



NAN HUA HIGH SCHOOL
Preliminary Examination 2026

CANDIDATE
NAME

--

CENTRE
NUMBER

S	2	3	8	6
---	---	---	---	---

CLASS

--	--	--

INDEX
NUMBER

--	--

HISTORY

2174/02

Paper 2 Developments in the post-World War II world:

The Cold War and decolonisation in Southeast Asia, 1940s - 1991

25 August 2026
1 hour 50 minutes

Additional materials: Laptop

SUGGESTED ANSWER SCHEME

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1	(a)	Study Source A. Why did the Soviet minister make this speech at that time? Explain your answer.	[5]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Lifting E.g. The Soviet minister made this speech because the United States was expanding in Europe and disregarding the national interests of countries.		1
L2	Reason based on outcome without main message OR based on provenance E.g. The Soviet minister made this speech at that time to <u>persuade</u> [P] <u>members of the United Nations</u> [A] to <u>reject the aid from the Marshall Plan</u> [O]. OR E.g. The Soviet minister made this speech to address the members of the United Nations.		2
L3	Reason based on main message E.g. The Soviet minister made this speech at that time to <u>persuade</u> [P] <u>members of the United Nations</u> [A] that <u>the US was intending on using the Marshall Plan to control Europe</u> [M]. The source states that “implementation of the Marshall Plan will mean placing European countries under the economic and political control of the United States and direct interference by the United States in the internal affairs of those countries.” This means that the United States was going to deprive the countries of their sovereignty as through the Marshall Plan, they would be obligated to align themselves with the United States. <i>*Responses that do not have a P or accurate audience identified will be capped at L3/3</i>		3
L4	Reason based on purpose <i>Award the higher mark for responses that address the specific context.</i> E.g. The Soviet minister made this speech at that time to		4 – 5

	<u>persuade [P] members of the United Nations [A] that the US was intending on using the Marshall Plan to control Europe [M].</u> The source states that “implementation of the Marshall Plan will mean placing European countries under the economic and political control of the United States and direct interference by the United States in the internal affairs of those countries.” This means that the United States was going to deprive the countries of their sovereignty as through the Marshall Plan, they would be obligated to align themselves with the United States. By making this speech in front of the United Nations in September 1947 <u>after the Soviet Union had rejected the Marshall Plan, [C] the minister was likely trying to justify the USSR and the Soviet satellite states’ rejection of the economic aid and attempting to convince other UN members to do the same. [O]</u>	
--	---	--

1	(b)	Study Source B. What is the message of this source? Explain your answer.	[5]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Describes source without an inference E.g. Source B shows a car and a vulture heading for Western Europe.		1
L2	Sub-message, supported <i>Award 3 marks for responses that are supported by evidence</i> E.g. The message of the source is that USA and USSR were in direct competition with each other over Western Europe. (2m) Source A shows a car labelled “Doctor, U.S. Congress” racing against a vulture labelled “communism”. Both of them are heading towards Western Europe, trying to reach Western Europe before the other party. (3m)		2 – 3
L3	Main message OR outcome of source, supported and explained <i>Award 5 marks for main message with source content use, and 5 marks for contextual knowledge made with reference to cartoon being published after George Marshall’s speech proposing the Economic Recovery Act.</i> E.g. The message of the source is that the USA was in competition with the USSR, to save Western Europe from communism. Source B shows a car labelled “Doctor, U.S. Congress” racing against a vulture labelled “communism”. The		4 – 5

	vulture is carrying “chaos”, implying that communism would be devastating for Western Europe and that by depicting the U.S. Congress as a doctor, the source is saying that the USA was the saviour of Western Europe. The source also states, “STEP ON IT DOC!”, which also demonstrates the urgency of Western Europe’s situation that requires a swift and decisive response to save Western Europe from becoming communist. OR E.g. The message of the source is to tell the American government to hasten their actions to help Europe and prevent them from falling to communism. This can be seen where Source B shows a car labelled “Doctor, U.S. Congress” racing against a vulture labelled “communism”. The vulture is carrying “chaos”, implying that communism would be devastating for Western Europe and that by depicting the U.S. Congress as a doctor, the source is saying that the USA was the saviour of Western Europe. The source also states, “STEP ON IT DOC!”, which also demonstrates the urgency of Western Europe’s situation that requires a swift and decisive response to save Western Europe from becoming communist.	
--	--	--

1	(c)	Study Sources C and D. How similar are these two sources? Explain your answer.	[6]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Comparison based on undeveloped provenance E.g. They are different as one is from an article and the other is from a speech.		1
L2	Common criteria identified, unsupported / Invalid match E.g. Both Sources C and D are similar in showing that the Marshall Plan would help Western Europe.		2
L3	Similarity/Difference based on content, supported <i>Award the higher mark of the level for more developed answers OR for comparison of both similarity and difference.</i> E.g. Both Sources C and D are similar in showing that the Marshall Plan would help Western Europe. Source C also shows that the Marshall Plan would restore Western Europe as it states that “It is of vital importance to the United States that		3 – 4

	European recovery be continued to ultimate success... Europe is thus an essential part of a world trading network". Similarly, Source D states that "The Marshall Planners are giving priority to the reconstruction of Western Germany. According to them, Germany's potential industrial productivity was the cornerstone of the European Recovery Program." Both sources demonstrate that the Marshall Plan was directed at Western Europe's recovery as it was widely regarded as a key foundation to the economic health of the global economy as well.	
L4	Difference in purpose <i>Award 6 marks for well-developed answers.</i> E.g. Sources C and D are different in their purpose. Source D is trying to convince [P] fellow communist sympathisers [A] that the Marshall Plan was not altruistic in nature and in fact was meant to be self-serving to USA's interests. [M] The source states that "Western Europe would eventually become a colonial slave of the US" and that "there will never be a real recovery for them. It will make Western Europe a satellite of the US". This means that the Marshall Plan would not bring genuine benefits to Western Europe. The article was published a few months before the Marshall Plan was formally implemented [C] and thus the author could be attempting to convince other communist sympathisers to resist and opt of the Marshall Plan. Whereas Source C's purpose is to convince [P] Congress [A] of the importance of the Marshall Plan in the recovery of Europe. [M] The sources states that "It is of vital importance to the United States that European recovery be continued to ultimate success. Considered in terms of our own economy, European recovery is essential. The last two decades have taught us the bitter lesson that no economy, not even one so strong as our own, can remain healthy and prosperous in a world of poverty and want. Europe is thus an essential part of a world trading network." This means that the Marshall Plan was not only important, but it was necessary as Europe's economic well-being would determine the rest of the world's stability as well. By making this speech to the Congress after Marshall's initial outline of the plane in June of the same year, [C] Truman wanted to convince Congress to put their full support behind the ambitious financial programme [O].	5 – 6

1	(d)	Study Sources E and F. Having read Source E, are you surprised by Source F? Explain your answer.	[6]
----------	------------	--	------------

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Surprise/Not surprise based on undeveloped provenance E.g. Having read Source E, I am not surprised by Source F because Source E is written by American and Russian historians while Source F is just by a Russian, so they will definitely differ in content.	1
L2	Surprise based on undeveloped context of Source F only I am surprised by Source F because the source implies that the USSR wants aid from Marshall Plan but I know that the USSR and the USA were not on particularly friendly terms with each other and I would have expected the USSR to immediately reject any form of aid from the USA.	2
L3	Surprise based on comparison of Source E and Source F <i>Award 3 marks for identifying common criteria</i> <i>Award 4 marks for identifying common criteria, supported by evidence.</i> E.g. Having read Source E, I am surprised by Source F as they differ over whether the Marshall Plan was beneficial to the USSR. Source E shows that it would be disadvantageous for the USSR as it states that “Novikov interpreted the Marshall Plan as an attempt to roll back Soviet influence in Europe”. This means that the Marshall Plan would result in the diminishing of Soviet influence in the region. Whereas Source F shows that the USSR would benefit from the Marshall Plan where it states that Molotov “understood that the Soviet Union needed help. In his reply he noted that reconstruction was everyone’s main aim, and the the United States’ offer of help should be welcomed”. This means that the USSR would be able to rebuild its infrastructure with the aid received from the Marshall Plan, which would be advantageous for the USSR.	3-4
L4	Identifies differences + Cross reference to another source/contextual knowledge, supported <i>Award the higher mark of the level for more developed answers.</i> E.g. Identifies differences + I am further surprised by Source F as Source A also contradicts Source F. Source E shows that it would be disadvantageous for the USSR and similarly, Source A also states that “the implementation of the Marshall Plan will mean placing European countries under the economic and political control of the United States”. In the Cold War context, this means that the Marshall Plan would be depriving the USSR from extending their political sphere of influence in Europe, which would also mean that democratic elements threaten to	5

	encroach upon the Soviet sphere of influence, therefore not being beneficial to the USSR. <i>*Cross-reference to Source E is also acceptable</i>	
L5	Identifies differences + Not surprised because of Source F's provenance <i>Award 6 marks for well-developed answers.</i> E.g. Identifies differences + However, upon further analysis of the provenance, Source F is no longer as surprising regardless of what Source E is saying. The provenance indicates that Molotov's eagerness towards the Marshall Plan was before the June 1947 meeting in Paris. Before the meeting in Paris, the countries were not yet aware of the finer details and conditions of aid rendered through the Marshall Plan. As such, the openness of Molotov in Source F to consider accepting help from the USA is to be expected as he would want the best for the Soviet Union after being devastated by WWII. Furthermore, tensions between the USA and the USSR, while growing, had not yet solidified. Source F therefore only shows a snapshot of the USSR's incomplete understanding of the Marshall Plan and would have a contrasting viewpoint from Source E. Where Source E draws upon on extensive research done and written with input from both American and Russian historians, creating a more holistic understanding of the Marshall Plan that would differ from Source F. <i>*Will accept responses based on Cold War context and increasing suspicion, it is surprising and unexpected for Molotov to even consider the USA's deal. (5m)</i>	5 – 6

1	(e)	Study all the sources. 'The Marshall Plan's objective was to spread American influence.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your view.	[8]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Identifies sources that support / do not support the view without valid source use		1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 2 marks for one Y or N supported by valid source use, and additional 1 mark for each subsequent valid source use (up to a maximum of 4 marks).</i> E.g. Yes, Sources A, D and E support the statement.		2 – 4

	Source A supports the statement. Source A shows that <u>Marshall Plan was ploy to expand American influence by allowing them more control over European countries.</u> The source states that “implementation of the Marshall Plan will mean placing European countries under the economic and political control of the USA and direct interference by the USA in the internal affairs of those countries.” This means that the USA was going to deprive the countries of their sovereignty as through the Marshall Plan, they would be obligated to align themselves with the United States. Source D supports the statement. Source D shows that <u>the Marshall Plan was meant to be self-serving to the USA’s interests.</u> Source E states that “Western Europe would eventually become a colonial slave of the US” and that “It will make Western Europe a satellite of the US”. This means that through the Marshall Plan, the USA would be able to control the states who receive the aid and thereby spread their influence and hold over them. Source E supports the statement. Source E shows that <u>the Marshall Plan was meant to prevent Soviet Union from gaining ground in Europe, which in the Cold War context also meant that it would help the USA gain greater foothold in Europe.</u> Source C states that “the underlying goal of the American initiative (Marshall Plan)” was to establish “conditions for the strengthening of the position of the American capital in Europe and Asia” and to “roll back Soviet influence in Europe”. This means that the Marshall Plan was twofold, meant to not only spread American influence, but also to curb and contain Soviet influence as well. OR E.g. No, Sources B, C and F do not support the statement. Source B does not support the statement. Source B shows that <u>the Marshall Plan was not to spread its influence but instead to save Western Europe from the evils of communism.</u> Source B shows a car labelled “Doctor, U.S. Congress” racing against a vulture labelled “communism”. The vulture is carrying “chaos”, implying that communism would be devastating for Western Europe and that by depicting the U.S. Congress as a doctor, the source is saying that the USA would be the saviour of Western Europe. As the source was published after George Marshall’s speech that outlined the economic aid plan, the doctor’s cure and help is referencing the Marshall Plan that would help rescue Western Europe’s economy.	
--	---	--

	Source C does not support the statement. Source C shows that <u>the only goal of the Marshall Plan was to restore economic stability to Europe and therefore the world</u>. Source C states that “It is of vital importance to the United States that European recovery be continued to ultimate success. Considered in terms of our own economy, European recovery is essential...no economy, not even one so strong as our own, can remain healthy and prosperous in a world of poverty and want. Europe is thus an essential part of a world trading network.” This shows that the USA was introducing the Marshall Plan to safeguard not just Europe but the world as well. Source F does not support the statement. Source F shows that <u>the Marshall Plan was not to spread its influence but instead to help rebuild Europe</u>. Source F states that “reconstruction was everyone’s main aim, and the United States’ offer of help should be welcomed.” This means that the Marshall Plan’s primary objective was to help re-establish stability in Europe. <i>Note:</i> - To be awarded L2 or L3, there must be a direct reference to source content. - Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues raised by the sources is insufficient.	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 5 marks for 1Y and 1N, and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks.</i> <i>Note:</i> - Bonus of 2m (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency, etc but the total for this question must not exceed 8m. E.g. Source A is reliable because it is supported by my contextual knowledge. Based on what I know, countries that did not have democratic, capitalist systems did not receive financial support. For example, Italy did not receive any aid until a non-communist government took power in 1948. This thus further supports Source A in its claim that the countries had to bend to the USA’s will in exchange for economic aid. As such, Source A can be used to support the statement.	5 – 8

Section B: Essays

2	'Poor military leadership was the most important reason that led to the defeat of Germany in WWII.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the reasons behind Germany's defeat in WWII <i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Other possible answers: - Importance of the USA - Importance of the USSR - Importance of Britain - Weaknesses of the Axis powers	1 – 3
L2	Explains how poor military leadership was the most important reason that led to the defeat of Germany in WWII OR how other factors led to it <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how poor military leadership was the most important reason that led to the defeat of Germany in WWII OR how other factors led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that poor military leadership was the most important reason that led to the defeat of Germany. German commanders constantly had to report back to Hitler, who regularly intervened in military decisions. Hitler had never been a senior military commander. He had little military command experience at the highest level. This lack of experience was exemplified by his order to halt the advance of German forces towards Dunkirk in May 1940. Another critical error Hitler made was during the siege of Stalingrad. In 1942, German forces attacked Stalingrad and met stubborn resistance from Soviet troops. Most of the German commanders wanted to withdraw, as the city was not particularly valuable from a strategic point of view. However, Hitler overruled them. To Hitler taking Stalingrad was a matter of pride, as the city was named after Stalin. Thus, he committed hundreds of thousands of troops to a pointless battle that was lost by February 1943. The halt at Dunkirk <u>resulted in the Allies being able to retreat, recuperate and regroup. Rather than taking out the enemy completely, Hitler's command gave the Allies a strategic exit plan</u>	4 – 5

	<u>and denied the Axis powers a chance at an early victory. His further mistakes at Stalingrad wasted precious resources and manpower, further weakening Germany's war effort and thus leading to their defeat.</u> OR E.g. Another reason that led to the defeat of Germany was the role of the USA. From 1942 onwards, the USA supplied the Allies with food, raw materials, industrial equipment, weapons and ammunition, troops, ships and aircraft. Between 1941 and 1945, USA's factories produced 250,000 aircraft, 90,000 tanks, 350 naval destroyers, 200 submarines and 5,600 merchant ships. <u>The overwhelming volume of fresh arms and equipment that was injected into the war effort was instrumental as it meant that the Allied forces had a stronger war machine. With the fresh troops, it meant that war weary soldiers could be replaced; the new equipment replaced damaged weapons, ensuring that the Allied forces would be able to outlast and outperform the Germans.</u>	
L3	Explains how poor military leadership was the most important reason that led to the defeat of Germany in WWII AND how other factors led to it <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how poor military leadership was the most important reason that led to the defeat of Germany in WWII AND how other factors led to it, and additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of 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). E.g. L3 + In conclusion, <u>I believe that poor military leadership was the most important reason that led to the defeat of Germany in WWII. Although the USA's contributions did help to sway the course of the way later, the mistakes that were made by Hitler enabled the Allied forces to recuperate in the first place. By not advancing at Dunkirk, Germany allowed a tactical retreat that ensured the survival of the Allied forces in the in the early years of the war. Thereby protracting the conflict in a manner that was actually favourable to the Allied forces.</u>	6 – 8

3	'External commitments were the most important reason that led to decline of the USSR.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the reasons behind the decline of USSR <i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Other possible answers: - Weaknesses of command economy - Opposition to Communism in Eastern Europe - Ageing leadership - Gorbachev's political reforms - Gorbachev's foreign policy reforms	1 – 3
L2	Explains how external commitments led to the decline of the USSR OR other reasons that led to it <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how external commitments led to the decline of the USSR OR other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that external commitments led to the decline of the USSR. One example of such external commitments was the USSR's support for its allies such as the Arab states in the Middle East and Fidel Castro's Cuba. The Soviets provided money, technical equipment, advisors, food and medical supplies to many of their allies. These financial burdens greatly increased when the war in Afghanistan broke out in 1979. Soviet troops entered Afghanistan to maintain the power of the pro-soviet government there, but they were tied down for the next 10 years by Afghan fighters known as the Mujahideen. The Mujahideen saw themselves as fighting against the communist regime. To make matters worse for the USSR, they knew the territory, had plenty of experience in guerrilla warfare and were supplied with weapons and money by the United States and Saudi Arabia. The USSR invested far too much in its military power. In particular the nuclear weapons programme and the war in Afghanistan were very expensive. It was estimated that 30-50% of Soviet resources went to the military. <u>Such commitments to conflicts outside the borders of the USSR burdened the Soviet economy, diverting resources away from other important sectors of the country. As a result of these commitments, less economic resources were dedicated to investing in the consumer market, and new research and</u>	4 – 5

	<u>development, the Soviet economy further suffered and accelerated the USSR's decline.</u> OR E.g Another reason that led to the decline of the USSR was Gorbachev's economic reforms. These reforms, known as Perestroika, or "restructuring," aimed to revitalise the Soviet economy. They included encouraging innovation and allowing managers to try new approaches without seeking prior approval from the government. Managers were also encouraged to involve workers in discussions and decision-making processes regarding their workplaces. The goal was to foster new ideas, improve efficiency, and combat corruption. However, these reforms largely failed to produce an overall increase in output. Persistent problems such as unemployment, the growth of black markets, and shortages of basic necessities continued. <u>This led to increased criticism of Gorbachev's reforms and fuelled the emergence of opposition groups that challenged the communist government. These developments ultimately contributed to the government's collapse and the decline of the USSR.</u> OR E.g. Another reason that led to the decline of the USSR was Gorbachev's political reforms. One of his political reforms include Glasnost, which allowed open political debate by Communist Party members who disagreed with the government. It would also allow criticism of the government in the media. However, Glasnost backfired because it released much resentment against the communist government. It also exposed shortcomings of the government officials such as their inefficiency and corruption. <u>This led to decreasing confidence in the party. The Soviets were also further exposed to aspects of the outside world, especially the better quality of life in the US and Western European countries, through popular Western culture. As a result, the positive picture of Soviet life that the government previously presented to the public quickly fell apart. Many in the Soviet bloc felt deceived and lost confidence in the vision and rule of the communist governments. Support for the Soviet government fell, while opposition grew. This led to a loss of political control of the USSR, contributing to its decline in power and support from its people.</u>	
L3	Explains how external commitments led to the decline of the USSR AND other reasons that led to it <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how external commitments led to the decline of the USSR AND other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i>	6 – 8

	Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). E.g. L3 + In conclusion, I believe that <u>external burdens</u> were the most influential in catalysing the decline of the USSR. The sheer volume of funds that were irredeemably diverted away from the Soviet economy had detrimental consequences on several aspects of the country, particularly in terms of maintaining the social welfare within the USSR. The lack of funds, because of the external commitments, to properly dedicate to improving the standards of living of the people served as good breeding ground for dissent against communism, further compounding the internal issues USSR was facing. Thus, external economic burdens fundamentally caused the decline of the USSR.	
--	---	--

4	'Cold War politics was the most important reason that led to the decolonisation of Vietnam.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the reasons for decolonisation of Vietnam <i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Other possible answers: - Dien Bien Phu - Increasing resistance in France - Viet Minh's resistance	1 – 3
L2	Explains how Cold War politics led to the decolonisation of Vietnam OR other reasons that led to it <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how Cold War politics led to the decolonisation of Vietnam OR other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that Cold War politics was an important reason that led to the decolonisation of Vietnam. Unable to win the war in Vietnam by force, the French tried to gain American political and financial support for the costly campaign. In 1948, the French began to exaggerate the communist threat in Vietnam, seizing on	4 – 5

	the anxieties of the Western powers. In 1949, the communists came into power and Mao was keen to assist China's southern neighbour. In January 1950, China recognised the DRV, quickly followed by the USSR. The USA became even more pro-France when the Korean War broke out in June 1950. The attack by communist North Korea on South Korea seemed to highlight a growing communist threat in Asia. These led to China providing training and military advisors to aid the Viet Minh in combat areas. The Chinese provided 10,000 tonnes of equipment per month and the USSR sent artillery pieces to the Viet Minh. <u>These reinforcements enabled the Viet Minh to continue fighting the French in the first Indochina war. By protracting the conflict, it forced the French and the USA to reconsider their position in Vietnam and be open for negotiation and peace talks with the Viet Minh and the Associated States of Indochina, and therefore one step closer to decolonisation.</u> OR E.g. Another reason that led to the decolonisation of Vietnam was the battle of Dien Bien Phu. In November 1953, the French flew six battalions of parachuters into Dien Bien Phu in northwest Vietnam. The French wanted to lure the Viet Minh army into open battle at Dien Bien Phu and destroy it. However, the communists decided to surround the French base before overrunning it. They mobilised hundreds of thousands of peasants and pack animals to haul weapons, ammunition and food up the hills overlooking the valley. In January 1954, 50,000 communist forces attacked the French garrison at Dien Bien Phu. From the hilltop, Viet Minh artillery quickly knocked out the unprotected French guns and airstrip. The French were forced to dig themselves into trenches. The communists advanced towards the French trenches and slowly encircled the defenders. The French surrendered on 7 May and it was a decisive victory for the Viet Minh. <u>This led to the decolonisation of Vietnam as the decisive victory demonstrated to the French that the Viet Minh was a force to be reckoned with and would not be easily defeated. Even with financial support from the USA from 1952 to 1954, they were still unable to overwhelm the Viet Minh, forcing the French to the negotiating table to exit Vietnam permanently, and thus leading to Vietnam's decolonisation.</u>	
L3	Explains how Cold War politics led to the decolonisation of Vietnam AND other reasons that led to it <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how Cold War politics led to the decolonisation of Vietnam AND other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for	6 – 8

	a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different terms. 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). E.g. L3 + In conclusion, <u>I believe that the Cold War politics was a more important reason.</u> Even though the battle of Dien Bien Phu served as the spark to the peace progress that led to decolonisation of Vietnam, there were still elements of Cold War politics that contributed to the signing of the Geneva Accords as well. By 1954, the USA and China's involvement in Korea had made them exhausted and eager to end their involvements overseas; China had convinced a less than eager Ho Chi Minh to sign the Geneva Accords. Furthermore, it could also be argued that the battle of Dien Bien Phu could take place because of the support from China. As such, while Cold War politics played a key role in ensuring the Vietnamese independence effort was kept alive, it also had a great hand in bringing the fighting to an end given the great dependence on the USA and China for economic and military help, it could be considered to be the more important reason for the decolonisation of Vietnam.	
--	---	--

END OF ANSWER SCHEME