officials saw this as an opportunity to intervene.

ELABORATION: The French officials administering the protectorate of Cochín-China in the 1860's and 1870's were idealists who subscribed to new political philosophies such as **Social Darwinism** that was prevalent across Europe at that time, thus they appealed to the government in France to intervene which was at that time following a forward policy of conquering other states.

ELABORATION: Essentially, the French officials saw themselves as an 'enlightened civilization' with a duty to conquer inferior societies and bring about law and order and free the local people from unenlightened leaders. Thus, the **Vietnamese were unable to resist French colonization of the** because of the **unenlightened leadership of the local rulers**

Another reason why the Vietnamese were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the French army was a force not to be reckoned with. In 1873, the French tried to intervene when a French military expedition was sent to Hanoi however since it was carried out without official approval from the French government, they were forced to withdraw from Tonkin. However, between 1880-1881 and 1883-1885, France had a new Prime Minister Jules Ferry who was an opportunist and strongly advocated colonization. As such France became the second largest European colonial power after Great Britain. After the Second Treaty of Saigon was signed, Emperor Tu Duc went against the terms of the treaty by persecuting the Catholics and encouraging the Black Flags to harass the traders along the Red River. In 1883, Jules Ferry decided that they had faced enough resistance from Vietnam. Giving the reason that piracy along the Red River was endangering the lives of French trader, a second military expedition led by Captain Henty Riviere was sent to Hanoi. **Riviere's army stormed the citadel before moving on to occupy the coals mines in Hon Gai. Vietnam attempted to resist the French by petitioning to China for help. China had learned from experience to enlist the Black Flags to fight the French. The Black Flags proved a strong adversary and in May 1883. However, the French refused to back down and sent a large French army to occupy Tonkin.**

ELABORATION: By August 1883, French troops had forced the Black Flags to retreat. It was also around this time that Emperor Tu Duc died. The French army took advantage of the chaos caused by the Emperor's death to send an ultimatum to the Vietnamese court. The Vietnamese officials were to choose between destruction of their country or French protection. The Vietnamese had little choice but to **sign the Treaty of Hue**, also known as the Harmand Treaty, with Dr Françoise Jules Harmand, the French diplomat. China protested the treaty. French authorities in Tonkin attempted to enforce the Harmand treaty by sending reinforcements. China responded by sending troops from Yunnan to support the Vietnamese resistance against the French in Son Tay near Hanoi. **Make the Link Now→** By December 1883, the French defeated the Vietnamese and Chinese forces and proceeded to take over other parts of Vietnam.

ELABORATION: In June 1884, the Treaty of Protectorate was signed to replace the 1883 Treaty of Hue, and French colonization of Vietnam was effectively complete. **In 1887, Cochin-China, Annam and Tonkin were combined with Cambodia to become the Union of Indochina. In 1893, the French annexed Laos to be part of Vietnam. The Ministry of Colonies were formed and a Governor-General who had been stationed in Tonkin was now in charge of the Governor in Cochin-China as well as the Resident Superiors in the individual protectorates. Make the Link Now→** Thus the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule between 1883-1884 because the French army was too strong for them to defeat.

SUGGESTED CONCLUSION:

I agree that the main reason why the Vietnamese people were unable to resist the extension of French colonial rule was because of the unenlightened leadership of the local rulers. This was the root cause which made the country weak and vulnerable to foreign intervention or invasion. With a strong enlightened leader, one would be able to set up a strong and stable political structure which would include a strong military and naval force. Thus, the strength of a country's army would only be possible with an enlightened leader as he would establish good governance. An educated leader would also be able to negotiate with foreign powers and provide concessions such that the foreign powers would not be able to use any excuse to use force or violence to take over the country on the pretext of bringing about the rule of law based on social concerns. This is evident with the enlightened rulers of Thailand such as the likes of King Mongkut and King Chulalongkorn who, having being educated in Switzerland, were able to save their country from foreign intervention but instead invited foreigners to help develop the country without having to colonize it as the heads of state were efficient in running the administration and country at large.

3. 'The greatest injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree that one great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause. <i>AND</i> EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: I agree that one great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt Clause This was so as the Guilt Clause had far-reaching negative economic, political and social implications on Germany, and this made the Germans feel that it was an unfair treaty.	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason). Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). I agree that one great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the War Guilt Clause which the Germans deeply resented because the Germans had to accept total blame for the war. However, the Germans believed that the Allies were being unfair. This was so as Germany's ally, Austria-Hungary was the first to invade Serbia and thus should also shoulder some of the blame. (Make the Link→ Thus, the Germans felt that they were being treated extremely unfairly. ELABORATION: More importantly, accepting the war guilt clause meant paying heavy war reparations amounting to 6600 million pounds as a means of compensation to the affected countries, especially France OR Historically, it was unfair because the figure of 6600 million pounds was only arrived at in 1921 by the Reparations Commission, thus when Germany signed the agreement in 1919, it was like signing a 'blank cheque'. (Make the Link The huge amount was seen as extremely unfair as it was estimated that Germany would only be able to repay the full sum in about 80 years. This meant economically Germany would be in dire straits for many decades. ELABORATION: Moreover, the Germans saw the War Guilt Clause as as too harsh and thus unfair because as further compensation, Germany had to give up large areas of land that contained vital and valuable natural resources. For example, important coal areas such as the Saar from which profits would be given to	6-8m

France for 15 years and **heavy industrial areas such as Alsace-Lorraine, which was rich in iron ore**, were taken from Germany. **Fundamentally, this meant further loss of economic resources. MAKE THE LINK NOW → Thus, the Germans viewed the treaty as too harsh and thus unfair because economically, it squeezed them dry and led to great economic hardship.**

ELABORATION: Moreover, because of the War Guilt Clause, the Allies made Germany hand over Malmedy and Eupen to Belgium, Danzig to the League of Nations, and Upper Silesia and the Polish Corridor were given to Poland. **This effectively split Germany in half and in turn made Germany weaker. MAKE THE LINK NOW → Thus, the Germans resented paying compensation because they viewed it as unreasonable and thus too harsh as it led to heavy war reparations and territorial losses that would ultimately **cause long-term economic hardship / suffering and poverty**. Hence, they viewed the War Guilt Clause as a great injustice/extremely unfair.**

ELABORATION: However, another great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the **military clauses which the Germans viewed as too harsh on Germany as well**. This was so as the curtailing of **Germany's military strength** was justified, but leaving Germany **powerless indefinitely** was seen by the Germans as unfair. The Rhineland was demilitarized and no fortifications or training were allowed. Weapons were to be melted down as well. Military conscription was banned, and Germany could only have 100,000 soldiers. No submarines were allowed, and only 6 battleships and 24 smaller ships were permitted. An air force and tanks were also forbidden. By curtailing Germany's military strength in every way and leaving it without any modern methods of warfare, the treaty **not only greatly reduced Germany's might, but left her defenceless and vulnerable to external threats**.

ELABORATION: In addition, no other countries were forced to reduce their building of weapons even though the League of Nations stated that all countries should do so, especially the other countries who were also involved in World War I. **Make the Link Now → The Germans viewed the military clauses imposed by Treaty of Versailles as extremely unfair because of the Allies' double standards and hence viewed it as a great injustice.**

ELABORATION: Under the clause of self-determination, many smaller states were allowed to vote in or out of Germany. However, the Germans felt that the ***allies*** were not establishing a fair treaty because the **clause of self-determination was not carried out in all the chosen countries**. For example, the Polish Corridor and Alsace-Lorraine were given away without a vote. This meant further ***loss of German citizens*** (population) who were forced to live under foreign rule.

ELABORATION: Certain territorial clauses were somewhat ***opportunistic***, especially the signing away of German overseas colonies in Asia and Africa, which were parcelled out under the disguise of League of Nations mandates as spoils of war to the Allies. This was evident because the colonies in Africa, such as Togoland, East Africa, Southwest Africa and the Cameroons, and in Asia, though taken away from Germany, were ***not given their independence***. Instead, they were to become mandate territories to Britain and France. **MAKE THE LINK NOW → Thus, the actions were not based on legal issues, but more on squeezing Germany dry as well as for the vested economic interest of the allies. Thus, the Germans felt that the Treaty was an extremely unfair one.**

ELABORATION: Another great injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles **that it was a dictated peace treaty**. The Germans called the

	treaty a 'diktat' because it was <i>imposed upon them without them having any say</i>. Moreover, Germany was <i>not allowed any representatives during the negotiations</i>. MAKE THE LINK NOW → Thus, a feeling developed in Germany that since they were not involved in the negotiations, they were under no moral obligation to obey the terms, and they resented the Treaty of Versailles very deeply. <u>Suggested Conclusion: (Students need to adress the “greatest” injustice)</u> I agree that the greatest injustice imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles was the terms of the War Guilt because the German economy took the hardest blow as it caused unemployment and poverty and affected the daily social and economic lives (material needs) of the Germans citizens as a whole, not only in the short run, but also in the long run. For many years to come, the Germans not only had to succumb to inflation and subsequently further poverty but also had to resort to borrowing from other countries, such as the USA. Thus, when the Great Depression hit Germany in 1929, Germany was in dire straits again because of situation created by the reparation clauses. On the other hand, even though the other specific terms of the Treaty of Versailles such as the territorial clauses, the clauses of self-determination and the military clauses were also extremely harsh and had far-reaching economic, political and social implications for Germany, it can be argued that they were not the greatest injustices imposed on Germany because firstly it essentially only hurt German pride as it took away German power and glory but more significantly, these clauses were imposed as a result of Germany having to accept total blame for World War I as thus they were an offshoot of the root cause which is the War Guilt Clause. (Accept any logical/plausible answers)	
--	--	--

4. 'Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10m]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree to a certain extent that Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake <u>AND</u> EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: I agree to a certain extent that <u>Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake for several reasons.</u> Neville <u>Chamberlain</u> seemed to have <u>misjudged Hitler</u> as being a rational politician who would demand the bare minimum.	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i> Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). I agree to a certain extent that <u>Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was a mistake for several reasons.</u> Neville <u>Chamberlain</u> <u>seemed to have misjudged Hitler</u> as being a rational politician who would demand the bare minimum. However, Hitler turned out to be an unscrupulous tyrant who saw Appeasement (any concession) as a sign of weakness and the more Britain and France gave him, the more he demanded. This can be seen during the Sudetenland Crisis whereby Hitler had promised that this was his last territorial claim and threatened that if the Allies did not give in to his demands, war would break out in Europe. However, when the Allies gave in easily to his demands during the Munich Conference in 1938, Hitler showed himself to be an unreasonable man who took a bold step in March 1939 and invaded the whole of Czechoslovakia. <u>Make the Link NOW→ Thus the policy was not justified because it placed too much faith in Hitler's promises, and these promises ultimately proved to be empty.</u> <u>ELABORATION:</u> Britain's policy of <u>appeasement in the 1930's was also a mistake because it was morally wrong.</u> If Hitler was using <u>bullying tactics</u>, it was up to Britain to oppose him especially during the Sudetenland/Munich Crisis. However, Britain and France were so afraid of another war that they allowed Germany to break international agreements without punishment and finally abandoned Czechoslovakia to its <u>fate in return for meaningless</u>	6-8m

promises **Make the Link NOW**→ Fundamentally, Appeasement was not justified as it promised world peace at the expense of Czechoslovakia.

However, Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was not a mistake because Britain and France were facing many problems. Firstly, because of the **Great Depression** between 1929-1935, Britain could not afford to spend money on another war as their economy was in the doldrums as it had to concentrate on bringing their country out of the poor economic situation.

ELABORATION: Secondly, because of the economic situation, a re-armament programme could only begin in 1936 and was not planned for completion until 1940.

ELABORATION: Thirdly, Britain was not ready to go to war as it had to concentrate on dealing with problems in her colonies such as India that had begun to agitate for independence. **Make the Link NOW**→ Thus, since India was a source of economic revenue, adopting a policy of appeasement would not only allow Britain to avoid double trouble, but also simultaneously allow Britain to buy more time to build up its military strength.

ELABORATION: Moreover, the policy of appeasement was not a mistake because Britain's attitude towards Germany was one of sympathy as many Britons viewed the Versailles Treaty as too harsh and therefore Germany should be allowed to re-arm and get back German speaking territory which rightfully belonged to them. There was not a lot of public support among British citizens for another war against Germany, and thus taken in the context of the time, appeasement was right in the eyes of many, but certainly not all, of the British public. Thus in 1935, the British were happy to make the a) **Anglo-German Naval Agreement**, which ignored the terms of the Versailles Treaty as it allowed Germany to build 30% of warships thus keeping the peace with Hitler and strengthening their friendship.

ELABORATION: b) When Hitler demilitarized the Rhineland, there was a feeling that this was just 'marching into his own backyard'

ELABORATION: And when the Anschluss occurred in 1938, the Austrians were simply achieving self-determination denied to them at Versailles.

****Make the Link NOW**→ Thus each single step that Hitler took could be justified based on the mistreatment of Germany during the Treaty of Versailles hence it was not a mistake.

ELABORATION: In addition, the memories of the horrors of the 1st World War where many lives were lost as well as the enormous physical devastation justified the policy of appeasement in the eyes of many across Europe. The Allies wanted to find peaceful solutions to Germany's problems and to avoid another destructive war at all cost. Thus Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was not a mistake.

ELABORATION: The policy of appeasement was also not a mistake because Communism was seen as a greater evil compared to Nazism. Although the Allies, including Czechoslovakia and Poland hated the aggressive nature of Nazi policies in central Europe and Eastern Europe, they saw the spread of Communism as a greater threat. **Make the Link NOW**→ Thus the Allies viewed the policy of Appeasement as not a mistake/justified because giving in to German demands would ensure Germany's friendship and support against the Soviet Aggression.

	<u>Suggested Conclusion:</u> In the short run, Britain's policy of appeasement in the 1930's was not a mistake as it had prevented a war from erupting in Europe between 1936-1938. Essentially, it brought peace to the world at all costs. However, in the long run, appeasement was a mistake because it led to the outbreak of World War II in 1939. Ultimately, the policy of appeasement put Britain in a bad light and showed them to be weak as it gave Hitler the confidence to step up his demands until he invaded Poland after taking over Czechoslovakia in 1939. Hitler's invasion of these 2 countries was not justified, as both these countries did not have a majority German-speaking population. Fundamentally, Appeasement was not justified because it was a policy that did not act as a deterrent against aggressors, but rather was a policy that tended to encourage an aggressive foreign policy. *Accept any plausible answer	
--	--	--

Prelim Sec 4 Core History 2025
Section A SBQ Suggested Answer Scheme

1a) Study Source A

Why was the cartoon published?

L1	Sub-message i.e. <i>It is to tell that the West Berliners representing USA, British and France were being invaded by USSR who were occupying Eastern Berlin</i>	1m
L2	<i>Source A's historical context lies in the early Cold War tensions over Germany immediately after World War II, specifically the situation in Berlin in 1948, right before the outbreak of the Berlin Crisis (1948–1949). After World War II in 1945, Germany was divided into four occupation zones controlled by the U.S, U.K, France, and the Soviet Union. Berlin, located deep inside the Soviet zone of East Germany, was also divided into four sectors. Tensions began to rise from 1947–1948 as political differences between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union deepened. The West sought economic recovery in their zones, including introducing the Marshall Plan and a new German currency (the Deutsche Mark). The Soviets opposed these moves, seeing them as threats to their influence. Berlin was of strategic importance because West Berlin was a Western-controlled Island inside Soviet territory which was a symbolic and strategic foothold for the West in Eastern Europe. Thus, in retaliation, the USSR launched the Berlin Blockade on 24 June 1948 whereby they blocked all road, rail, and canal access from West Germany into West Berlin, cutting off 2.5 million residents from food, coal, and supplies. Stalin's aim was to force the Allies out of Berlin without direct military confrontation</i>	2m
L3	Main Message, supported <i>Source A was published to show that Stalin was helpless and could not stop the Allies from circumventing/ overcoming the Berlin blockade that Stalin had initiated. This is so as the British depicts the Allies as a strong united force (combined effort) as seen by the massive number of planes the airlift of food supplies of food and coal into Berlin by the massive number of planes which are drawn as storks who represent the giver of life. At the same time, the cartoon portrays Stalin as holding a rifle but pointing the rifle to the sky and not at the storks thus showing that the Soviets, despite their hostility, did not shoot down the planes as they wanted to avoid a direct war but hoping the airlift would fail. Further more the captions of "Bird Watcher" implies that Stalin was merely passive and was unable to take action. From my contextual knowledge, I know that the Western Allies responded with the Berlin Airlift, flying in supplies using the agreed-upon air corridors. At its peak, planes landed in West Berlin every 30 seconds, delivering over 2 million tons of goods and that the Soviets avoided a confrontation as they were behind USA in terms of the nuclear arms race at that point in time/ could not afford to engage in a nuclear war with the US.</i> <i>(The cartoon is symbolic of conveying the feeling of helplessness and uncertainty that people felt, aware that if a nuclear war broke out, it could lead to the end of humanity)</i>	3m

L4	Purpose of the cartoon (explain motive of the author for drawing the cartoon - <i>Award the 5th mark only if students have addressed the audience and intended outcome of the author's motive.</i> <i>The motive of the British cartoonist was to use the cartoon as a propaganda tool to praise/glorify the US, British and France combined military effort/actions for being able to circumvent/overcome the Berlin Blockade which Stalin had launched, while at the same time, mocking Stalin for being helpless and not being able to retaliate leading to the failure of the Berlin Blockade. I know this as the cartoon depicts storks, who represent givers of life, carrying coal and food to Berlin. Essentially, the storks are symbolic of the Allies taking action as a strong united force (combined effort), flying the massive number of planes towards Berlin as part of the airlift of supplies to the Berliners because of the road, rail and canal blockade that the Soviets had launched with the intention of starving the West Berliners in order to force them to leave their occupied zones. At the same time, the cartoon portrays Stalin as holding a rifle but pointing the rifle towards the sky and not at the storks, thus indicating that the Soviets, despite their hostility, could not shoot down the planes, as they needed to avoid a war because they could not afford to engage in a nuclear war with the US. This was so as the Soviets had not yet achieved nuclear parity with the US at that point in time. (5m). The British cartoonist wanted to convince the British public to continue to support the Allied effort so that the democratic Allies can eventually win the ideological conflict which they were facing with the Soviet Union. (6m)</i>	4-5 m
----	--	-------

b) How far can you trust what the Soviets are saying about the Berlin Crisis? Explain your answer.

L1	Undeveloped Provenance <i>E.g. It can be trusted because it is Soviet commentary on the Berlin crisis, published in an international newspaper in 1949.</i>	1m
L2	Can trust based on reliability of content i.e. true information about the Berlin Crisis, supported. OR Cannot trust based on unreliability of content i.e. false information, about the Berlin Crisis, supported. <i>Award 2 marks for reliable <u>Or</u> not reliable in content, supported.</i> <i>Award 3 marks for reliable <u>And</u> not reliable in content, supported.</i>	2-3m
L3	Can trust based on reliability of content i.e. true information about the Berlin Crisis, supported. <u>AND</u> Cannot trust based on unreliability of content i.e. false information, about the Berlin Crisis, supported. <i>Award 4 marks for reliable <u>Or</u> not reliable in content supported + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge.</i> <i>Award 5 marks for Reliable <u>And</u> Not Reliable in content, supported + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge.</i> <u>Can trust because reliable + supported + cross-reference to other sources/contextual knowledge</u> <u>E.g. I can trust what the Soviets are saying in Source B as it is reliable to in providing factual information about the reasons why Stalin was provoked to implement the Berlin Blockade.</u> Source B states that, “The conduct of the Western powers to strengthen the West German economy risked bloody incidents.” This implied that because USA, with its Allies, Britain, France, had taken steps to strengthen West Germany by introducing economic reforms in their occupied zones in West Berlin, it indicated to Stalin that their main objective was geared towards eventually establishing West Germany/whole of Germany as a democratic country, thus indirectly challenging the communist ideology. <u>Cross-referencing</u> <u>I know that this is true as from my contextual knowledge.</u> Britain, USA and France decided to join their occupied zones in West Germany to call it Trizonia, and subsequently introduced economic reforms such as the Marshall Plan and a new currency which was indicative of introducing democratic elements, it created tensions with USSR who were occupying Eastern Germany and Eastern Berlin thus, provoking Stalin to implement the Berlin blockade from West Germany to West Berlin as a retaliation to force the Allies in West Berlin to leave by the West Berlin zones which fell within the perimeter of USSR’s occupied zone. In turn, Stalin could introduce communist elements in his own occupied zones to ensure the allies did not have an upper hand in Cold War politics. <u>AND</u> <u>Cannot trust based on unreliability of content as it contains false information + cross-reference to contextual knowledge/ other sources.</u>	4-5m

1) However, I cannot trust what the Soviets are saying about the Berlin Crisis because it is **unreliable as it provides false information in terms of USA being the mastermind/chief manipulator behind the Berlin Crisis** as Source A states that, **"The Crisis was planned in Washington, behind a smokescreen of anti-Soviet propaganda. In 1948 there was danger of war"**. This implied that the Berlin Crisis was a deliberate ploy by USA to challenge USSR's communist ideology/to put communism in a bad light by provoking USSR which then led Stalin to impose the Blockade. Stalin perceived USA's proposal to the US Congress to introduce the Marshall Plan and a new currency in West Germany in March and June 1948 respectively as intentional. This was so as USA's proposed economic reforms would undermine communism in Eastern Germany because such reforms would strengthen West Germany economically which meant that politically, the USA and their allies wanted to turn West Germany into a democratic nation and subsequently, the whole of Germany.

OR

To Stalin, such actions was an attempt to crush communism in Eastern European because the Eastern Europeans were exchanging their currency for the new currency introduced in West Germany as it had a higher value compared to USSR's currency.

Cross-referencing to contextual knowledge

USSR's accusation that the USA was the mastermind behind the Berlin Crisis is **contradicted** by **my contextual knowledge** as I know that the Allies did not deliberately intend or plan to provoke USSR but were merely acting accordingly with regards to their occupational zones in West Germany. This was so because after W.WII, Germany's economy was in shambles thus based on circumstances, the Allies wanted to make political and economic reforms which would naturally be based on the principles of democracy. Thus, Stalin's accusations is false and therefore not useful about USA being the main culprit for the Berlin Crisis.

OR

2) I cannot trust what the Soviets are saying about the Berlin Crisis because it is **unreliable as it provides false information in terms of the outcome of the Berlin Blockade**. This is so as Source B states that, **"In the Spring of 1949, the USA was forced to yield...their war plans had come to nothing, because of the conduct of the USSR."** This implied that the Berlin Blockade imposed on road, rail, and canal with the aim of preventing the transportation of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin in order to force the Allies out of their occupational zones in West Berlin **was a success**.

Cross-referencing to contextual knowledge

This is **contradicted** by my contextual knowledge as I know that the Allies got around the Berlin Blockade of road, railway, and canal which Stalin imposed by airlifting food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin, thus eventually resulting in Stalin caving in and lifting the blockade, thus admitting defeat.

OR

Cross-referencing to Source C

I know that Source B is providing false information as it is contradicted by Source D which states that, "We refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened." This implied that the Allies did not give in/was not pressured by the imposition of the blockade to vacate their zones in Berlin

OR

	<i>This implied that the Allies did not give in as the Allies got around the Berlin Blockade of road, railway, and canal which Stalin imposed in order to force the West Berliners (i.e. the Allies who had occupied zones in the West Berlin) by airlifting food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin thus eventually forcing Stalin to withdraw the blockade and admit defeat.</i>	
L5	Purpose, supported. Explains unreliability based on motives of the author. Students must be able to provide evidence of biasness e.g. loaded words/opinion/judgement/one-sidedness to get 5 marks. Award the 6th mark for intended outcome. <i>E.g. (Answer the question on purpose+ author+ historical context) e.g. I cannot trust what the Soviets is saying in Source B <u>as it is biased in its motive/ purpose.</u> (Historical Context) After the Allies introduced economic reforms in West Germany, Stalin retaliated by imposing a blockade on all road, rail, and canal with the aim of preventing the transportation of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin in order to force the Allies out of their occupational zones in West Berlin. The ultimate aim was to turn Eastern Germany into a communist bloc. However, the Allies managed to circumvent the blockade though the airlift of resources. As such Stalin had to admit defeat leading to an embarrassing situation. (Intention/Message+ evidence of biasness) Hence, Source B, which is Soviet commentary in 1949, a year after the Berlin Blockade, has a propaganda purpose in terms of wanting to cover up/do damage control for the failure of the Berlin Blockade by deflecting/pushing the blame to USA for the Berlin Crisis. *Essentially USSR accuses the USA of planning to turn Germany into a democratic nation through their actions/economic reforms as it states that, “The conduct of the Western powers to strengthen the West German economy risked bloody incidents,” thus implying that the introduction of Trizonia, the Marshall Plan and a new currency into Allied occupied zones of West German was a deliberate move to provoke USSR to impose the Berlin Blockade <u>and make them out to be the aggressors, subsequently putting communism in a bad light.</u> Source B continues to state that, “The Crisis was planned in Washington, behind a smokescreen of anti-Soviet propaganda. In 1948 there was danger of war.” <u>Such statements has negative connotations as it portrays a distorted/inflated/ inaccurate version of the truth as it only a one-side view.</u> Basically, it <u>omits the fact that</u> it was Stalin who had initially created tensions over Germany when he demanded \$10million more as compensation for USSR’s war efforts, as opposed to taking only 25% of industrial goods that was originally specified in the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, hence creating tensions with the allies, who then responded with their economic reforms. *(Target Audience + Intended Outcome) This was done in order to convince the international community that USSR was the innocent party and that they should support communist parties who want to come into power/continue to support the spread of communism/give them their support to communist regimes in helping to spread communism and not to put their trust in superpowers like USA and their Allies based on their scheming actions/containment policy.</i>	5-6m

1c) Study Sources C and D.

How far does Source C make you surprised by Source D? Explain your answer. [6]

L1	Yes/No: Identifies content in Source C and D which is /is not surprising but no reason given	1m
L2	Not surprised/surprised based on provenance. <i>E.g. I am not surprised that Source C and D are different because Source C is a from a memo written by Alexander Paniushkin, Soviet Ambassador to the USA, to George Marshall, 14 July 1948, Soviet Union memo while Source D is a statement from President Truman speaking to the US media in 1949</i>	2m
L3	Not Surprised And Surprised based on similarity/differences in content, supported. <i>Award 3 m for valid surprised <u>OR</u> not surprised, supported and explained.</i> <i>Award 4 marks for valid surprised <u>AND</u> Not surprised, supported and explained.</i> <u>Not Surprised based on similarity of factual evidence + explained</u> <u>Source C does not make me surprise by what Source D says as both share similar facts about the economic and political competition leading to the Berlin Crisis /the economic issues leading to the Berlin Crisis because it had political implications.</u> This is so as Source C states that, "The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe." Similarly, Source D states that, "When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin". Hence both sources imply that economic strategies like the Marshall Plan and monetary reforms were central to the Berlin Crisis conflict as it provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Crisis a he felt that the Allies were implementing these economic reforms to politically make Germany democratic in nature <u>OR</u> <u>Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions.</u> This is so as Source C states that, "Moreover, the introduction of a separate monetary reform in West Germany, has placed Berlin and the whole Soviet zone of occupation in a predicament as it threatens to pour into Berlin and the Soviet zones of occupation. Hence, the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation.", This implied that Stalin saw the economic reforms such as the introduction of the new currency by the Allies as trying to introduce democratic reforms which would mean restricting Stalin's attempts to make Germany a communist state. This is because by introducing a new, strong currency in the Allied zones in West Germany, it would also mean introducing it in West Berlin Allied occupied zones and since Berlin fell within the parameters of	3-4m

the Soviet zone in East Germany, the new currency would affect the Soviet zone which / they had competing ideologies and as such, the aim of the Allies was to have the upper hand in the ideological conflict in order to tilt the strategic balance of power in the Allies favour. Similarly, Source D states that, "When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin". This implied that Truman acknowledged that the economic reforms introduced by US had provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Blockade. Make the Link Back→ **Thus, Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions**

OR

Soviet Concern Over Western Moves:

Source C highlights Soviet anxiety over the economic implications of the West's actions leading to the Berlin Crisis. Similarly, Source D indirectly acknowledges this concern, stating that Stalin reacted because he couldn't prevent Western initiatives such as the economic policies, leading to the Berlin Crisis

And

Surprised based on differences in content, supported by evidence and explained.

Note* In this instance, even though both are saying different things they are still both providing facts, hence there is no contradiction/false information and as such there is no reason/logic to cross-reference i.e. cannot try to prove there is a contradiction as such students cannot proceed to level 3 to gain marks for cross-referencing.

E.g.

Source C does male me surprised by what Source D says because they are **different** about the **main focus of the Berlin Crisis This is so as Source C focuses on the actions of the Allies i.e. the economic disruptions caused by Western actions before the Berlin Crisis and the subsequently reaction of the Soviets** as Source C states that, "the Soviet Command has been forced therefore to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation." Thus Source C emphasizes on the Soviet need to protect East Berlin and the Soviet zone by launching the Berlin Blockade in order to pressure the West to leave their occupied West Berlin zones to ensure that that the Allies don't take over the whole of Berlin and turn it into a democratic zone as opposed to Stalin's wish to take over Berlin and ensure it will become communist as it fell within the Soviet occupied zone of Eastern Germany.

However, Source D focusses on the outcome of the Berlin Crisis as Truman states that, "However, we refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test our ability and our will to resist." Hence Source D focuses on Western

	unity and resolve, frames the crisis as a test of American strength, and highlights the positive political impact that it had on Western Europe in terms of drawing it closer to the U.S. based on the Marshall Plan OR Source C makes me surprised by what Source D says as they are different about the <u>nature of Soviet action in terms of launching the Berlin blockade</u> as it states that because the US was going to implement economic reforms, “the Soviet Command has been forced therefore to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation”. <u>Thus, Source C presents the Soviet actions as defensive and necessary to maintain order as they saw the economic measures taken by the Allies in their zones as a means of destabilising communism by spreading democracy through economic means.</u> <u>However, Source D describes Soviet actions as an aggressive test of Western resolve to overcome the Berlin blockade as it states that,</u> “When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin. However, we refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin.” This implied that USA was able to overcome the blockade of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin through an airlift mission carried out by the Allied forces because the blockade meant not only starving women and children in the West Berlin zones but a expansionist strategy by Stalin to force the West Berliners out of their zones so that the Soviet Union could turn it into a communist bloc hence, hence intensifying Cold War tensions.	
L4	Not Surprised based on similarity/ in content, fully developed explanation and evidence + Cross-reference to contextual knowledge/other sources Award 5 marks for valid Not surprised, supported by evidence + cross-reference to contextual knowledge/other sources. <u>Similarities between the sources based on reliability/ facts</u> E.g. Source C does not make me by what Source D says as both share similar facts/reliable about: <u>Source C does not make me surprise by what Source D says as both share similar facts about the economic and political competition leading to the Berlin Crisis /the economic issues leading to the Berlin Crisis because it had political implications.</u> This is so as Source C states that, “The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe.” Similarly, Source D states that, “When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin”. Hence both sources imply that economic strategies like the Marshall Plan and monetary reforms were central to the Berlin Crisis conflict as it provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Crisis a he felt that the Allies were implementing these economic reforms to politically make Germany democratic in nature	5m

OR

Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions. This is so as Source C states that, "Moreover, the introduction of a separate monetary reform in West Germany, has placed Berlin and the whole Soviet zone of occupation in a predicament as it threatens to pour into Berlin and the Soviet zones of occupation. Hence, the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation.", This implied that Stalin saw the economic reforms such as the introduction of the new currency by the Allies as trying to introduce democratic reforms which would mean restricting Stalin's attempts to make Germany a communist state. This is because by introducing a new, strong currency in the Allied zones in West Germany, it would also mean introducing it in West Berlin Allied occupied zones and since Berlin fell within the parameters of the Soviet zone in East Germany, the new currency would affect the Soviet zone which / they had competing ideologies and as such, the aim of the Allies was to have the upper hand in the ideological conflict in order to tilt the strategic balance of power in the Allies favour. Similarly, Source D states that, "When we combined our zones with Britain and France into a single economic unit and introduced the Marshall Plan and a new currency in order to rebuild Germany, Stalin could not stop us. Nevertheless, he thought he could make a point by forcing us out of Berlin". This implied that Truman acknowledged that the economic reforms introduced by US had provoked Stalin to launch the Berlin Blockade. Make the Link Back→ **Thus, Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says as both mention similar facts that the introduction of new currency or/and the economic reforms/policies of the US were triggers to the Berlin Crisis /Blockade/intensifying Cold War tensions**

OR

Soviet Concern Over Western Moves:

Source C highlights Soviet anxiety over the economic implications of the West's actions leading to the Berlin Crisis. Similarly, Source D indirectly acknowledges this concern, stating that Stalin reacted because he couldn't prevent Western initiatives such as the economic policies, leading to the Berlin Crisis

Cross-Referencing to contextual knowledge to:

1. **Currency Reform** (June 1948): West introduced the Deutsche Mark in their zones and West Berlin. The Soviets saw this as a breach of four-power agreements. This reform triggered the Soviet blockade, as they feared economic isolation of East Germany and Berlin.

OR

2. **Marshall Plan** (1948 Onward): Aimed at rebuilding Europe but excluded the Soviet bloc. The Soviets viewed it as an attempt to economically and politically dominate Europe. Paniushkin's concerns

	reflect the Soviet perspective of being encircled or undermined economically. <u>OR</u> 3. <u>Berlin Blockade and Airlift</u>: From June 1948 to May 1949, Soviets blocked rail and road access to West Berlin. The U.S. and its allies launched a massive airlift to supply the city, reinforcing their commitment as Truman claims in Source D	
L5	Not Surprised because of Different Perspective based on different historical context + intention of author, explained using contextual knowledge i.e. when and *why/in what context was it said in during that particular time period) Though there are differences between Sources C and D in terms of their main focus of the Berlin Crisis or how USSR perceives their actions as defensive while USA sees it as aggressive, I am not surprised based on <u>historical context</u> because of the <u>different perspective based on different time periods</u>. This was so as Source C was a Soviet Memo written by Alexander Paniushkin, Soviet Ambassador to the USA, to George Marshall, 14 July 1948, one month after the Soviet Union launched the Berlin Blocade preventing the Western zones in Germany from sending aid to the West Berlin zones. This was in retaliation to the USA had implemented the Marshall Plan in order to not only give economic aid to Western European war-torn states but as part of their policy of containing the spread of communism from Eastern Europe to Western Europe as USSR had made the Eastern European countries communists satellite states. Subsequently, economic reforms such a introduction of a new currency and the Marshall Plan was also introduced into the allied zones of Western Germany and West Berlin. Hence, since this was written during escalating Cold War tensions, just after the West introduced the Deutsche Mark in their zones making USSR feeling sidelined by Western decisions and fearing economic dominance in Europe through the Marshall Plan, it is not surprising that Source C was used as a propaganda tool with the intention of justifying the Berlin Blockade by framing the Western economic reforms as a provocation and a destabilizing act. Essentially, USSR blames Western monetary reform and Marshall Plan for creating economic chaos and necessitating Soviet action hence USSR's attempts to justifies Soviet actions as defensive, protecting Berliners and their economy from Western destabilization by launching the Berlin blockade. This is evident as Source C states that, "The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe," and as such "the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation." <u>OR</u> Moreover, the introduction of a separate monetary reform in West Germany, has placed Berlin and the whole Soviet zone of occupation in a predicament as it threatens to pour into Berlin and the Soviet zones of occupation. Hence, the Soviet Command has been therefore forced to	5-6m

	adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation. <u>Hence, I am not surprised as</u> Source C represents the official Soviet diplomatic stance, written to convince an American audience in this instance, George Marshall, aiming to deflect blame and present the Soviet side as reasonable based on American's action in 1948. On the other hand, though Source D portrays Soviet actions as aggressive and a test of Western resolve <u>I am also not surprised</u>. This was so as it was a statement by American President Truman in 1949, <u>after USA's subsequent victory in overcoming the Blockade</u>. Hence, spoken after the successful end of the Berlin Airlift and the lifting of the blockade, it <u>is not surprising that</u> it reflects the American Cold War propaganda in terms of US being the defender of freedom, facing down Soviet oppression as it portrays Stalin is portrayed as the aggressor, using the blockade as a tool of coercion. Hence, President Truman's <u>intention was to portray Soviet's actions as aggressive and thus criticises Soviet response of the Berlin Blockade to their economic challenge and an attempt to force the West out of Berlin, while simultaneously glorifies Western response of an airlift of resources/food/coal from West Germany to West Berlin (as morally and politically righteous)</u> in order to <u>justify/legitimize</u> their actions/ wants to emphasize the moral high ground of the West and the effectiveness of American resistance through the Berlin Airlift. This is evident when Truman states, " , "we refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test our ability and our will to resist." <u>Thus, I am not surprised</u> that Truman speaks in a tone of <u>determination and vindication, highlighting American strength and ideological superiority</u> as the states that <u>(Intended Outcome)</u> Thus Truman's statement aims to convince the American public that America had the upper hand in the ideological conflict in order to consolidate public and political support by framing the U.S. response as a victory for democracy as the speech would help to solidify America's ideological position in the emerging East-West divide. Thus, based on the different perspective because of the different time period, Source C does not make me surprised by what Source D says. (Summary) ♦ Difference in Perspective: In essence, the difference in tone and perspective is rooted in each source's political purpose and intended audience. The Soviet memo seeks justification and understanding; Truman speech seeks unity and ideological clarity. This contrast is symbolic of the Cold War's early propaganda battles.	
--	---	--

Study Source E.

1d) What is the message of the source? Explain your answer 5m

L1	Describes/Lifts evidence	1m
L2	Identifies sub-messages <i>i.e. Makes valid inferences/ comments interpreting the cartoon but misses the main message of the source. (2m) Award the 3rd mark if sub-message is fully developed, supported.</i> <i>E.g. The message of Source E is that neither USA or USSR emerged victorious based on the Berlin Crisis. I know this as the source states that, "The Berlin airlift was a considerable achievement but neither side gained anything from the confrontation. The USSR had not gained control of Berlin. The West had no guarantees that land communications would not be cut again." This implied that on the one hand, USSR had not achieved the aim of attempting to block road, rail and canal access from West Germany to West Berlin in order to force the Allied to evacuate/leave their zones in Berlin because the West/Allied powers had responded to the blockade by airlifting coal and fuel/resources from West Germany to West Berlin thus ending with Stalin admitting defeat. On the other hand, USSR still managed to hold on to Eastern Germany and subsequently turn it into a communist state so West Germany which would become democratic after the Berlin Crisis would still be under threat from USSR based on the ongoing ideological conflict.</i>	2-3m
L3	Identifies the main message of the cartoon. Award the higher mark in the level for fully developed answers. <i>i.e. Explain <u>main</u> inference fully developed with the use of contextual knowledge), supported with evidence)</i> <i>The main message of Source E is that though the Allies managed to overcome the Berlin Blockade through the airlift of food and coal, and that Stalin had to admit defeat, it did not diffuse Cold War tensions but instead deepened it. This is because the Berlin Crisis itself was a reflection of the ideological conflict between USA and USSR. As such, after the Berlin Crisis, this ideological conflict continued as there was no solution in terms of what type of government Germany should embrace but instead Germany was split into two whereby East Germany came under communist rule and West Germany became a democratic nation.</i> <i>From my contextual knowledge, the long-term effect of the Berlin Crisis led to the acceleration of the Cold War as there were many instances of tit for tat actions on both sides of the divide namely the democratic Allies versus Communist countries. E.g. the acceleration of the arms race such as building of nuclear weapons to use it as threats against each other, the emergence of proxy wars e.g. Korean War, OR the subsequent formation of NATO by the Allies in 1949, as they realized that during the Berlin Crisis, they did not have the presence of an army readily available to confront any aggressive action undertaken by communist Russia which then led to USSR retaliating with the Warsaw Pact in 1955/ Industrial Espionage etc. (Accept ANY ONE EXAMPLE)</i>	4-5m

1e) Study all sources.

'The USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War tensions.' How far do the sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1m
L2	Yes Or No, supported by valid source use i.e. Finds evidence that USA's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions OR Finds evidence that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge), and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.	2-4m
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use i.e. Finds evidence that USA's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions AND Finds evidence that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis heightened Cold War tensions <i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and NO supported by valid source use + detailed explanation of the source content (i.e. by using contextual knowledge) and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use with explanation up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i> <u>Source A- Yes</u> <i>Source A does support the view that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War tensions because by showing that Stalin is holding a gun at the chimney, intending to shoot the storks, /symbolic of/ representing the Allied planes, it implied that Stalin was the aggressor. Essentially, it portrays Stalin in a threatening position as he attempts to retaliate against the Allies solution of airlifting coal and food from West Germany to West Berlin in order to overcome the road, railway and canal blockade imposed by Stalin whose intention was to force out the allies from their occupied zones in West Berlin so that he could establish communism in Eastern Germany. (Note: **If you only show one side, then you question) E.g. However, overall, this Source cannot be trusted as the cartoon is a one-sided view drawn by a British and it is obviously for propaganda purposes as the cartoonist intention is to put Stalin in a bad light by portraying him as the aggressor standing on the top of a chimney with a gun but fails to show that the Allies had also provoked Stalin by indicating through their actions that they were planning to make West Germany a democratic nations through their economic policies, Thus we cannot say that Stalin is totally to be blamed for heightening Cold War the tensions.</i> OR Source A - Yes and NO <i>Source A shows only to a certain extent that USSR was responsible for heightening tensions because *on the one hand, by showing that Stalin is holding a gun at the chimney, intending to shoot the stalks who were representatives of the Allies, it implied that Stalin was the aggressor as it shows him in a threatening position by wanting to retaliate the Allies airlift of coal and food from West Germany to West Berlin. *On the other hand, it also shows that the Allies actions in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War heightened Cold War tensions. This can be seen whereby the birds which represent the giver of life bringing in food into Berlin and defying Stalin's</i>	5-8m

blockade. This implied that the airlift of food supplies into Berlin is a dangerous mission (venture) and could provoke a war with the Soviet Union. (Note if you show both sides, you cannot question the source)

Source B- No but questions reliability/limitations of source.

Source B does not support the view that USSR's action in the Berlin Crisis deepened Cold War tensions but rather it was USA's actions. This is so as the source states that, "The conduct of the Western powers to strengthen the West German economy risked bloody incidents. However, in the Spring of 1949, the USA was forced to yield...their war plans had come to nothing, because of the conduct of the USSR." This implied that because USA, with its Allies, Britain, France, had taken steps to strengthened West Germany by introducing economic reforms in their occupied zones in West Berlin, it indicated to Stalin that their main objective was geared towards eventually establishing West Germany/whole of Germany as a democratic country, thus indirectly challenging the communist ideology. This then angered and provoked Stalin to impose the Berlin Blockade. Thus, the Berlin Crisis showed that USA's actions triggered the Berlin Blockade as they in wanted to have a upper hand in the ideological conflict, creating further hostile reactions by USSR, and hence deepening Cold War tensions because the Berlin Crisis became one of the first major confrontations of the Cold War. It deepened mistrust, accelerated the creation of NATO (1949), and entrenched the division of Germany into East and West.

Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source

However, this source cannot be taken at face value as this source has a propaganda purpose and thus biased in terms of limitations because firstly Source A accuses USA of being the mastermind behind the Berlin Crisis as USA deliberately wanted to provoke Stalin into taking aggressive actions through their economic policies in order to make it look as though the Russians/Soviets were the bad guys and they did this "through a smokescreen of Soviet propaganda". However, this is a one-sided view as it did not show that before the Crisis, Stalin had created tension with the Allies but demanding more money from its zone in Eastern Germany in order to weaken it so that the zone would succumb to Communist ideology which the Allies viewed with suspicion thus responding with the economic reforms in their own zones

OR

It pains a **false/inaccurate/ picture/distorted** version in terms of the outcome of the Berlin Crisis by stating that the Allies were not victorious when USSR launched the Blockade as Source A states that, "However, in the Spring of 1949, the USA was forced to yield. Their war plans had come to nothing, because of the conduct of the USSR". This was not the case as the allies had circumvented the Blockade through the airlift of food and coal from West Germany to West Berlin, thus forcing Stalin to admit defeat an eventually lift the blockade.

Source C – No

Source C does not support the view that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis had deepened Cold War tensions but rather it was USA's actions. I know this as Source C states that, "The interests of the Berlin population do not permit a situation where the introduction of the Marshal Plan would have similar benefits or validity in the Soviet zone just like in Eastern Europe. Moreover,

the introduction of a separate monetary reform” and as such, **“the Soviet Command has been forced therefore to adopt certain urgent measures for the protection of the interests of the German population and of the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation.”** This clearly implies that USSR blames the USA’s actions as provocative as the **introduction of a separate currency and Marshall Plan in the Western zones created economic chaos in the Soviet Zone, subsequently escalating tensions and thus justifying/necessitating Soviet action/retaliation by launching the Berlin Blockade in order to force the Western Zones out of Berlin so that USSR could have total control over Berlin as Berlin fell within the perimeters of USSR zone in East Germany.**

Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source

However, Source C cannot be trusted as it is not reliable as the Soviets provides a one-sided view in terms of pushing the blame of the USA for escalating Cold War tensions when they too had contributed to this tension. This is so as they had omitted the fact that they had the intentions of turning the Soviet Zone in Germany into a communist satellite State just as how they had done so to Eastern Europe. This was evident because instead of the original clause of taking 25% of resources and goods from their zone as compensation for helping the Allies to defeat Germany during World War II as stipulated by the Yalta/Potsdam Conference, USSR demanded \$10 million more from their Eastern zone in order to weaken in so that it could fall to communism. (accept any other valid actions taken by USSR to show they too was responsible for escalating Cold War tensions)

Source D- Yes but questions the reliability of the source

Source D- Yes but can questions reliability of the source

Source D does support the view USSR’s actions in the Berlin Crisis had deepened Cold War tensions. This is so as Source D states that, **“We refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened.”** This implied that USSR had risked a war and thus deepened Cold War tensions with USA and their Allies as they had imposed the Berlin Blockade by closing all railway, road, and canal links from West Germany to West Berlin, cutting of food and coal supplies from reaching the Allied occupied zones in West Berlin. This deepened Cold War tensions because Stalin’s aim was to starve the Berliners out of their zones which fell within the perimeters of the USSR’s occupied zone in East Germany, in order to eventually take total control of his occupied zones and turn it into a communist regime. As a result, it forced USA to respond in order to overcome the blockade through the airlift of resources from West Germany to West Berlin as the Berliners were being starved by USSR’s actions. Moreover, Truman by stating in Source B that, **“Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test out ability and our will to resist”, implied that because of USSR’s actions,** it made USA more determined to further tighten their grip over Western democratic countries in Europe through their Marshall Plan based on the Truman doctrine/containment policy in order to further ensure those countries did not succumb to communist ideals. **This ultimately permanently sealed Cold War tensions as it accelerated the arms race,** and established Allied military readiness from 1949 onwards through the formation of NATO with the Soviets retaliating with the establishment of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 thus establishing a tense balance between the rival superpowers hence creating a permanent divide between democracy and communism in Germany,

Europe and subsequently which to Asia for the next 41 years. (Accept any one example)

Award 1 extra mark for Questioning Reliability/Limitations of source

However, since Source D cannot be taken at face values as it is a statement made by President Truman to the American press in 1949, the source would obviously be biased and thus cannot be taken at face value as it paints a one-sided view of the USSR as being the chief culprits by omitting the fact that the Allies, through their economic policies (Trizonia, Marshall Plan & introducing a new currency) had also provoked Stalin into imposing the Berlin Blockade because such reforms, based on democratic elements, was indicative to Stalin that they were in indeed gravitating/moving towards political reforms, to eventually make Germany into a democratic country. This indirectly meant that the Allies were attempting to contain the spread of Communism in Germany.

OR

Source D-To a certain extent

Source D supports the view that the Berlin Crisis showed that USSR's actions deepened Cold War tensions only to a certain extent, as it also showed that USA's actions was also to be blamed. This is so as on the one hand, USSR was to be blamed because Source C states that, **"We refused to be forced out of the city of Berlin. We demonstrated to the people of Europe that we would act and act resolutely when their freedom was threatened. This implied that USSR had risked a war and thus heightened Cold War tensions with USA and their Allies as they had imposed the Berlin Blockade by closing all railway, road, and canal links from West Germany to West Berlin, cutting of food and coal supplies from reaching West Berlin. As a result, it forced USA to respond to the to overcome the blockade through the airlift of resources from West Germany to West Berlin as the Berliners were being starved by USSR's actions. On the other hand, it also shows that USA was to be blamed because the Allies and USA were determined to counter/retaliate Stalin's blockade **not through negotiations but through a confrontational approach, their airlift mission was a risky venture, risking a possible war with USSR.****

OR

USA was also to be blamed because Truman by stating in Source D that, **"Politically it brought the people of Western Europe close to us. The Berlin blockade was a move to test out ability and our will to resist"**, implied that because of USSR's actions, it made USA retaliate/ more determined to further tighten their grip over Western democratic countries in Europe by continuing with their Marshall Plan giving economic aid based on the Truman doctrine/containment policy in order in order to strengthen these countries to further ensure those countries did not succumb to communist ideals. **Such actions merely sealed Cold War tensions as it accelerated the arms race, and established Allied military readiness from 1949 onwards through the formation of NATO; with the Soviets retaliating with the establishment of the Warsaw Pact in 1955, ultimately establishing a tense balance between the rival superpowers hence creating a permanent divide between democracy and communism in Germany, Europe and subsequently which to Asia for the next 41 years. (Accept any one example)**

Source E- To a certain extent

Source E supports the view that the Berlin Crisis showed that USSR's actions had deepened Cold War tensions only to a certain extent as it also reflected the view that USA's actions had also deepened Cold War tensions. This is so as Source E states that, "The Berlin airlift was a considerable achievement but neither side gained anything from the confrontation. Above all, confrontation made both sides even more stubborn." This implied that though the Allies managed to overcome the Berlin Blockade through the airlift of food and coal, and that Stalin had to admit defeat, it did not diffuse Cold War tensions but instead deepened it. This is so because the Berlin Crisis itself reflected the ideological conflict between USA and USSR. As such, after the Berlin Crisis, this ideological conflict continued as there was no solution in terms of what type of government Germany should embrace but instead Germany was split into two whereby East Germany came under communist rule and West Germany became a democratic nation. The long-term effect of the Berlin Crisis was that it led to the acceleration of the arms race and the subsequent formation of NATO by the Allies in 1949, as they realized that during the Berlin Crisis, they did not have the presence of an army readily available to confront any aggressive action undertaken by communist Russia. In retaliation, USSR set up the Warsaw Pact in 1955 whereby all the Eastern European countries pledged military support and immediate readiness to confront the NATO forces, hence deepening Cold War tensions/ Also led to proxy wars such as the Korean and Vietnam War whereby each side used 3rd parties to try to outdo each other in terms of gaining the strategic balance of power in their favour. (Note: Students should be awarded the mark for any one example of long term impact of the Berlin Crisis showing deepening/heightening of Cold War tensions)

Source F- Yes

Source E does support the view that USSR's actions in the Berlin Crisis had deepened Cold War tensions. This is so as Source F states that, "On 23 June, the Soviet authorities suspended all traffic into Berlin because of alleged technical difficulties.... Shortly before midnight, the Soviet authorities issued orders to ...disrupt electric power from Soviet power plants to the Western sectors. Shortage of fuel was given for this measure." Source E which is a "US Government report in June 1948", is insinuating/implying that the Soviets were lying about the reasons for the blockade, which is, that food and coal could not be transported through road, rail, and canal links from West Germany to West Berlin as there was a problem with the transportation and communication lines, as well as insufficient fuel to be distributed to the Berliners, and that real motive for the Berlin Blockade was a deliberate move by Stalin to try to starve the Berliners, which included women and children, with the aim/goal of forcing the Allies out of their occupied zones in Berlin. This was so as Stalin ultimately wanted to make Eastern Germany a communist regime. Thus, Stalin's unjustified actions heightened Cold War tensions as it pushed the allies to a corner with the possibility of an outbreak of war/a face off/confrontation with the Soviets.

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

Notes:

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

Section B (SEQ) Suggested Answer Scheme

2. 'The main reason the Malayan Union failed was because the Malays feared that they would be marginalized.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10m]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree that one reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the methods used by the British to implement it AND EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: One reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the <u>methods used by the British to implement it</u>. The Malays opposed the high-handed manner in which the British introduced the Malayan Union.	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).</i> <i>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i> <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).</i> <u>Agree:</u> I agree one reason why the Malayan Union failed was because the Malays feared that they would be marginalized based on the <u>clauses features/terms of the Malayan Union Constitution such as:</u> a) Positions of the Sultans was threatened According to the terms stated in the Malayan Union Constitution, there would be complete centralization of power at K.L with the British Governor having full control of the administration. Laws were to be passed by the Central Legislative Council and the consent of the Sultans would no longer be required. The Sultans would thus become mere figureheads without authority or power. Thus the Sultans and the State Councils would have no more political power. They would be left in charge of religious matters only. The Sultans were to become only advisers on the Council if Rulers.	6-8m

(Elaboration)

b) Criticisms Over Citizenship

The Malays criticized the Malayan Union clauses because one of the main features of the Malayan Constitution was the granting of equal citizenship rights to all. This meant that the immigrant races, who had never pledged their loyalty to Malaya, would enjoy the same privileges as the Malays, the native people of the country. The Malays thus objected to the liberal citizenship qualifications, especially when those born or residing in Singapore could also qualify for citizenship. This meant that a large number of Chinese from Singapore would qualify for citizenship, thus the Malays would be outnumbered and Malaya would cease to be a Malay country. **Make the Link**→ **Thus the Malayan Union failed because**, their special rights and privileges as the native people of the country was threatened both in the economic and political sphere.

Disagree and explains other factors:

AND

Another reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the **methods used by the British to implement the Malayan Union**. The Malays opposed the high-handed manner in which the British introduced the Malayan Union. They did not consult local opinion of the opinions of the Sultans over such an important issue as the Malayan Union which would greatly change their position and status. Sir Harold Mc Michael was criticized for the way in which he obtained the agreement of the Sultans. He did not give time for the Sultans to discuss the Malayan Union proposals among themselves or with the State Councils. (4m) **(Elaboration)** Moreover, he was accused of threatening to depose the Sultans, labelling them as collaborators with the Japanese if they refused to sign the agreement accepting the Malayan Union. (5m) **Make the Link**→ **Thus, the Malayan Union failed because of the underhanded methods used by the British to implement the new constitution.**

OR/AND

Another reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the protests from former British Administrators. Essentially, there were also criticisms in England against the Malayan Union. Malay opposition was encouraged by a group of retired, ex-Malayan government officials, including Sir Frank Swettenham and Sir George Maxwell who protested the Malayan Union. They wrote to the British newspapers, deploring the **unjust way constitutional changes were being imposed in Malaya**.

(Elaboration) They also felt that the Malayan Union went against the principle of the **Atlantic Charter** which recognize that all peoples had the right of self-determination, thus pressuring the British to abolish the Malayan Union **Make the Link**→ **Thus the Malayan Union failed because of the pressure put on the British colonial government by some former British administrators to do away with the unconstitutional changes based on the Malayan Union.**

OR/AND

Another reason why the Malayan Union failed was because of the nationwide movement of non-cooperation by UMNO. The formation of UMNO marked the first united stand of Malay leadership and mass Malay support whereby they demanded the withdrawal of the Malayan Union. They encouraged supporters to wear white bands around their heads for a week as

a sign of protest and mourning for the loss of Sultan's rights. There were numerous rallies and demonstrations.

(Elaboration) Malays appointed as officials on the Councils or Government Boards refused to attend the installation ceremonies of Sir Edward Gent as Governor of the Union and Sir Malcolm MacDonald as Governor- General. They also refused to attend meetings of the Advisory Council. **Make the Link**→ **Thus, the Malayan Union failed because of the movement of non-cooperation by UNMO pressured the British into abolishing the Malayan Union.**

Suggested Conclusion

Although there were several reasons why the Malayan Union failed, I agree that the fear among the Malay rulers that they would be marginalized was the main reason as it was the root cause. The terms of the Malayan Union Constitution would have stripped the Sultans of their political power, reducing them to symbolic roles. This threatened not only their authority but also the special position of the Malays as the native people of the land, especially with the introduction of equal citizenship rights for non-Malays. Moreover, British methods of using high handed ways to get the Sultans to sign the Malayan Union proposal cannot be the main reason as this was just a process in ensuring that the Malayan Union became official. **Hence it was a secondary reason as it merely further fueled the anger of the Malays**

OR

While the British use of high-handed methods, such as forcing the Sultans to sign agreements under pressure, did provoke anger, it was the actual content of the Malayan Union that caused the greatest concern and resistance.

Additionally, even though protests by former British administrators and the mass non-cooperation campaign led by UMNO added significant pressure on the British, these were merely reactions to the threat posed by the Union's terms and the potential marginalization of the Malays and thus an offshoot of the root cause. Without the deep fear of losing their rights and identity, these movements would not have gained such strong support. Therefore, the root cause of the Malayan Union's failure was the fear of marginalization among the Malay rulers and people, making it the most decisive factor compared to the others.

E.g. I disagree that the Malayan Union failed because of the British methods of using high handed ways to get the Sultans to sign the Malayan Union proposal as this was just a process in ensuring that the Malayan Union became official.

Hence it was a secondary reason as it merely further fueled the anger of the Malays. However, the main reason was due to the clauses of the Malayan Union which would not only strip the Malay rulers of their powers but threaten their very existence in terms **of their rights and privileges based on the granting of equal citizenship rights to all immigrant races. This was the root cause and had the greatest impact on the Malay population because as it triggered the movement.** Moreover, the protest from former British Administrators in England merely highlighted the Malayan Union as being unjustified/ illegal which further added pressure on the British colonial government to do away with the Malayan Union. Similarly, the nationwide movement of non-cooperation by UMNO was not the main reason as it was the trigger factor/acted as a catalyst in pressuring the British colonial government to abolish the Malayan Union proposal.

*Accept any plausible answer.

4. 'The main aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions.' 'How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10m]

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree that one aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions. EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: I agree that one aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions. The failure of the Vietnam War greatly affected future US policies towards communists' states. Fundamentally, demonstrated that ideologies could not be imposed through unpopular governments and if there was enough will to resist those governments and if the resisters had sufficient support.	1-3m
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason). <i>Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i> <i>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2).</i> Agree: I agree that one aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 was that it led to the reduction of Cold War tensions. The failure of the Vietnam War greatly affected future US policies towards communists states. Fundamentally, it demonstrated that ideologies could not be imposed through unpopular governments and if there was enough will to resist those governments and if the resisters had sufficient support. The cost of the Vietnam War led to the pursuit of co-existence between the two superpowers and as such, USA sought greater understanding with USSR known as détente/ reduction of tensions. This is evident from the Strategic Arms Limitations Talk and the signing of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (1972) that sought to reduce nuclear weapons. (Elaboration) Talks continued in Helsinki (1975) to discuss borders and human rights. At the same time, USA ended its block on the issue of China's representation in UN and Nixon made visits in China to improve relations. (Make the Link→)The cost of the Vietnam War led to the pursuit of mutual co-existence between the superpowers, marked by treaties limiting nuclear weapons, and the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the communist states and America.	6-8m

AND

Disagree and explains other factors e.g.

Another aftermath of the Vietnam war was the **impact it had on US domestic and foreign policies**. The Vietnam War had devastating consequences for 1a) American society and 1b) the confidence of the US managing international relations. **This domestic doubt was mirrored by an international decline in American prestige**. This was so as the campaign against communism was portrayed by US as a moral crusade. However, the atrocities by US soldiers and use of chemical weapons damaged the US reputation and challenged perceptions of US moral superiority.

Moreover, Vietnam was evidence of the **failure of containment** as US had failed to stop the spread of communism in SEA despite its military strength. 1iii) Furthermore, the domino theory which the US had feared became reality as the fall of South Vietnam had a ripple effect of impacting Laos and Cambodia who also turned communist by 1975.

(Elaboration) The Vietnam War also saw the weakening of US Presidency powers. This was so as the United States Congress had traditionally supported the Presidential actions. However, towards the end of the Vietnam War, Congress exercised greater oversight of presidential actions. For instance, Congress had forbidden US military aid to Cambodia (1970) and introduced the War Powers Act (1973) limiting ability of the President to go to war.

OR/And

Another aftermath of the Vietnam war was the impact it had within South East Asia. Within SEA, the inability of the US to win the Vietnam War and contain communism stoked fears of a widespread communism. This fear contributed the formation of ASEAN (1967) and ASEAN declared SEA as a Zone of Peace, Friendship and Neutrality (1971), with the goal of keeping ASEAN free from interference of outside powers. **Make the Link**→ Thus the aftermath of the Vietnam War made many Southeast countries less dependent on Western/Superpowers such a USA in terms of foreign policy influence and more co-operative with one another.

Another aftermath of the Vietnam war was that it. It had a heavy human cost in Vietnam. It was estimated that over 2 million Vietnamese perished in the war and another 3 million were wounded. The use of chemical weapons by the United States also created health problems for subsequent generations of Vietnamese. Moreover, the defeat of South Vietnam triggered a refugee crisis in 1975, in which as estimate 800,000 Vietnamese fled Vietnam by small boats. These refugees were through grave suffering as they braved hunger, disease and pirates at sea in order to reach safely to other neighbouring countries. **Make the Link**→ Thus the aftermath of the Vietnam war was socially disastrous causing great misery and suffering among the Vietnamese people as it affected innocent lives in the long term (e.g Agent Orange had long term side effects on crops and humans) because in reality the local Vietnamese were not the main aggressors but were proxies in this Cold War ideological conflict

Suggested Conclusion

E.g. *Accept any plausible answer.

5. 'Gorbachev's reforms was a failure.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. 10m

L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more reasons. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i> EXAMPLE (1m) – identify: I agree that Gorbachev's reforms failed because of opposition from the hardliners. EXAMPLE (2m) – describe: Gorbachev's reforms failed because of opposition from the hardliners. The hardliners were upset with the introduction of a free market economy under Perestroika as well as glasnost reforms like the introduction of elections in parliament. The communist hardliners felt that Gorbachev was compromising communist ideals which had governed the country for 70 years.	1-3
L2	Explains Yes or No <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, up to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains Yes and No Award 6 marks for an explanation of <u>Given</u> And <u>other reason</u>, and additional mark(s) for <u>further supporting detail or reason</u>, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason). Award additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). <u>Agree:</u> <u>Failure to a certain extent because:</u> <u>Speed of reforms and expectations of the people</u> Gorbachev's reforms failed because of the speed with which he introduced the reforms and the high expectations the people had for quick results. Gorbachev tried to introduce economic and political reforms all at one go but the machinery of government could not cope with so many changes so quickly. For example, there were insufficient funds and raw material to support the economic reforms. This led to higher prices. The government rationed goods like meat and sugar and people had to travel thousands of miles to purchase foodstuffs. The situation led to increase in wages for employees and the government printed more money which in turn led to inflation. Though workers received higher wages, they could not buy the basic necessities which were in short supply. This caused greater economic hardship. The fact that the people had high hopes of Gorbachev's reforms and that they did not see immediate results caused them to be even more disappointed. The increased opposition to Gorbachev's reforms thus caused his reforms to fall flat. <u>(Elaboration) The Russian people could not adapt to the new ideas</u> that were introduced as they were used to a system where they were told what to	6-8m

do and what to say and could not adjust to the reforms that were being implemented quickly by Gorbachev in order to salvage the current economic situation. Thus the ideas of being involved in the process of government was foreign to them. Gorbachev also did not deliver what he had promised in terms of economic reforms. The economy didn't improve. Thus they did not support Gorbachev's reforms.

Opposition from Communists Hardliners

Gorbachev's reforms failed because of opposition from the hardliners. The hardliners were **upset with** the introduction of a free market economy under **Perestroika as well as glasnost reforms** like the introduction of elections in parliament. The communist hardliners felt that Gorbachev was compromising communist ideals which had governed the country for 70 years. As a result, they opposed his policies by sabotaging his economic reforms. For instance, many hardliners threatened the managers of factories not to implement innovative ideas and to continue to take orders from the hardliners. **(Elaboration)** The hardliners also believed that Gorbachev was **endangering the security of the country by reducing expenditure on the military**. The hardliners were **upset Gorbachev did nothing to stop East European communist states from breaking away from Moscow's control**. Thus the hardliners **did not co-operate with Gorbachev** and constantly opposed his reforms. His reforms thus did not take off and thus **failed to produce the desired results**.

Failure of glasnost

Gorbachev introduced glasnost as a means to reform the political structure in order to remove the corrupt practices of the hardliners as to allow the political process to be more flexible such that Perestroika could take place. However, Glasnost made the government more open and subsequently exposed the political weaknesses to the people. They began to oppose communism. Thus people's faith in communism was ruined and there were mass demonstrations. This weakened the USSR government.

(Elaboration) Glasnost also resulted in East European satellite states demanding similar economic and political freedom. Gorbachev had wanted to reduce military spending in E Europe in order to focus on economic growth. Moreover, improved relations with the West in the late 1980s reduced Moscow's need to hold onto the Eastern Europe satellite states as a buffer zone. Gorbachev's announcement not to interfere in the domestic affairs of the communist governments in Eastern Europe and the withdrawal of military troops from E.E thus inspired demands for more democracy and greater opposition to communist rule in E Europe.

Make the Link→ One by one, communist governments in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and East Germany collapsed in 1989. The communist hardliners blamed Gorbachev for the USSR's loss of control of these communist satellite states. Subsequently, Glasnost also resulted in growing nationalism in the Soviet republics. The Soviet republics like **Armenia and Azerbaijan** (many of Soviet Unions southern states have large Muslim majorities) wanted the right to control their own economy and state/ethnic identity. Resenting control from the Soviet central government in Moscow, these republics were increasing their calls for independence and separation from Moscow's control. This loss of control and prestige contributed to the last days of USSR and Soviet communist influence.

AND

Success to a certain extent:

However, he was successful in several areas. **Perestroika was a success to a certain extent as it 1)Introduced Market Economy** which replaced the Command Economy. 1a)This opened up the economy to foreign companies and investors which helped to a small degree to boost economic growth. Glasnost (Openness) was also a success. Glasnost removed oppression and gave them freedom of speech. **(Elaboration) Russians were allowed to criticize the government in order to remove corruption and make it more efficient and dynamic. (Elaboration)Leading political dissidents like Andrei Sakharov was released. A new law in 1988 which prevented dissidents from being sent to mental institutions was a significant move to win the trust of the Russians and ease tension with Western democratic countries who believed in Human Rights.**

(Elaboration) Glasnost also made the Russian government more credible. It Introduced 2/3 elected government instead of nomination. 1a) This made sure there was some form of electoral process whereby efficient and capable officials were chosen to replace those corrupt officials. It was one step towards establishing a fair and transparent political system. **(Elaboration)It also loosened media control by relaxing censorship** and allowing foreign media like CNN to be televised. This opened up a whole wealth of knowledge and information. For instance, reports of the Chernobyl disaster allowed to surface openly and the Gulag Archipelago which was banned during Stalin's time was allowed to be released for sale.

(Elaboration) Externally, Glasnost was also a success. Glasnost had loosened tight and oppressive control over the satellite states in Eastern Europe and gave them more freedom to run their own government. For example, Gorbachev gave them a choice of whether to remain in the Warsaw Pact or not. **(Elaboration) Gorbachev had also promoted World Peace, reduced building of nuclear weapons by signing two treaties in 1987 &1989.** This won him the Noble Peace Prize for his efforts in making the world a safer place. Thus, Gorbachev's reforms was a success as it ultimately led to better relations with the West, hence thawing Cold War tensions leading to the end of the Cold War.

Suggested Conclusion

E.g. **From one perspective**, Gorbachev's reforms of Perestroika and Glasnost was a failure because it backfired as the communist hardliners within his own country were so steeped in the pure form of communism established by Lenin and Stalin, that they could not accept his reforms because it questioned the very fundamentals of Soviet society. **However, from another perspective**, Gorbachev reforms was a success as it did introduce **human rights** in Russia which **ended the oppression of the people**. Moreover, **he was responsible for easing Cold War tensions**. Ironically, his reforms did contribute to the downfall of Communism which in turn led to the end of the Cold War, **which from the perspective of Western democratic countries, was a good thing.** **Yet on the other hand, many commentators see the return of Vladimir Putin in the current era as returning Russia too its previous 'Communists' state**. The Control of the media, glorification of Nationalism and resurrection of Stalin has been viewed as a National Icon.

*Accept any plausible answer.