

Secondary 4 Prelim Examination 2025
Express
Humanities (History)
Mark Scheme

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

(1a)	Study Source A. Why do you think this cartoon was published? Explain your answer.	[5]
L1	Description of the cartoon <i>e.g. Germany was threatening Austria. Britain did not want to get involved.</i>	1
L2	Specific Context of the start of the Cold War. <i>e.g. This cartoon was published because Germany was threatening to send its troops into Austria. Hitler was using the excuse that Austria was suffering from disorder and he needed to take action to save the people, who he viewed as ethnically German.</i>	2
L3	Main Message <i>(Award 4 marks for evidence and explanation of the Main Message)</i> Main Message: Hitler's aggressive actions would impact Britain eventually. <i>e.g. The cartoon was published because the cartoonist wanted to persuade the British public that Hitler's aggressive actions would impact Britain eventually. This is evident from how the characters are lined up side by side. When Austria completely falls, the impact will reach Britain. Britain will slip onto the rock and fall badly. This implies that <u>the events in Austria would eventually affect Britain. Britain should care about what was happening in Austria even though the events were taking place far away Britain.</u></i>	3-4
L4	L3 + Intended Outcome of the Cartoon <i>e.g. The cartoon was published because the cartoonist wanted the British public to support Austria in resisting German aggression. The British public should pressurise the government to stand up to Hitler and stop Hitler's aggression in Austria. By doing so, the British would prevent Hitler from taking further aggressive actions.</i> <i>[Outcome must be an action. Award 3 marks if Outcome is Accepted but not the Message.]</i>	
(1b)	Study Source B. How useful is this source as evidence about the Munich Agreement? Explain your answer.	[5]

L1	Useful / Not Useful based on undeveloped use of provenance e.g. Source B is useful because it was from the British Ambassador to Germany. He would know what was going on behind the scenes.	1
L2	Useful or Not Useful based on source content <i>Award higher mark for comparisons supported with evidence and explanation.</i> e.g. Source B is useful because it tells me that there were British in the government who believed that the Nazis would honour their commitment to the Munich . This is evident from "I do not regret having tried to believe Germany's honour and good sense." This implies that the <u>British believed that they could reason with the Germans. The Germans would honour their word and fulfil their part of the Munich Agreement.</u> Accept: Useful as evidence that the Munich Agreement was not wrong.	2-3
L3	Useful or Not Useful based on cross-reference to another source or contextual knowledge <i>Award higher mark for cross-references supported with evidence and explanation.</i> e.g. L2 + Source B is not useful because it is not reliable when I cross reference it to Source C . Source C states "I am afraid I remain profoundly doubtful of Nazi promises". This implies that there were people in the British government who did not trust the Nazis to honour their commitment to the Munich Agreement. To them, the Nazis were lying and could not be reasoned with. Since Source C contradicts Source B, Source B is not reliable and thus, not useful. For other sources, Accept: C.R. to Source E for Useful C.R. to Sources D for not useful Contextual Knowledge: Note that Invasion of Czechoslovakia and World War Two are not C.K.	4
L4	L3 + Not Useful based on critical analysis of Provenance Source B is not useful because it is from the British Ambassador to Germany. As ambassador, he represented Britain and was involved in the Munich Conference. He had supported the Munich Agreement. As this source was published after the outbreak of war, the ambassador would have wanted to justify the Munich Agreement was the right thing to do in 1938. This would enable him to receive less criticisms and more sympathy from the British people. Since he had a self-serving motive, the source is not reliable and thus not useful.	5

1c	Study Source C. How surprised are you by what this source says? Explain your answer.	[6]
L1	Surprised based on provenance e.g. I am surprised that a member of Chamberlain's government would oppose the Munich Agreement.	1
L2	Surprised or Not Surprised based on Source Content <i>Award 3 marks for supporting evidence.</i> e.g. I am surprised that a British politician would openly lie to the public by supporting the Munich Agreement when he personally did not believe in it. This is evident in "I am prepared to play my part in defending the Munich Agreement publicly but I am afraid I remain profoundly doubtful of Nazi promises". e.g. I am not surprised by the source because it shows that there were British politicians who did not believe in the Munich Agreement. This is evident in "I am afraid I remain profoundly doubtful of Nazi promises and shall do so until I see peaceful words accompanied by peaceful deeds."	2-3
L3	Surprised or Not Surprised based on cross-reference to another source or contextual knowledge <i>Award 5 marks for a more developed and supported answer.</i> e.g. I am not surprised by the source because it is supported by Source D. Both sources agree that there were British politicians who did not believe in the Munich Agreement. Source C states "I am afraid I remain profoundly doubtful of Nazi promises and shall do so until I see peaceful words accompanied by peaceful deeds." Source D states "I have believed Hitler was more open to the language of military might. I tried to persuade myself that the terms of the Munich Agreement were good enough". <u>Both sources show that there were British politicians who did not believe in the Munich Agreement. They viewed Hitler to be untrustworthy and would not keep his commitments to the Munich Agreement.</u> Contextual Knowledge: - Use of Churchill as evidence of opposition to the Munich Agreement. - Invasion of Czechoslovakia and World War Two are not C.K.	4-5
L4	L3 + Not Surprised based on Critical Analysis of Provenance i.e. I am not surprised by Source C because Oliver Stanley wanted Chamberlain to make use of the time provided by the Munich Agreement to prepare Britain for war. He did not believe that Hitler would keep his promise not to threaten the peace of Europe. Britain had to be ready for war when Hitler threatened Europe again. As a member of the government, he saw it as his duty to warn Chamberlain while continuing to support the Prime Minister in public.	6

1d	Study Sources D and E. Does Source E prove that Source D was wrong about the Munich Agreement? Explain your answer.	[6]
L1	Undeveloped use of Provenance e.g. Source E does not prove that Source D was wrong since both men were members of the British parliament.	1
L2	Analysis of Source E content <i>Note: Evidence must show the contradiction to Source D (For Does prove) Or Evidence must show the agreement with Source D (For Does not prove)</i> e.g. Source E does prove that Source D was wrong because it tells me that Munich Agreement was the right way to ensure peace in Europe. Source E states “We ought to recognise that Hitler contributed significantly to this peaceful solution by agreeing to discuss this matter on Sudetenland” and “the new Czechoslovakia will find greater security”. <u>This implies that the Munich Agreement was the right approach as it benefitted Czechoslovakia by having Germany to any further aggressive actions against Czechoslovakia. In addition, Hitler was willing to negotiate for a peaceful solution, instead of going to war.</u> Or e.g Source E does not prove that Source D was wrong because it tells me that Britian had to use the time provided by the Munich Agreement to rearm and to increase its ability to fight a war. Source E states “we must continue our efforts to rearm this country, a programme which is daily increasing in pace and in volume. We must remain on guard”. <u>This implies that the Munich Agreement was a way for the British to hold off any direct conflict with Germany when their military were not ready for a war. The British would use the interval provided by the Munich Agreement to increase its military preparations for war.</u>	2
L3	Prove or Does not Prove based on cross-referencing to each other <i>Award 5 marks for supporting evidence.</i> e.g. Source E does prove that Source D was wrong because both disagree over the effectiveness of the Munich Agreement. Source E shows that the Munich Agreement was the right way to ensure peace in Europe. Source E states “We ought to recognise that Hitler contributed significantly to this peaceful solution by agreeing to discuss this matter on Sudetenland” and “the new Czechoslovakia will find greater security”. <u>This implies that the Munich Agreement was the right approach as it benefitted Czechoslovakia by having Germany to any further aggressive actions against Czechoslovakia. In addition, Hitler was willing to negotiate for a peaceful solution, instead of going to war.</u> Source D shows that the Munich Agreement was not the right way to ensure peace in Europe. Source D states “I have believed Hitler was more open to the language of military might. I tried to persuade myself that the terms of the Munich Agreement were good enough”. <u>This implies that the Munich Agreement was flawed. It was a mistake to give in to Hitler.</u>	3-4

	Or e.g Source E does not prove that Source D was wrong because both sources agree that the Britain must be open to the possibility of a war with Germany. Source E states “we must continue our efforts to rearm this country... we may be ready to defend ourselves if a crisis should return.” Source D states “our country should firmly declare we were prepared to fight to prevent one great Power from dominating Europe by force.” <u>Both sources shows that a war remained an option for Britian to deal with Hitler’s aggression. Britian had to be prepared to fight Germany should Hitler keep threatening the peace of Europe.</u>	
L4	Both sides of L3	5
L5	Does not Prove based on the analysis of Source E’s provenance Or Use of another source to support/contradict one of the two sources e.g. Source E does not prove that Source D was wrong because it was Chamberlain’s motive in Source E to rebut Cooper and defend the Munich Agreement. Source E was a direct response to Source D. Since Cooper challenged Chamberlain directly and openly in Parliament, Chamberlain’s only reply was to defend his actions in Munich. Otherwise, his personal credibility and British acceptance of the Munich Agreement would be damaged. Since Chamberlain’s motive was to rebut Copper, Source E cannot be objectively use to prove that Source D was wrong.	6

1e	‘Chamberlain was right to sign the Munich Agreement.’ How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to support your answer.	[8]
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use <i>(Award 1 mark for each source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.)</i> [Note: Connection between the source and the statement must be made by the student in the explanation.] e.g. Source E supports the view because the Munich Agreement prevented war from breaking out in Europe. This is evident from “Munich Agreement has shown that great Powers can agree on resolving difficult and complex issues by discussion instead of by force, thereby preventing war”, “peaceful solution” and “the new Czechoslovakia will find greater security”. <u>The evidence implies that the Munich Agreement had resulted in peace in Europe. There were benefits for Czechoslovakia even though it had to give up Sudetenland. Ultimately, the major powers like Britian and Germany were committed to prevent another war in Europe.</u> OR Source C does not support the view because Hitler could not be trusted to fulfil his commitments to the Munich Agreement. This is evident from “I remain profoundly doubtful of Nazi promises and shall do so” and “not as “peace in our time” but as an uneasy truce”. <u>This implies that Chamberlain had made a mistake to trust that Hitler would be honourable to keep his promises. The Munich Agreement would not end</u>	2-4

	<u>Hitler's aggressive actions. Instead, Hitler would continue to be a threat to Europe.</u>					
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>(Award 5 marks for 1 Yes and 1 No and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks.)</i> i.e. both aspects of L2 <table><tr><td>Support the View</td><td>Sources B, E and F</td></tr><tr><td>Does not support the View</td><td>Sources A, C and D</td></tr></table> Bonus of two marks (i.e. +1. +1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency, etc. but the total for the question must not exceed 8. <i>e.g. Source E is reliable because Chamberlain was aware that Britian was not ready for war against Germany at the time of the Munich Agreement. The British military needed more time to catch up with the German military. In addition, Chamberlain believed that Hitler would act honourably when he agreed to the Munich Agreement. Thus, Chamberlain was prepared to give in to Hitler while using the time provided by the Agreement to speed up the military preparation of Britain.</i>	Support the View	Sources B, E and F	Does not support the View	Sources A, C and D	5-8
Support the View	Sources B, E and F					
Does not support the View	Sources A, C and D					

Section B: Essays

2	"Damaging the German pride was what caused German anger against the Treaty of Versailles." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
L1	Describes how the damage to the German pride caused German anger towards Treaty of Versailles or other reasons German anger. <i>(Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 reasons for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.)</i> <i>E.g. The treaty contained many conditions which severely diminished the pride of Germans, particularly the military and blame for the war. Part of the treaty limited the military to 100,000 men, the navy to six battleships, no armoured vehicle, submarine or aircrafts. In addition, Germany had to accept total blame for starting the War under the War Guilt Clause.</i> Other reasons: - <i>Huge amount of reparations payment</i> - <i>Territorial losses</i>	1-3
L2	Explains how the damage to the German pride caused German anger towards Treaty of Versailles or other reasons German anger. <i>(Award 4 marks for an explanation and the 5th mark for additional reason(s) or further</i>	4-5

	<i>supporting detail.)</i> <i>e.g.</i> The Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles because the treaty humiliated the German. The treaty contained many conditions which severely diminished the pride of Germans, particularly the military and blame for the war. Part of the treaty limited the military to 100,000 men, the navy to six battleships, no armoured vehicle, submarine or aircrafts. In addition, Germany had to accept total blame for starting the War under the War Guilt Clause. The Germans did not feel that they alone started the war. The deep alliances in Europe also resulted in Britain and France entering the war, supporting Russia. Furthermore, Germany was only in the war to support their ally, Austria-Hungary, who had declared war on Serbia, triggering the start of WW1. <u>As the military was a source of pride for Germany, such as reduction caused Germany to have a less prestigious military. Furthermore, they were forced to accept total blame, which was an unfair term in the German eyes given the historical complexity of how the war took place. This caused many Germans to resent the treaty as it treated Germany poorly and hence humiliated the Germans.</u> Or <i>e.g.</i> I also disagree with the statement because the Germans also hated the Treaty of Versailles as it caused economic hardship to the Germans. The Treaty harshly punished Germany forcing Germany to repay 6.6 billion pounds. This was a heavy financial burden for a Germany already devastated by the war and faced more difficulties rebuilding in the post war period. <u>As a result of this, the Germans faced economic hardships as their rebuilding was delayed by the burden of pay reparations.</u> The reparations situations worsened in 1923 when Germany failed on a payment in January. In response, France and Belgian invaded the Ruhr, Germany's valuable industrial region. To pay for reparations, the German government printed money, which only drove up the prices of goods, leading to hyperinflation. <u>The hyperinflation caused tremendous rise in prices of basic essential goods and wiped out the savings of many Germans. Unemployment also became widespread. Thus, the economic hardships suffered by the Germans was another reason for hatred of the TOV.</u>	
L3	Explains how the damage to the German pride caused German anger towards Treaty of Versailles AND Explains how other reason(s) caused German anger towards Treaty of Versailles. <i>(Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the actions taken by the United States to limit Japanese expansion led to World War Two in the Asia-Pacific and another reason responsible for World War Two in the Asia-Pacific. Add additional mark for further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.)</i> i.e. both aspects of L2 Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. <i>e.g. L3 + In the short term, the Germans would have hated the TOV for the economic</i>	6-8

	hardships it caused, but that was addressed over time eventually by the German government under the leadership of Gustav Streseman, who brought down the hyperinflation and stabilized the German economy in 1924. However, on the longer term, the hatred for TOV persisted for the humiliating military terms it imposed upon the Germans. As proven by the rise of Hitler, this humiliation was not forgotten by the people and they supported his rise as he promised to break the country from the TOV's terms to rearm the country.	
--	--	--

3	“Japan’s expansionist policy caused the outbreak of World War 2 in Asia Pacific.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
L1	Describes how the Japan’s expansionist policy were responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific or Identifies other reasons responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific. <i>(Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 reasons for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.)</i> e.g. During the 1930s, the civilian politicians in Japan increasingly lost the trust of the people. The military leaders were able to rise and take political control of the country as they became extremely popular especially after the annexation of Manchuria. Other reasons: - Weaknesses of League of Nations - Worsening relations with the USA	1-3
L2	Explains Japan’s expansionist policy were responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific or Explains other reasons responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific. <i>(Award 4 marks for an explanation and the 5th mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail.)</i> e.g. I agree that WWII broke out in the Asia-Pacific because of Japan’s expansionist foreign policy. During the 1930s, the civilian politicians in Japan increasingly lost the trust of the people. The military leaders were able to rise and take political control of the country as they became extremely popular especially after the annexation of Manchuria. <u>Many Japanese officers believed that it was Japan’s destiny to pursue an expansionist foreign policy to remove the Western powers and expand its rule over Asia, hence, Japan pursued an expansionist foreign policy that would eventually result in WWII breaking out in the Asia-Pacific.</u> Japanese also saw Britain, Russia, and the United States as rivals and obstacles to achieve their ambitions in Asia. They came up with the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere idea to promote to other Asian hoping to convince them to support Japanese rule for the betterment of all Asians. They were also needing key resources from Southeast Asia when their war with China dragged on. <u>Thus, the Japanese launched their surprise attack on Pearl Harbour in the hope to cripple USA’s ability to intervene as they invaded the Southeast Asian countries for their resources, effectively causing the outbreak of WWII in Asia Pacific.</u>	4-5

	Or <i>e.g.</i> However, I also disagree with the statement because WWII also broke out in the Asia-Pacific due to the weak response by the League of Nations. After Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, the League took a full year before presenting the Lytton Report on the incident that concluded Japan had acted unlawfully and should return Manchuria to China. The Lytton Report was passed by the League Assembly by an overwhelming vote of 42 to 1. However, there was no further guarantee of actions to be taken against Japan for their illegal actions in Manchuria. The British and French did not give any promise to send troops and the USA was not a member of the League to offer any economic sanctions or military intervention. <u>Being confident that they will not face any detrimental consequences for their actions in China, Japan rejected the Lytton Report and resigned from the League. The Manchurian Crisis demonstrated that the League was helpless in the face of aggressor nations, and emboldened Japan to further expand into Asia, which eventually resulted in WWII breaking out in the Asia-Pacific.</u>	
L3	Explains Japan's expansionist policy were responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific AND Explains other reasons responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific. <i>(Award 6 marks for an explanation of how Japan's expansionist policy were responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific or Identifies other reasons responsible for the outbreak of World War Two in Asia-Pacific. Add additional mark for further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.)</i> i.e. both aspects of L2 Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. <i>e.g.</i> L3 + In conclusion, the weakness of the League of Nations is still the key factor contributing to the start of WWII in Asia Pacific. Before the unlawful takeover of Manchuria, the Japanese had already enacted their expansionist policy in the early 1900s with the colonizing of Korea and Taiwan. Their further conquest of Manchuria in 1931 became a test for how far they could push their expansionist ambition. The weak response from the League became a clear signal for the Japanese that they could further their territorial expansion into China and Southeast Asia with little chance of reprisal. Hence, this emboldened them to attack Pearl Harbour and open their path to invade Southeast Asia.	6-8

4	"Gorbachev's reforms caused the Eastern Europe Communist regimes to collapse." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
L1	Describes how the reforms taken by the Gorbachev led to Eastern Europe Communist regimes collapse or Identifies other reasons for their collapse.	1-3

	<i>(Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 reasons for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.)</i> <i>E.g. One of Gorbachev's main reforms to abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine, under which the Soviet Union would intervene to crush any resistance to communist governments. Instead, the Eastern Europe Communist satellite states were not allowed to pursue whatever policy they want, if the leaders saw it as beneficial for the country.</i> Other reasons: - <i>Years of economic stagnation under communist leadership</i> - <i>Political repression to build up resentment</i>	
L2	Explains the reforms taken by the Gorbachev led to Eastern Europe Communist regimes collapse OR Explains how other reason(s) led to Eastern Europe Communist regimes collapse. <i>(Award 4 marks for an explanation and the 5th mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail.)</i> <i>e.g.</i> Gorbachev's reforms did caused the Eastern European Communist regimes to collapse in 1989. One of his main reforms to abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine, under which the Soviet Union would intervene to crush any resistance to communist governments. Instead, the Eastern Europe Communist satellite states were not allowed to pursue whatever policy they want, if the leaders saw it as beneficial for the country. <u>This led countries like Poland and Czechoslovakia having free and fair elections. As a result, their first non-Communist was elected bringing the end of communism in these countries.</u> Furthermore, Gorbachev also decided to withdraw 50,000 troops from the Warsaw Pact countries. This meant that the Eastern European Communist regimes which had always depended on Soviet military support no longer has it to control it people. Such withdrawal made Eastern Europeans more daring to protest against the government, leading to the collapse of communist regimes in both East Germany and Romania. Or <i>e.g.</i> However, Gorbachev's reforms were not the only thing that caused collapse of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. The many years of economic stagnation and political oppression also led to its eventual collapse. As part of COMECON, many of the satellite states did not benefit from the economic relationship with Soviet Union which serves to primarily benefit Soviet interest. <u>In many countries such as East Germany, people worked long hours but were only given a meagre wage. Hungary's economy was also doing poorly and accumulated a large amount of national debt. The continued economic suffering built up resentment amongst the people who became increasingly resistant to continued Soviet rule over the decades.</u> On top of that, there has been many years of political oppression. For example, the Hungarian Uprising of 1956 was crushed by Soviet tanks when the people were just pressing for democratic reforms. Members of the Polish opposition group, known as Solidarity who were fighting for better workers' rights were also jailed for pressing for similar reforms. <u>Economic failure, coupled with political oppression meant that the people of Eastern Europe would eventually want to</u>	4-5

	<u>overthrow the Communist regimes.</u>	
L3	Explains the reforms taken by the Gorbachev led to Eastern Europe Communist regimes collapse AND Explains how other reason(s) led to Eastern Europe Communist regimes collapse. <i>(Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the actions taken by the United States to limit Japanese expansion led to World War Two in the Asia-Pacific and another reason responsible for World War Two in the Asia-Pacific. Add additional mark for further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.)</i> i.e. both aspects of L2 Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. e.g. L3 + In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. Gorbachev's role was more of a catalyst that brought about the end of the Soviet Union. After WWII, the Soviet Union has always tightened the control over the satellite states. Leaders like Brezhnev saw that they needed to tighten their control over Eastern Europe to crush any chance of democratic processes budding within them. The adoption of harsh repressive style of government, plus the failure of command economy to better the lives of the people simply built up resentment that would explode one day in Eastern Europe to bring down their communist governments. What Gorbachev merely did was to open a valve for the discontent that has been building up for decades to be expressed and that was exactly what happened in 1989.	6-8