



NAN HUA HIGH SCHOOL
Preliminary Examination 2026

CANDIDATE
NAME

--

CENTRE
NUMBER

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

CLASS

--	--	--

INDEX
NUMBER

--	--

HISTORY

2174/01

Paper 1 Extension of European Control in Southeast Asia and Challenges to
European Dominance, 1870s–1942

28 August 2026
1 hour 50 minutes

Additional materials: Laptop

SUGGESTED ANSWER SCHEME

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1(a)	Study Source A. Why was this photograph published in the Nazi newspapers? Explain your answer.	[5]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Describes source without addressing the question. <i>E.g. The photograph shows a grocery store in Munich. It is very well stocked with food.</i>	1
L2	Reason identified, based on provenance. <i>E.g. The photograph was published in the Nazi newspapers to show that the Nazi party was a good party.</i>	2
L3	Reason identified, based on content, supported by valid source use <i>E.g. The photograph was published in the Nazi newspaper to show that food was sufficient in Germany. Source A shows a photograph of a grocery store in Munich, filled with food and supplies. Three saleswomen were smiling, holding on to sausages and apples. This implies that grocery stores were well supplied, with food well stocked and sufficient for the needs of Germans.</i> Other acceptable reasons: Germany had recovered from the Great Depression, people had good living standards, Nazis had provided for the Germans	3
L4	Reason identified and/or supported, based on purpose. Award 4 marks for reason identified based on purpose, supported by valid evidence and explanation. Award 5 marks for a well-developed paragraph (contextualising the photograph). <i>E.g. The photograph was published in the Nazi newspapers to convince (P) the Germans (A) that the Nazis had provided abundantly for the Germans (M) so that the Germans would continue to be confident in the Party and support their policies (O). I know this because Source A shows a photograph of a grocery store in Munich, filled with food and supplies. Three saleswomen were smiling, holding on to sausages and apples. This implies that the Nazi party had resolved the economic issues of the Great Depression and ensured that grocery stores were well supplied and well stocked with food that was abundantly sufficient for the needs of Germans. [4m] This photograph was published in 1934, a year after the Nazi Party had taken over Germany. It was likely to show the country the</i>	4-5

	<i>accomplishment of the Party in resolving the economic problems caused by the Great Depression since 1929. This in turn would ensure that Germans would continue supporting the Nazis, confident in the Party's ability to govern and provide for its people (C). [5m]</i>	
--	--	--

1(b)	Study Source B. Are you surprised by this report? Explain your answer.	[5]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identify valid claim Award 2 marks for valid source support. <i>E.g. I am surprised that the report would highlight the negative sentiments of the workers about Nazism/ Hitler. (1m) I know this because Source B states "Though the workers do not express it publicly, one senses that they will never be conquered by Nazism", "whenever possible they show that they really have very little interest in Hitler's gibberish" and "as the speech ended, workers immediately ran for the doors." This implies that the workers were not interested in Nazism nor were they impressed by Hitler and what he had to say.</i> Other acceptable claims: workers dared to express their disinterest about Nazi ideology through their actions, workers were dissatisfied with the Nazi Party	1-2
L2	Surprised/Not surprised based on "common sense" or undeveloped provenance, such as economic recovery in 1936 or the role of the Defence Industry Inspectorate XIII Nuremburg <i>E.g. I am surprised that the report would highlight the negative sentiments of the workers towards Nazism/Hitler because by 1936, Germany was well on the road of economic recovery. I know this because Source B states "Though the workers do not express it publicly, one senses that they will never be conquered by Nazism", "whenever possible they show that they really have very little interest in Hitler's gibberish" and "as the speech ended, workers immediately ran for the doors." This implies that the workers were not interested in Nazism nor were they impressed by Hitler and what he had to say, which was surprising given the fact that they were employed and had jobs that were provided for by the Nazi Party.</i> OR <i>E.g. I am surprised that the report would highlight the negative sentiments of the workers towards Nazism/Hitler because I would have expected the monthly report to be highlighting positive things</i>	3

	<i>on the ground. Source B states “Though the workers do not express it publicly, one senses that they will never be conquered by Nazism”, “whenever possible they show that they really have very little interest in Hitler’s gibberish” and “as the speech ended, workers immediately ran for the doors.” This implies that the workers were not interested in Nazism nor were they impressed by Hitler and what he had to say. As this report was compiled by the Defence Industry Inspectorate XIII Nuremburg, which would have been part of the government and hence, Nazi supporters, I would have expected it to censor the negative sentiments and highlight only positive aspects of the situation. Instead, it mentioned actual sentiments of the workers which is surprising.</i> OR <i>E.g. I am not surprised that the factory’s Brownshirts would have stepped in to stop the noise caused by the workers because it was expected of their responsibilities. Source B states “During the speech, the workers conversed among themselves such that the factory’s Brownshirts had to intervene in order to restore quiet.” This implies that the workers showed their lack of interests and support for Hitler and the Nazi Party by ignoring the broadcasting of Hitler’s speech, conversing amongst themselves and being noisy enough for the factory’s Brownshirts to intervene and keep them quiet. Given that Hitler’s speech was being broadcasted, it was important that Germans displayed respect and decorum and thus, it would not be surprising that the Brownshirts would have stepped in to ensure quiet and calm so as to create the impression that Germans were supportive of Hitler.</i>	
L3	Surprised/Not surprised based on historical knowledge or other sources OR Surprised, based on provenance explained <i>E.g. I am surprised that German workers dared to express their disinterest about Nazi ideology through their actions because based on my contextual knowledge, such negative expressions could lead to arrests or consequences. I know this because Source B states “whenever possible they show that they really have very little interest in Hitler’s gibberish” and “During the speech, the workers conversed among themselves such that the factory’s Brownshirts had to intervene in order to restore quiet. As the speech ended, workers immediately ran for the doors.” This implies that the workers showed their lack of interests and support for Hitler and the Nazi Party by ignoring the broadcasting of Hitler’s speech, conversing amongst themselves and being noisy enough for the factory’s Brownshirts to intervene and keep them quiet. They also left very quickly after listening to Hitler’s speech. Despite these actions, the workers were not arrested nor punished, which was not what I expected, given my contextual knowledge about the role of Gestapo in eliminating potential dissidents and opposition of the Nazi party.</i>	4

	OR <i>E.g. I am not surprised by the negative sentiments of German workers in Source B because it is supported by Source D. Source B states "Though the workers do not express it publicly, one senses that they will never be conquered by Nazism", "whenever possible they show that they really have very little interest in Hitler's gibberish" and "as the speech ended, workers immediately ran for the doors." This implies that the workers were not interested in Nazism nor were they impressed by Hitler and what he had to say. This highlights the negative sentiments that the workers had towards Nazism / Hitler. This is supported in Source D where it states "a large number of the skilled workers who were unemployed for a long time are not enthusiastic Nazis. They often complain that they earn much less now than in 1929", "the fact that one's wages continually buy less, and that the slave driving gets worse every day cannot be denied" and "the mood in the factories is depressed." This implies that workers were unhappy about their salaries and the rising cost of living, which in turn, made them unhappy about the Nazis who were in power and did not manage the economic situation well.</i> OR <i>E.g. I am surprised that the report would highlight the negative sentiments of the workers towards Nazism/Hitler because I would have expected the monthly report to be highlighting positive things on the ground. Source B states "Though the workers do not express it publicly, one senses that they will never be conquered by Nazism", "whenever possible they show that they really have very little interest in Hitler's gibberish" and "as the speech ended, workers immediately ran for the doors." This implies that the workers were not interested in Nazism nor were they impressed by Hitler and what he had to say. As this report was compiled by the Defence Industry Inspectorate XIII Nuremburg, I would have expected it to censor the negative sentiments and highlight only positive aspects of the situation. This is because it was a regional administrative office, and thus, its monthly report would likely have been submitted to the head office or to their bosses. Given the audience, it would have made sense for the office to play up the positives instead of mentioning anything negative, so that they could be rewarded for their effort and work. Instead, it mentioned actual sentiments of the workers which would work against them should their bosses or head office be upset at the situation. (provenance developed)</i>	
L4	Not surprised based on provenance contextualised <i>E.g. I am not surprised that the report would highlight the negative sentiments of the workers towards Nazism/Hitler because this would be expected of what an Inspectorate would do. Source B states</i>	5

	<i>“Though the workers do not express it publicly, one senses that they will never be conquered by Nazism”, “whenever possible they show that they really have very little interest in Hitler’s gibberish” and “as the speech ended, workers immediately ran for the doors.” This implies that the workers were not interested in Nazism nor were they impressed by Hitler and what he had to say. Given that the Defence Industry Inspectorate XIII Nuremburg was a regional administrative office that coordinated civilian industry, manpower and military production of a district, it would be important to reflect the truth and the realities on the ground, so that proper intervention could be taken to manage the situation. This would have been important as Hitler had just started on the 4 Year Plan in August 1936, where the economy was expected to shift towards rearmament and in preparation for war. The administrative office thus needed to ensure accuracy in their report so that problems could be weeded out and efficiency ensured for military production (C).</i>	
--	--	--

1(c)	Study Source C. How useful is Source C as evidence of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment? Explain your answer.	[6]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Uncritical acceptance of source based on provenance OR useful based on what it shows <i>E.g. Source C is useful as it is a table published by the League of Nations, an international organisation.</i> OR <i>E.g. Source C is useful as evidence of Nazis’ successful attempts to reduce unemployment in Germany.</i>	1
L2	Not useful, based on provenance <i>E.g. Source C is not useful as the statistics for Germany in the table was provided by the German government, who were the Nazis at that point in time. They would have wanted to provide statistics that would reflect well on their governance and thus, the data is likely to be biased and unreliable.</i>	2
L3	Useful or not useful, based on source content, supported with valid source use <i>e.g. Source C is useful as evidence of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment. Source C shows a table with statistics about the unemployment rate of workers from different countries. It shows that in 1932, Germany had 30.1% of workers who were</i>	3

	<i>unemployed but in 1937, there were only 4.6% and then in 1939, 2.1% under Nazi rule. This shows that after the Nazis took over in 1933, they were able to resolve the economic issues and ensured that Germans were employed, thereby successfully reducing unemployment.</i> OR <i>Source C is not useful as evidence of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment because it is not very reliable. Source C shows a table with statistics about the unemployment rate of workers from different countries. It shows that in 1932, Germany had 30.1% of workers who were unemployed but in 1937, there were only 4.6% and then in 1939, 2.1% under Nazi rule. Even though these statistics seem to prove that the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment, it is not very reliable as the data is provided by the Nazis. It could be biased data as the Nazi government could simply have wanted to paint a positive picture of their country. Also, the way each country calculated or defined “unemployment” could be different and thus, numbers could be low based on the Nazis’ definition of unemployment rather than reflecting actual unemployment rates.</i>	
L4	Useful OR Not useful, based on reliability (cross-reference). Award 5 marks for a well-developed paragraph or for both sides. <i>e.g. Source C is useful as evidence of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment because it is reliable. Source C shows a table with statistics about the unemployment rate of workers from different countries. It shows that in 1932, Germany had 30.1% of workers who were unemployed but in 1937, there were only 4.6% and then in 1939, 2.1% under Nazi rule. This shows that after the Nazis took over in 1933, they were able to resolve the economic issues and ensured that Germans were employed, thereby successfully reducing unemployment. Source C is reliable as it is supported by Source D. Source D states “In particular, a large number of the skilled workers who were unemployed for a long time are not enthusiastic Nazis” and “but they always say: “It is all the same to us; at least we have work.”” This implies that there were a large number of workers who were employed due to Nazis’ efforts and they had work to do even though they were not necessarily too happy under their governance. Since Source D supports Source C, Source C is reliable and hence, useful as evidence of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment.</i> OR <i>Source C is not useful as evidence of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment because it is not reliable. Source C shows a table with statistics about the unemployment rate of workers from different countries. It shows that in 1932, Germany had 30.1% of</i>	4-5

	<i>workers who were unemployed but in 1937, there were only 4.6% and then in 1939, 2.1% under Nazi rule. Even though these statistics seem to prove that the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment, it is not very reliable as the data is provided by the Nazis. It could be biased data as the Nazi government could simply have wanted to paint a positive picture of their country. Also, the way each country calculated or defined “unemployment” could be different and thus, numbers could be low based on the Nazis’ definition of unemployment rather than reflecting actual unemployment rates. Furthermore, Source C is unreliable as it is challenged by Source F. Source F states “It is crucial to question the validity of the full employment achieved by the Nazi Party in 1939. First, women were not included in the assessment of the domestically unemployed. Second, those considered ‘work-shy’ by the State for various reasons were simply taken to concentration camps - as many as 500,000 by 1933” and “the manipulation of statistical data brings into question the actual effect of the economic policies on unemployment.” This implies that the statistics in the table were not accurate as data was manipulated in such a way that other groups of unemployed people were removed from the head count. Source C’s data is not reliable and cannot be used as evidence of Nazis’ economic policies and attempts to reduce unemployment.</i>	
L5	Not useful OR Limited utility based on critical analysis of provenance Award 6 marks for a well-developed paragraph based on provenance explained. <i>E.g. Source C is not useful as evidence of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment because it is not reliable. Source C shows a table with statistics about the unemployment rate of workers from different countries. It shows that in 1932, Germany had 30.1% of workers who were unemployed but in 1937, there were only 4.6% and then in 1939, 2.1% under Nazi rule. Even though these statistics seem to prove that the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment, it is not very reliable as the data is provided by the Nazis. It is likely that the Nazis provided the data to the League of Nations so that member nations with access to the data (A) would be convinced (P) that the Nazis were competent and capable as the ruling party of Germany, resolving the economic problems efficiently and successfully (M) so that member nations would accord Nazi Germany the respect and legitimacy it desired in the international arena (O). (5m) This was at a period of time where Hitler was making many territorial demands in Europe and pushing the boundaries and tolerance of many countries. Proving its strength and ability would strengthen their case and back up their demands (C). Since there was a hidden agenda, the statistics would not be a useful indicator of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment. (6m)</i> OR	5-6

	<i>While Source C is not useful as evidence of the success of Nazi attempts to reduce unemployment due to its potential purpose and problematic reliability, it is still useful as a reflection of what the Nazis hoped to show the world regarding their ability to manage unemployment in Germany. Source C shows a table with statistics about the unemployment rate of workers from different countries. It shows that in 1932, Germany had 30.1% of workers who were unemployed but in 1937, there were only 4.6% and then in 1939, 2.1% under Nazi rule. Even though these statistics seem to prove that the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment, it is not very reliable as the data was provided by the Nazis. It is likely that the Nazis provided the data to the League of Nations so that member nations with access to the data (A) would be convinced (P) that the Nazis were competent and capable as the ruling party of Germany, resolving the economic problems efficiently and successfully (M) so that member nations would accord Nazi Germany the respect and legitimacy it desired in the international arena (O). This was at a period of time where Hitler was making many territorial demands in Europe and pushing the boundaries and tolerance of many countries. Proving its strength and ability would strengthen their case and back up their demands (C). As such, Source C may not necessarily reflect the truth but is useful as evidence of how the Nazis would like to be seen in terms of managing unemployment in Germany. (6m)</i>	
--	---	--

1(d)	Study Sources D and E. Both Sources D and E seem to have contradictory reports about the lives of workers in 1938. Does it mean that one of them must be wrong? Explain your answer.	[6]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Answers the question by addressing only one source <i>E.g. Yes, Source D is wrong about the unhappiness of the workers because Source D has a purpose in highlighting the negative aspects of life under the Nazis.</i>	1
L2	Yes, based on comparison of differences regarding the lives of workers OR NO, based on undeveloped comparison of the provenance of both sources <i>E.g. Yes, one of the sources must be wrong because both sources contradict each other regarding how good the lives of workers were in 1938 under Nazi rule. Source D shows that the lives of the workers were not good and they were unhappy while Source E shows that the lives of the workers were good. (2m) Source D states “The fact</i>	2-3

	<i>that one's wages continually buy less, and that the slave driving gets worse every day cannot be denied. The mood in the factories is depressed." This implies life was getting tougher as the cost of living was increasing faster than the increase in wages, and workers were generally in a depressed mood. They were also being pushed to work very hard. As such, it shows that the lives of workers were bad. On the other hand, Source E states "6,000 factory courtyards now offer space for real relaxation, which was not true in the past. 17,000 canteens and lounges, and 13,000 shower rooms have been transformed" and "over 20 million have participated in KdF trips since 1934." This implies that the working conditions for Germans had improved and they were also able to afford and enjoy holidays which they had not done before. This shows that life for workers was good under the Nazis. (3m)</i> OR <i>E.g. No, it does not mean that one of them is wrong. Both are wrong as both sources are biased. Source D is from a political party in exile and would naturally highlight the negative aspects of the lives of workers. Source E is an excerpt taken from a Nazi publication and would be expected to praise the efforts put in by the Nazis to improve the lives of the workers. As such, both reports are unlikely to be telling the whole truth and thus, both are wrong/unreliable. (3m)</i>	
L3	Comparison from L2 + Yes, based on the evaluation of reliability of either source via cross-referencing <i>L2 + Yes, one of them must be wrong. Source D is wrong because it is unreliable. Source D is unreliable as it is contradicted by Source A. Source D states "The fact that one's wages continually buy less, and that the slave driving gets worse every day cannot be denied. The mood in the factories is depressed." This implies life was getting tougher as the cost of living was increasing faster than the increase in wages, and workers were generally in a depressed mood. They were also being pushed to work very hard. As such, it shows that the lives of workers were bad. However, Source A shows a photograph of a grocery store in Munich, filled with food and supplies. Three saleswomen were smiling, holding on to sausages and apples. This implies that the Nazi party had resolved the economic issues of the Great Depression and ensured that grocery stores were well supplied and well stocked with food that was abundantly sufficient for the needs of Germans, and the workers were happy working. Since Source A contradicts Source D regarding the lives of workers and the living situation in Germany, Source D is more unreliable than Source E and therefore, is the wrong one between the two.</i> Acceptable reasoning: Source D is right as it is supported by Source B, making Source E wrong since Source D contradicts Source E;	4

	Source D is wrong as Source E is the more reliable source, being supported by Source C/A.	
L4	Identifies comparison + Yes OR No, based on analysis of provenance of one or both sources <i>Award 6 marks for No, based on a comparison of the provenances of both sources.</i> <i>Identifies comparison + Yes, one of them must be wrong. Source D is wrong because it is unreliable. Source D is unreliable as it had a purpose. Source D is a report published by a German political party in exile, as part of their resistance work against the Nazis. The report was meant to convince (P) other European nations (A) that the Nazis were not competent, and the lives of workers were not good (M) so that these European nations would support them and provide aid (O) so they could weaken Nazi rule and make a comeback in Germany. This would be significant as the Nazis had made political parties illegal and it was difficult to overthrow the Nazis without external support and help (C). To resist the Nazis and question their legitimacy, it was important to show that the Nazis were not truly benefitting the people. (5m)</i> OR <i>E.g. Identifies comparison + No, it does not mean that one of them must be wrong. This is because both reports could be right at the same time. While the reports seem to provide contradictory reports regarding the lives of workers in Nazi Germany, the reports were highlighting different aspects of the lives of workers. In Source D, the report did not deny that the Nazis had provided employment for the workers. The issue was the costs of living vis-a-vis the wages of workers while in Source E, the focus was on the working conditions and their annual vacations which were not mentioned nor addressed in Source D. As such, it could be possible that workers struggled with the cost of living while enjoying an improvement in their working conditions. Similarly, their annual vacations were heavily subsidised based on my contextual knowledge, which might not have much impact on their daily costs of living. Since both sources were highlighting different aspects of the lives of workers, both sources could be right at the same time. (5m)</i> OR <i>No, it does not mean that one of them is wrong. Both are wrong as both sources had their own ulterior motives. Source D is from a political party in exile resisting the Nazis and would naturally highlight the negative aspects of the lives of workers. The report was meant to convince (P) other European nations (A) that the Nazis were not competent, and the lives of workers were not good (M) so that these European nations would support them and provide aid (O)</i>	5-6

	<i>so they could weaken Nazi rule and make a comeback in Germany. This would be significant as the Nazis had made political parties illegal and it was difficult to overthrow the Nazis without external support and help (C). To resist the Nazis and question their legitimacy, it was important to show that the Nazis were not truly benefitting the people. As for Source E, it is an excerpt taken from a Nazi publication and would be expected to praise the efforts put in by the Nazis to improve the lives of the workers. The report was meant to convince (P) Germans (A) that the Nazis were making much effort to improve their lives, both in work and for leisure (M) so that Germans would be grateful to the Nazis and continue supporting their policies and actions (O). This was at a period where Hitler was preparing for war and thus, it was important that he had the support of the German population (C). Given the two different purposes, both reports are unlikely to be telling the whole truth and thus, both are wrong/unreliable. (6m)</i> Note: There's an implicit comparison of the two sources based on purpose and can be given full marks without having to identify comparison in any prior paragraphs.	
--	--	--

1(e)	Study all the sources. 'Nazi economic policies brought about an improvement to the lives of Germans.' How far do the sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.	[8]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies sources that support / do not support the view without valid source use. <i>Source A supports the statement.</i>	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use Award 2m for one Y or N supported by valid source use, and additional 1m for each subsequent valid source use (up to a maximum of 4m). <i>Source A supports the statement as it shows that Germans had sufficient food under the Nazis. I know this because Source A shows a photograph of a grocery store in Munich, filled with food and supplies. Three saleswomen were smiling, holding on to sausages and apples. This implies that the Nazi party had resolved the economic issues of the Great Depression and ensured that grocery stores were well supplied and well stocked with food that was abundantly sufficient for the needs of Germans.</i>	2-4

	<i>Source C supports the statement as it shows that unemployment was reduced under the Nazis. It shows that in 1932, Germany had 30.1% of workers who were unemployed but in 1937, there were only 4.6% and then in 1939, 2.1% under Nazi rule. This shows that after the Nazis took over in 1933, they were able to resolve the economic issues and ensured that Germans were employed, thereby successfully reducing unemployment.</i> <i>Source E supports the statement as Germans enjoyed better working conditions and affordable holidays under the Nazis. Source E states “6,000 factory courtyards now offer space for real relaxation, which was not true in the past. 17,000 canteens and lounges, and 13,000 shower rooms have been transformed” and “over 20 million have participated in KdF trips since 1934.” This implies that the working conditions for Germans had improved and they were also able to afford and enjoy holidays which they had not done before. This shows that life for workers had improved under the Nazis.</i> OR <i>Source D does not support the statement as it shows that Germans struggled with the cost of living. Source D states “The fact that one’s wages continually buy less, and that the slave driving gets worse every day cannot be denied. The mood in the factories is depressed.” This implies life was getting tougher as the cost of living was increasing faster than the increase in wages, and workers were generally in a depressed mood. They were also being pushed to work very hard. As such, it shows that the lives of workers were bad.</i> <i>Source F does not support the statement as it shows that there were segments of society whose needs were not met. Source F states “First, women were not included in the assessment of the domestically unemployed. Second, those considered ‘work-shy’ by the State for various reasons were simply taken to concentration camps - as many as 500,000 by 1933 (twice as many as employed by the Autobahn program). Those of Jewish descent were also excluded from the unemployed as a result of the Careers Civil Service Act (1933) and the Nuremberg Race Laws (1935), which revoked their citizenship.” This implies that the work situation of women was ignored and not taken care of, and those who were unwilling to work were sent to concentration camps. Lastly, the Jews were stripped of their citizenship and economic situation ignored as well. This meant that the Nazis took care of only specific groups in Germany, while ignoring the plight of the others whom they were not concerned about or were deliberately making life harder for. As such, Source F shows that it is not true that lives of everyone improved under Nazi Germany.</i>	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use	5-8

	Award 5 marks for 1Y and 1N, and additional mark for each supporting source use, up to a maximum of 7 marks. Both sides of L2. Note: Bonus of 2 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 this question must not exceed 8. Even though Source E seems to support the statement, it cannot be used as it is unreliable. <i>Source E is an excerpt taken from a Nazi publication and would be expected to praise the efforts put in by the Nazis to improve the lives of the workers. The report was meant to convince (P) Germans (A) that the Nazis were making much effort to improve their lives, both in work and for leisure (M) so that Germans would be grateful to the Nazis and continue supporting their policies and actions (O). This was at a period where Hitler was preparing for war and thus, it was important that he had the support of the German population (C). (+1m)</i>	
--	---	--

Section B: Essays

- 2 'The benefits from British colonial rule from the late 1870s in Malaya outweighed the problems.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

[10]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the benefits or problems of British colonial rule in Malaya <i>Award 1 mark for identifying a benefit or problem, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing a benefit or problems and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> - Benefit: economic opportunities (small businesses, employment), improvement in infrastructure, quality of life - Problem: Loss of political powers under the Residency system and FMS; displacement of Malaya population, Malay population left behind economically Yes, I agree that the benefits from British colonial rule from the late 1870s in Malaya outweighed the problems, such as the <u>increase in economic opportunities for Asian businessmen</u>. (1m) The British improved the transportation system, making it more convenient and accessible to transport raw materials from the mines to the ports. Such infrastructural development transformed Malaya into a lucrative export-oriented economy that promoted businesses which businessmen could tap on. (2m)	1 – 3
L2	Explains one benefit from British colonial rule OR a problem of British colonial rule <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how the British colonial rule had benefitted either Malaya or its residents OR how it had contributed to a negative impact/ problem faced by the colony or its people, and an additional mark for additional action(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that the benefits from British colonial rule from the late 1870s in Malaya outweighed the problems as Malaya's economy grew rapidly under the British. The British were deliberate in building infrastructure that connected the tin mines, rubber plantations and the towns and ports. This was to ensure that raw materials and products were transported efficiently and conveniently. For example, the first railway line that operated between towns and plantations opened in 1885, connecting Taiping in Larut to Port Weld further up north. With the formation of the Federated Malay States, there was better coordination of railway lines and by 1896, there were four railway lines that supported the tin and rubber industries. <i>This in turn promoted jobs and a flow of people from the countryside to the towns, leading to rapid growth and expansion of towns and the Malayan economy as more goods</i>	4 – 5

	could be transported to ports and exported quickly to meet world demands. The total revenue collected from the tin and rubber industries increased from 9 million Straits dollars in 1896 to 21 million Straits dollars in 1902. <i>As such, colonial rule benefited Malaya in terms of its infrastructure, economy and employment.</i> (5m) OR E.g. I disagree with the statement as the <u>Malays were increasingly left behind in the economy</u>. While the British respected the Malays as the indigenous natives of the Malayan peninsular and provided a system of free, compulsory education for them, education did not go beyond the primary level for the common Malays. The syllabuses leaned towards agriculture and the rural way of life and did not prepare the Malays for a life in modern society. The Malays also did not set up schools on their own, unlike the Chinese and Indian immigrant communities, as many of the elites sent their children to English-medium schools. <i>Thus, for the general Malay population, while they remained largely undisturbed in their way of life, they worked in the less profitable rural economy, which made them economically disadvantaged as compared to the immigrants or Malay elites. They were left behind in the economy, working hard in sectors that were not as profitable as others in Malaya.</i>	
L3	Explains one benefit from British colonial rule AND a problem of British colonial rule <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the British colonial rule had benefitted either Malaya or its residents AND how it had contributed to a negative impact/ problem faced by the colony or its people, and an additional mark for additional action(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Both paragraphs 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. 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 + Yes, I agree with the statement that the benefits from the British colonial rule outweighed the problems as the <u>economic benefits can be felt across all communities and population while the problem of the general Malay population behind left behind only impacts one group of the population</u>. Moreover, economic growth also benefited the Malays as they were able to sell more agricultural products as the population of Malaya expanded. <u>It was simply that the prosperity and profitability enjoyed was not as much when</u>	6 – 8

	compared to the wealth and prosperity enjoyed by the other communities.	
--	---	--

- 3 'The outcomes and treaties that resulted from the Paris Peace Conference had a positive impact on Europe.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the outcome(s) of the Paris Peace Conference that had either a positive or negative impact on Europe <i>Award 1 mark for identifying a positive or negative impact, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing a positive or negative impact and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> - Positive impact: Treaty of Versailles, formation of League of Nations, new borders and self-determination for the peoples in Europe - Negative impact: Treaty of Versailles Yes, I agree with the statement as <u>the Treaty of Versailles</u> is a peace settlement that resulted from the Paris Peace Conference which had a positive impact on Europe. (1m) This treaty was meant to determine the fate of Germany, the degree of punishment to be inflicted on her, and to ensure that Germany would never be strong enough to threaten the peace of Europe again. (2m)	1 – 3
L2	Explains one outcome from the Conference that is positive OR negative <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how the outcome was positive OR negative for Europe, and an additional mark for additional action(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree the <u>formation of the League of Nations</u>, an outcome of the Paris Peace Conference (PPC), had a positive impact on Europe. US President Wilson, a key participant of the PPC believed in the formation of an association of nations where disputes could be resolved without having to go to war. He pushed for such an organisation, and managed to secure the agreement of the participants, leading to the formation of the League of Nations in 1920. The League's key aim was to resolve international disputes without going to war. This was to be done primarily through collective security. While there were only 44 members at the beginning, it managed to resolve issues like the Upper Silesia crisis in 1921 and a border conflict between Greece and Bulgaria in 1925. <i>The formation of such an international peacekeeping organisation was a positive outcome from the PPC as it provided countries with a platform where they could bring their disputes and grievances to</i>	4 – 5

	<i>and resolve them peacefully through mediation. This was beneficial for Europe as it helped them keep peace internationally. (5m)</i> Note: Award 4 marks for students who did not include a specific example of success. OR E.g. I disagree with the statement as <u>the Treaty of Versailles did not have a positive impact on Germany</u>. One of the objectives of the PPC was to discuss the fate of Germany and determine the degree to which Germany had to be punished. One of the terms that were finally agreed upon, was the amount of reparations that Germany owed the Allied powers. The reparations clause stated that Germany had to pay 6,600 million pounds as monetary compensation. This was in light of the territories and cities they destroyed during the war, and the cost of rebuilding the war-torn countries. <i>This clause was too harsh on Germany because Germany had also suffered from the war and needed money to rebuild its country. Instead, the reparation clause would cripple her economy and cause her citizens to suffer both economically and socially. As such, the Treaty of Versailles had a negative impact on Germany and its people, more so than she deserved.</i>	
L3	Explains outcome(s) from the Conference that is positive AND negative <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the outcome was positive AND negative for Europe, and an additional mark for additional action(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Both paragraphs 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. 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 + Yes, I agree that the results and outcome of the Paris Peace Conference had a positive impact on Europe. This is because the original objective of the Paris Peace Conference was to reach a settlement that would legally and officially end World War I. The various treaties and organisation that resulted were meant to prevent conflict and reduce possibilities of tensions occurring again. This would result in a positive impact for Europe. Even though the negative consequences experienced by Germany would arguably be considered too harsh, <u>the terms were well-intended for the larger good of the continent, acting as both a punishment and deterrent</u>	6 – 8

	<u>so that Germany would learn its lesson and not repeat similar mistakes again thereby achieving permanent peace in Europe.</u> Note: Students could argue for 'No' by arguing that the long-term impact of the Paris Peace Conference, specifically the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles contributed to the rise of Hitler and hence, WWII. However, students need to be able to explain the causation thoroughly <u>and</u> weigh it against the positive outcomes of the League in order to attain the marks.	
--	--	--

- 4 'The militarist government was able to exert control over the Japanese society because they had control over the education system.' How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes method(s) of control by the military <i>Award 1 mark for identifying a method, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing a method and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Yes, I agree that the militarist government was able to exert control over the Japanese society because they had control over the education system. Japan's education system originally had a strong emphasis on national pride and the importance of Japanese traditions. It also stressed Shinto beliefs, loyalty to the Emperor, and the community over the individual. (2m) Other methods of control: censorship, special police force, promotion of loyalty to the state (as part of economic revitalisation), support for militarist government due to military successes.	1 – 3
L2	Explains how the method(s) helped the militarist government ensure control over Japan <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of the method worked, and an additional mark for additional method(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. Yes, I agree that the militarist government was able to exert control over the Japanese society <u>because they had control over the education system</u>. Japan's education system originally had a strong emphasis on national pride and the importance of Japanese traditions. It also stressed Shinto beliefs, loyalty to the Emperor, and the community over the individual. All these worked in the favor of the militarist government as the Japanese would learn to prioritise national goals and obedience to the state. The curriculum sought to instill a sense of patriotism in young Japanese and was centred on ultranationalist and militarist ideals. Students were exposed to physical exercise, military-style drilling and technical lessons that prepared them for war. <i>Young Japanese were indoctrinated to respect the military and support strong actions</i>	4 – 5

	<i>taken by the country as it made Japan stronger. All these translated to strong support for the militarist government as these young Japanese saw the government bringing pride and honor to Japan through their policies and actions. This allowed the government to exert control over the Japanese society. (5m)</i> OR <i>E.g. No, I disagree with the statement as <u>the government enforced censorship that helped it control the population</u>. There was censorship of ideas that did not conform with the government's beliefs or were seen as threats to Japanese national identity. The Publications Monitoring Department published guidelines for all publishing companies and scrutinised all media, including fiction books. In 1936, the Information and Propaganda Committee was formed, working with the Publications Monitoring Department to further control the media and promote the government's militarist ideas. <i>This meant that the Japanese population were exposed to only ideas and information that the government wanted them to know about. This made it easier for the government to control the population as the population would not know any better or understand any potential alternatives, supporting only the militarist government. (5m)</i></i>	
L3	Explains how the control of education and other method(s) helped the militarist government ensure control over Japan <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the control of education helped the militarist government ensure control, and an additional mark for additional method(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Both paragraphs 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. 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 + While both education and censorship helped the government control the Japanese population, <u>censorship had a greater impact in ensuring this control</u>. This is because of the limitations of the education system. Japan's education system instilled values of loyalty to the Emperor and respect for the military in younger generations from an early age, creating a population that was more likely to support a militarist government. <u>However, the education system primarily shaped the beliefs of younger citizens over a long period of time, leaving adults who had already completed their schooling less directly influenced. Censorship, on</u>	6 – 8

	the other hand, had a more immediate and far-reaching impact as <u>it controlled what the entire population was exposed to through newspapers, radio broadcasts, and public discourse on a daily basis</u>. This meant that regardless of age or background, the Japanese were consistently presented with information that supported the government while dissenting ideas were actively suppressed. Censorship also reinforced and protected the values instilled through education as citizens were not exposed to opposing or alternative viewpoints that could have undermined the government's control. As such, while education may have provided some groundwork, it was censorship that made the government's control over the population both comprehensive and long-lasting.	
--	--	--

END OF ANSWER SCHEME