

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

Who was to blame for escalating tensions in the Korean War?

Source A: A leaflet dropped by the United States in North Korea, 3 April 1953. It reads: 'So-called Soviet advisers are Russian special agents to control China. Stay safe and keep fit for fighting against the Communist Soviet puppets!'



1(a) Study Source A. What is the message of Source A? Explain your answer. [5]

Target Skill: Inference

L1	Description of source / Answer based on Provenance details	1
L2	SUB-Message, UN/SUPPORTED Award 2m. E.g. [Point] The message of Source A is that China was manipulated by the Soviet Union. [Evidence] In Source A, it says "So-called Soviet advisers are Russian special agents to control China". It also shows China's leaders such as Mao Zedong being controlled by strings like a puppet. [Explanation] This suggests that China is being controlled by the Soviet Union and that they do follow the instructions of the Soviet Union.	2
L3	MAIN Message, UNSUPPORTED Award 3m for unsupported answers.	3
L4	MAIN Message, SUPPORTED Award 4m for supported answers. Award 5m for answers that make use of contextual knowledge as well as note the tone of the source as being critical of China. E.g. [Point] The message of Source A is that China was manipulated into joining the Korean War. [Evidence] In Source A, it says "So-called Soviet advisers are Russian special agents to control China". It also shows China's leaders such as Mao Zedong being controlled by strings like a puppet. [Explanation of the message within context and tone] This suggests that China did not join the Korean War out of their own national interest but did so after being manipulated by the Soviet Union. Therefore, China's involvement in the Korean War was not sincere. By 1953, it was clear that China was acting under the influence of the Soviet Union as much of the equipment and training provided to them and the North Koreans came from the Soviet Union. Moreover, the Soviet Union is conspicuously absent in the conflict even though China has a treaty of friendship and mutual assistance with them and that they are all communist allies. Hence, this source seeks to criticise them as merely being controlled by the Soviet Union and not being able to make an independent decision on their own.	4-5

Source B: *Truman speaking at a press conference on 29 June 1950.*

We are not at war. The Republic of Korea was set up with the United Nation's help. It is a recognised government by the members of the United Nations. It was unlawfully attacked by a bunch of bandits from North Korea. The United Nations Security Council held a meeting and passed a resolution on the situation and asked the members to go to the relief of the Korean Republic. The members of the United Nations are going to the relief of the Korean Republic to suppress a bandit raid on the Republic of Korea. That is all it is.

Source C: *An extract taken from Truman's memoirs published in 1965.*

In my generation, this was not the first time that the strong had attacked the weak. Communism was acting in Korea just as Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese had acted fifteen, twenty years earlier. I felt certain that if South Korea was allowed to fall, Communist leaders would be emboldened to override nations close to our own shores. If the Communists were permitted to force their way into the Republic of Korea without opposition from the free world, no small nation would have the courage to resist threats and aggression by stronger Communist neighbours.

1(b) Study Sources B and C. How far does Source C help you to decide if Truman was telling the truth in Source B? Explain your answer. [6]

Target Skill: Detect values, bias, recognise reliability

L1	Source C does/ does not help decide based on Provenance, undeveloped. <i>E.g. Source C does not help me decide that Source B was telling the truth because they are from different dates.</i>	1
L2	Source C does/ does not help decide if Source B was telling the truth based on ONE SOURCE, UN/SUPPORTED <i>Award 2m.</i> Underdeveloped Tools, UN/SUPPORTED <i>Award 2m.</i>	2
L3	Source C helps to decide that Source B was not telling the truth based on SOURCE CONTENT MATCH, SUPPORTED <i>Award 3m.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: ATQ + Tool] Source C does help me decide that Truman was not telling the truth in Source B as Source C contradicts Source B about the reasons for America's entry into the Korean War. In Source C, it suggests that America entered the Korean war to contain the spread of communism. However, in Source B, it suggests that America entered the Korean War to help South Korea regain her independence at the request of the United Nations. [Evidence and Explanation of Source C] In Source C, it says "I felt certain that if South Korea was allowed to fall, Communist leaders would be emboldened to override nations close to our own shores". This suggests that President Truman needed to act in Korea to prevent a greater international catastrophe from happening like the second world war. Therefore, Truman seeks to portray his intentions in Korea as being principled and honourable. [Evidence and Explanation of Source B] This is in contrast with Source B which says, "The United Nations Security Council held a meeting and passed on the situation and asked the members to go to the relief of the Korean Republic". This suggests that America only intervened in Korea at the request of the United Nations to help South Korea repel the North Korean invasion and to defend South Korea's sovereignty. [ATQ] Therefore, as Source C contradicts Source B, Source C helps me to decide that Truman was not telling the truth in Source B.</i>	3-4

1(b) Study Sources B and C. How far does Source C help you to decide if Truman was telling the truth in Source B? Explain your answer. [6]

Target Skill: Detect values, bias, recognise reliability

	Source C helps to decide Source B was telling the truth as it explains the same underlying goal based on SOURCE CONTENT MATCH, SUPPORTED <i>Award 4m.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: ATQ + Tool]</i> Source C helps me to decide that Source B is telling the truth as Source C supports Source B, as they both suggest the same fundamental goal for America was to ensure world peace. [Evidence and Explanation of Source C] In Source C, it says “I felt certain that if South Korea was allowed to fall, Communist leaders would be emboldened to override nations close to our own shores”. This suggests that President Truman needed to act in Korea to prevent a greater international catastrophe from happening like the second world war. Therefore, Truman seeks to portray his intentions in Korea as being principled and honourable. [Evidence and Explanation of Source B] Similarly, in Source B, it says, “The United Nations Security Council held a meeting and passed on the situation and asked the members to go to the relief of the Korean Republic”. This suggests that America intervened in Korea at the request of the United Nations to help South Korea repel the North Korean invasion and to defend South Korea’s sovereignty. If the America did not act, then the United Nations would have failed its first big international conflict and aggressor nations would not listen to it, leading to the possibility of another war. [ATQ] Therefore, as Source C supports Source B, Source C helps me to decide that Truman was telling the truth in Source B.	
L4	Source C does not help decide Source B was telling the truth because it is un/reliable based on CROSS-REFERENCE, SUPPORTED <i>From L4 onward, both sources need to be used implicitly or explicitly.</i> <i>Award 4m.</i> <i>Award 5m for more developed answers.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: ATQ + Tool]</i> Source C does not help me decide that Truman was telling the truth. My contextual knowledge contradicts Source C when I cross-reference with it, making Source C unreliable and not helpful. In Source C, it suggests that America entered the Korean war to contain the spread of communism. However, according to my contextual knowledge, America entered the Korean War to support the work of the United Nations. [Evidence and Explanation of Source C] In Source C, it says “I felt certain that if South Korea was allowed to fall, Communist leaders would be emboldened to override nations close to our own shores”. This suggests that President Truman needed to act in Korea to prevent a greater international catastrophe from happening like the second world war. Therefore, Truman seeks to portray his intentions in Korea as being principled and honourable. [Evidence and Explanation of Contextual Knowledge] This is in contrast with my contextual knowledge. The Korean War was the United Nations’ first conflict to address. The UN had asked member countries for help and America only intervened in Korea based on this request and not due to the desire to contain communism.	4-5
L5	Source C does not help decide Source B was telling the truth based on PROVENANCE-EXPLAINED (UNRELIABLE), SUPPORTED <i>Award 5m.</i> <i>Award 6m for well-developed answers.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: ATQ + Tool]</i> Source C helps me to decide that Source B is telling the truth as Source C supports Source B, as they both suggest the same fundamental goal for America was to ensure world peace. [Evidence and Explanation of Source C] In Source C, it says “I felt certain that if South Korea was allowed to fall, Communist leaders would be emboldened to override nations close to our own shores”. This suggests that President Truman needed to act	5-6

1(b) Study Sources B and C. How far does Source C help you to decide if Truman was telling the truth in Source B? Explain your answer. [6]

Target Skill: Detect values, bias, recognise reliability

	in Korea to prevent a greater international catastrophe from happening like the second world war. Therefore, Truman seeks to portray his intentions in Korea as being principled and honourable. [Evidence and Explanation of Source B] Similarly, in Source B, it says, "The United Nations Security Council held a meeting and passed on the situation and asked the members to go to the relief of the Korean Republic". This suggests that America intervened in Korea at the request of the United Nations to help South Korea repel the North Korean invasion and to defend South Korea's sovereignty. If the America did not act, then the United Nations would have failed its first big international conflict and aggressor nations would not listen to it, leading to the possibility of another war. [ATQ] Therefore, as Source C supports Source B, Source C helps me to decide that Truman was telling the truth in Source B. [Provenance-explained for Source C + ATQ] However, Source C does not help me decide that Truman was telling the truth as it has a motive and so it is unreliable and not helpful. [Motive of Source C] Source C was published by President Harry Truman after the Korean War. As such, he seeks to justify his actions as President then and to portray his decisions favourably. [Inference of Source C] In Source C, it suggests that America entered the Korean War to contain the spread of communism. Therefore, Truman seeks to portray his intentions in Korea as being principled and honourable. This contrasts with some of the accusations that were levelled at him and America for entering the war only to expand American influence in East Asia, after Japan and Taiwan so that he can rehabilitate his reputation.	
--	--	--

Source D: *A report by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK, North Korea), transmitted by radio on 25 June 1950*

Early on the morning of 25 June 1950, troops of the so-called 'army of national defence' of the puppet government of South Korea began a surprise attack on the territory of North Korea along the entire 38th parallel. Having begun a surprise attack, the enemy invaded the territory of North Korea to a depth of one or two kilometres north of the 38th parallel in the area west of Haeju and in the areas of Geumcheon and Cheolwon.

The government of the DPRK has charged the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic with warning the authorities of the puppet government of South Korea that if they do not immediately halt their reckless military operations in the areas north of the 38th parallel, decisive steps will be taken to subdue the enemy and that they will bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences of these reckless military operations.

1(c) Study Source D. How surprised are you by Source D? Explain your answer. [5]

Target Skill: Inference, cross-reference, analyse purpose

L1	Answer based on Provenance details <i>E.g. I am not surprised by Source E as it was published by North Korea.</i>	1
L2	Answer based on Source Content <i>E.g. I am not surprised by Source E as I expected it as it is a source by the North Korea talking about the start of the Korean War. It should not have come as a surprise given that the North and South were at odds with each other for some time.</i>	2
L3	Answer based on Cross-Reference <i>E.g. [1st paragraph] I am surprised by Source D as I did not expect it, as it contradicts with what I know about the Korean War from my contextual knowledge. [Inference] In Source D, it suggests that the South Korean started the Korean War. [Evidence] In Source D, it says "Early on the morning of 25 June 1950, troops of the so-called 'army of national defence' of the puppet government of South Korea began a surprise attack on the territory of North Korea along the entire 38th parallel". [Explanation] This suggests that South Koreans were responsible for the start of the Korean War.</i> <i>[2nd paragraph] This is surprising as my contextual knowledge tells me otherwise. [Relevant contextual knowledge] According to my contextual knowledge, it was North Korea that invaded South Korea that started the Korean War in 1950. By this time, they were backed by both the Soviets and China and therefore had enough resources to begin a war unlike the underprepared South.</i>	3
L4	Answer based on Purpose <i>Award 4m for less developed answers.</i> <i>Award 5m for well-explained answers.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: ATQ] I am not surprised by Source D as I expected it. [Inference] In Source D, it suggests that South Korea started the Korean War. [Evidence] In Source D, it says "Early on the morning of 25 June 1950, troops of the so-called 'army of national defence' of the puppet government of South Korea began a surprise attack on the territory of North Korea along the entire 38th parallel". [Explanation] This suggests that the South Koreans were responsible for the start of the Korean War. This may sound surprising as my contextual knowledge tells me otherwise. It was the North that invaded South Korea that sparked the Korean War. [ATQ: Purpose] However, the North broadcasted this report to convince its people that the South was responsible so that they would sympathise with their own government and support its own war effort. Hence, because of its purpose, I am not surprised by Source D as I expected</i>	4-5

1(c) Study Source D. How surprised are you by Source D? Explain your answer. [5]

Target Skill: Inference, cross-reference, analyse purpose

	the source to be untruthful about the actual origins of the war as it sought to rally its citizens to support her war effort.	
--	---	--

Source E: A leaflet by the United Nations, dropped in Korea. It depicts a Russian Officer riding on the back of Mao Ze Dong. The leaflet is titled 'Road to Failure'. The text reads: 'Chinese Subservience - The Chinese Communists bend body and knees to Soviet Russia!'



Source F: Adapted from a Chinese historian on China's entry in the Korean War, 1990

China's decision to intervene in the Korean War has its historical roots. It was the natural result of gradually developed animosity between the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the United States, and the fear of a threat from the latter.

The Chinese leaders had no intention at all of intervening in the war at its beginning, and they provided only moral support for Kim Il- Sung. However, on 27 June, Truman not only ordered direct American air and naval support for South Korea but also decided to reintervene in the Chinese civil war by positioning the 7th Navy Fleet between the Chinese mainland and Taiwan. On 10 July, the 'Committee of Chinese People Against U.S. Invasion of Taiwan and Korea' was established in Beijing. On 5 and 18 August, Mao ordered the Army to finish all battle preparations before the end of September.

1(d) Study Sources E and F. To what extent would the cartoonist in Source E have agreed with the historian in Source F? Explain your answer. [6]

Target Skill: Comparing and contrasting different views

L1	Source E does not agree with Source F based on Provenance <i>E.g. Sources E and F are from different authors. They would not have agreed with each other.</i>	1
L2	Source E does not agree with Source F based on false matching, UN/SUPPORTED <i>Answers here may also lack a criteria for matching.</i> <i>E.g. Sources E and F would have agreed that China was involved in the Korean War.</i>	2
L3	Source E agree AND/OR does not agree with Source F based on CONTENT Match, SUPPORTED <i>Award 3m for one side.</i> <i>Award 4m for two sides.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: Common Criterion + Inference] The cartoonist in Source E would have agreed with the historian in Source F that China was actively involved in the Korean War. [Evidence and Explanation from Source E] In Source E, it shows Chinese leaders being controlled by Soviet officials. This suggests that the Chinese are actively involved in the Korean War to fight for the communist bloc. [Connecting Word + Evidence and Explanation from Source F] Similarly, in Source F, it says "It was the natural result of gradually developed animosity between the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the United States, and of the fear of a</i>	3-4

1(d) Study Sources E and F. To what extent would the cartoonist in Source E have agreed with the historian in Source F? Explain your answer. [6]

Target Skill: Comparing and contrasting different views

	threat from the latter". This suggests that the Chinese were actively involved in the Korean to fend off the Americans. AND/OR [Point: Common Criterion + Differing Inferences] In this same way, the cartoonist in Source E would have not agreed with the historian in Source F as they would have disagreed about the reason for China's involvement with Source E supporting the interest of the communist bloc whereas the other was about repelling America military intervention in East Asia. [Evidence and Explanation from Source E] In Source E, it shows Chinese leaders being controlled by Soviet officials. This suggests that the Chinese are actively involved in the Korean War to fight for the communist bloc – doing the work of the Russians. [Connecting Word + Evidence and Explanation from Source F] Similarly, in Source F, it says "It was the natural result of gradually developed animosity between the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the United States, and of the fear of a threat from the latter". This suggests that the Chinese were actively involved in the Korean to fend off the Americans.	
L4	L3 + Purpose of Source E. <i>Award 5m.</i> <i>Award 6m for that discuss the content of both sources as well as the purpose of Source E.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: Common Criterion + Differing Inferences]</i> The cartoonist in Source E would have not agreed with the historian in Source F as they would have disagreed about the reason for China's involvement with one supporting the interest of the communist bloc whereas the other was about repelling America military intervention in East Asia. [Evidence and Explanation from Source E] In Source E, it shows Chinese leaders being controlled by Soviet officials. This suggests that the Chinese are actively involved in the Korean War to fight for the communist bloc – doing the work of the Russians. [Connecting Word + Evidence and Explanation from Source F] Similarly, in Source F, it says "It was the natural result of gradually developed animosity between the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the United States, and of the fear of a threat from the latter". This suggests that the Chinese were actively involved in the Korean to fend off the Americans. Moreover, as Source E was a United Nations propaganda leaflet, it would never have agreed with the historian in Source F as it sought to demoralise Chinese fighters fighting the Korean War by telling them that they were fighting for the Soviets and not for the North Koreans or their own country.	5-6

1(e) Study all sources. 'The Communist Bloc escalated tensions in Korea to spread communism.' How far do the sources support this view? Explain your answer. [8]

Target Skill: Drawing conclusions based on an analysis of historical sources

L1	Writes about the topic in general without using sources	1
L2	Supports OR Does Not Support the view <i>Award 2m for support or does not support, supported by a valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 m¹.</i>	2-4 (5)
L3	Both aspects of Level 2 <i>Award 5m for support or does not support, supported by a valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks².</i>	5-7 (8)

Source	Support	Does not support	Reliability
A	The Soviets were to blame as they were using the Chinese to fight a proxy war to spread communism.		Reliable. The communist bloc sought to expand communist influence in East Asia, especially after the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance, Friendship, and Alliance between the Soviets and Chinese. Unreliable. The Chinese were fighting to defend their own borders and not trying to do the work of the communist bloc.
B		It was an internal conflict between North and South Korea.	Reliable. The North had long sought to unify the Korean peninsula under one single government. Unreliable. The North had support of the communist bloc to invade South Korea to establish communist rule in Korea.
C	The communists were looking to expand communism just like the Nazis were being aggressive in wanting to acquire lands in Europe.		Reliable. The communist bloc sought to expand communist influence in East Asia, especially after the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance, Friendship, and Alliance between the Soviets and Chinese.
D		The South started the Korean War to gain influence for itself.	Unreliable. The North had started the Korean War in 1950 to unify Korea under a single communist government.
E	The Soviets were using the Chinese to fight a proxy war, to spread communist in Korea.		Reliable. The communist bloc sought to expand communist influence in East Asia, especially after the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance, Friendship, and Alliance between the Soviets and Chinese. Unreliable. The Chinese were fighting to defend their own borders.
F		The Chinese were involved in the Korean War as they were threatened by America's actions.	Reliable. The Chinese were fighting to defend their own borders and not trying to do the work of the communist bloc.

¹ For L2 and L3, award a bonus mark of up to 2m (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency, etc. The total mark for the question must not exceed 8m.

² Ibid.

Section B: Essays

2 'The Marshall Plan started the Cold War.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Unpacking of the **proposed** argument, "Marshall Plan". The proposed argument refers to how this policy had contributed to the tensions and worries that are a significant characteristic of the Cold War.

Unpacking the **counter argument** would be to discuss alternative reasons such as earlier events or events that showed that circumstances or the Soviets were responsible for it.

L1	IDENTIFIES / DESCRIBES reasons. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing two or more.</i>	1-3
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason OR other reasons. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason AND other reasons. <i>Award 6 marks for explanations of both the given reason and other additional reasons. Award an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <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 factors.</i>	6-10

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations
Marshall Plan, Unit 2, pp. 43-57.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What is a power vacuum? Why did the power vacuum form?] [P.38]** With the end of the Second World War, many European countries were left devastated. The Great European powers, such as Britain and France, no longer had the resources to play an influential role in Europe. This led to a power vacuum in Europe that America and the Soviet Union sought to fill seeing it as an opportunity to expand their sphere of influence.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [What was the communist threat like in Europe?] [P.46, 49-50]** In Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union set up satellite states using salami tactics. An iron curtain descended across Eastern Europe.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [What is the Marshall Plan? Why did America have such a plan?] [P.55-57]** Hence, in order to contain the spread of communism, America needed to resolve the bleak economic conditions that were conducive to the rise of communism in countries. Noticing two years after the war, the European economies were not recovering well, the American secretary of state thus started the Marshall Plan to give billions of dollars in economic and technical aid to the European countries.
 - **[Explanation] [Why did this lead to the start of the Cold War? How did these contribute to the tensions between the two superpowers?]** The Marshall Plan led to the Cold War as it contributed to the ideological, economic struggle for influence and control over Europe between America and the Soviet Union. The Marshall Plan represented a strong American response to the Soviet Union's actions in setting up the satellite states thereby generating greater rivalry between the powers. The Marshall Plan aimed to contain the spread of communism in Europe. America feared a communist Europe would be hostile to America and America would lose its sphere of influence as well as vital trading markets in Europe.
 - The Marshall Plan thus represented a threat to the Soviet Union as it prevented the rise of more communist regimes that would have been friendly to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union was thus still encircled by democratic countries on her western front.
 - **[Why else did Americans have the Marshall plan?]** Furthermore, the Marshall Plan was designed to also offer aid to the Soviet satellite states in a move to open them up to American influence. And if the Soviets were to reject such aid, it would antagonise her relations with the satellite states because it would be rejecting much needed aid for their countries. This eventually was the case because the Soviets refused American aid and forbade the satellite states from accepting it. Hence, the plan threatened the interests of

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

the Soviet Union as it was seen as an attempt by America to undermine Soviet influence in Europe and encircle her.

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations**Yalta and Potsdam Conferences and the atomic bomb, Unit 2, pp. 43-50.**

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What happened between the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences?] [P.43-47]** While the Allies were united at Yalta, the defeat of Germany meant that by Potsdam they lacked a common enemy and relations began to fray. The West and Soviet Union disagreed over two key points – the fate of Germany and the political future of Eastern Europe. At Yalta, they agreed to divide Germany into four occupation zones, but at Potsdam, there were disagreements over reparations and economic policies. At Yalta, Stalin promised free elections liberated European countries but later installed a pro-Soviet communist government in various Eastern European states.
 - **[Explanation] [Why did this lead to the start of the Cold War? How did these contribute to the tensions between the two superpowers?]** The Yalta and Potsdam Conferences marked the start of the Cold War because they revealed deep divisions and growing mistrust between the wartime Allies. Stalin broken promises in Eastern Europe alarmed the West. Stalin was similarly frustrated and wary as he could not secure the level of reparations he wanted and saw this as the West trying to protect Germany for their own interests. These conferences marked the shift from wartime cooperation to post-war rivalry, laying the foundation for the Cold War by highlighting irreconcilable ideological differences and strategic competition between the superpowers.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [How did the atomic bomb affect US-Soviet relations?] [P.48]** The use of the atomic bomb escalated tensions as Stalin felt betrayed by America as America did not reveal the weapon to him earlier. Stalin already knew through spies but was angered by the U.S.'s secrecy. The bomb shifted the balance of power and initiated an arms race, intensifying Cold War rivalry.
 - **[Explanation] [Why did this lead to the start of the Cold War? How did these contribute to the tensions between the two superpowers?]** The bomb shifted the balance of power and initiated an arms race, intensifying Cold War rivalry. It heightened Stalin's suspicion and fear of American intentions – that they might use the weapon against the Soviets next. This caused deep divisions and mistrust between the two superpowers.

The Formation of the Soviet satellite states, Unit 2, pp. 43, 46, 49-50.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What are the satellite states? Why did Stalin form them?] [P.43]** At the end of the war, Stalin and the Soviet Union feared a democratic encirclement of herself. Stalin feared that America and her allies would use the bordering democratic states to attack the Soviet Union. Hence, Stalin began establishing a ring of satellite around the Soviet Union using salami tactics. Stalin saw these countries as a defensive measure to strengthen the security of the Soviet Union. This included countries such as Poland, Hungary, and Romania in 1947.
 - **[Explanation] [Why did this lead to the start of the Cold War? How did these contribute to the tensions between the two superpowers?]** The formation of the Soviet satellite states led to the Cold War as it contributed to the ideological, economic struggle for influence and control over Europe between America and the Soviet Union. America and her allies saw the setting up of satellite states as an aggressive attempt to spread communism by the Soviet Union. The actions of the Soviet Union thus threatened the survival of America as America feared that the Soviet Union sought to aggressively expand communism in Europe. A communist Europe would be hostile to America as Europe was an important trading partner and sphere of influence. Hence, tensions arose between America and the Soviet Union leading to the onset of the Cold War as a tense rivalry between both superpowers.

Truman Doctrine, Unit 2, pp. 53-55.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What is a power vacuum? Why did the power vacuum form?] [P.38]** With the end of the Second World War, many European countries were left devastated. The Great European powers, such as Britain and France, no longer had the resources to play an influential role in Europe. This led to a power

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

vacuum in Europe that America and the Soviet Union sought to fill seeing it as an opportunity to expand their sphere of influence.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What was the communist threat like in Europe?] [P.46, 49-50]** In Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union set up satellite states using salami tactics. An iron curtain descended across Eastern Europe.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [What is containment? Why did the US implement the Truman Doctrine?] [P. 54]** Hence, to contain the spread of communism, America needed to resolve the bleak economic conditions that was conducive to the rise of communism in countries. With the Truman Doctrine, America would provide economic and military aid to Turkey and Greece as Great Britain could no longer aid them.
- ✓ By providing Turkey and Greece with support, their economies would not falter and therefore provide the conducive economic conditions that would encourage their people to seek alternative forms of government.
 - o **[Explanation] [Why did this lead to the start of the Cold War? How did these contribute to the tensions between the two superpowers?]** The Truman Doctrine led to the Cold War as it contributed to the ideological, economic struggle for influence and control over Europe between America and the Soviet Union. The Truman doctrine represented America's response to the Soviet Union's actions in setting up the satellite states thereby generating greater rivalry between the powers. The Truman doctrine aimed to contain the spread of communism in Europe. America feared that a communist Europe would be hostile to America and America would lose its sphere of influence as well as vital trading markets in Europe. The Truman Doctrine thus represented a threat to the Soviet Union as it prevented the rise of more communist regimes that would have been friendly to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union was thus still encircled by democratic countries on her western front.

Weighing: Balanced Conclusion

Suggested Answer. Criterion: Root Cause

[Weighing Criterion] Overall, I think the Marshall plan marked the start of the Cold War as it marked America's first *comprehensive* response to the communist threat in Europe thereby confirming the rivalry that existed between the Soviet Union and America of their influence over Europe. **[Explaining the balance]** The Marshall Plan formed the first set of comprehensive action undertaken under the American containment policy. Therefore, this started the Cold War in Europe as this was America's first broad attempt to contain the spread of communism in Europe in response to the numerous actions by the Soviet Union to establish a communist Eastern Europe. Up until then, the rivalry that existed between the American and the Soviet Union was mainly dealt from one direction, from the Soviet Union against America. This would be seen in the formation of the satellite states whereby the Soviet Union acted on their own to achieve a buffer against Capitalist Western Europe. America up until that point had not acted on the threat the Soviet Union posed to them. Hence, with the Marshall Plan, it proved that the rivalry was mutual, confirming the start of the Cold War.

Suggested Answer. Criterion: Root Cause

[Weighing Criterion] Overall, I disagree. I think the Truman Doctrine marked the start of the Cold War as it marked America's first clear response to the communist threat in Europe thereby confirming the rivalry that existed between the Soviet Union and America of their influence over Europe. **[Explaining the balance]** While both the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine were key pillars of early Cold War policy, the Truman Doctrine more clearly marked the start of the Cold War in Europe. Announced in 1947, it framed the ideological divide between the capitalist West and the communist East. The Marshall Plan, launched shortly after, was an economic extension of this containment strategy, offering aid to rebuild war-torn Europe. In contrast, the Truman Doctrine introduced the geopolitical and ideological confrontation that defined the Cold War. Thus, while the Marshall Plan deepened the divide, it was the Truman Doctrine that marked the beginning of the Cold War in Europe.

3 'The main reason for Malaya's independence was the Malayan Emergency.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]		
Unpacking of the proposed argument, 'the Emergency'. The proposed argument refers to the Communist Emergency and how to defeat the communist, the British accelerated political reforms which in turn led to Malaya independence.		
Unpacking the counter argument would be other factors such as the 'Alliance'. The counter argument would be the Alliance and how their unity, stability, and strong support convinced the British that Malaya was ready for independence.		
L1	IDENTIFIES / DESCRIBES reasons. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing two or more.</i>	1-3
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason OR other reasons. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason AND other reasons. <i>Award 6 marks for explanations of both the given reason and other additional reasons. Award an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <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 factors.</i>	6-10

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations	
Communist Emergency, Unit 2, pp. 165-174.	
✓ [Evidence] [What is the Communist Emergency about? How did it affect the progression of political development in Malaya?] [P.165-166] The Malayan Emergency caused the British government to reconsider the timeline for Malaya's decolonisation. The Malayan Communist Party had presented themselves as nationalists who were leading Malaya in an anti-colonial struggle for national independence, arguing that the British were not committed to granting Malaya independence. - o Hence, to deny the MCP any legitimacy to their claims, the British accelerated the process of decolonisation to introduce elections and begin the transfer of power to an elected Malayan Government. ✓ [Evidence] [What political reforms were introduced?] [P.170-173] Templer introduced local elections and extended citizenship to the Chinese population. The British also introduced the Federal Legislative Council. Nine of the nominated members of the Federal Legislative Council were appointed as ministers responsible to the British High Commissioner. - o It gave leaders in Malaya the opportunity to gain the necessary political experience of administering and governing their country and laid the foundation for greater local participation in politics. - o [Explanation] [How did the Emergency lead to independence in Malaya? Why did the British grant the local's independence?] The Communist Emergency accelerated political reforms in Malaya. The communist claimed that they were fighting for an independent Malaya. Many had joined the MCP in the hope of securing political reforms in Malaya. Hence, to deny the MCP and their cause any legitimacy - the British under Templer agreed to political reforms. These British reforms promised the people eventual independence. - o In doing so, the British could ensure that those supporting the MCP for their political reforms, would not need to do so as the British were already promising reforms in their bid to defeat the communist in Malaya. Without the support of the people, the British were able to weaken the MCP and the insurgency they had launched. - o Consequently, the Malayan Emergency compelled the British to accelerate plans for political reform granting independence sooner rather than later.	

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

World War 2 and the rise of Malayan National Consciousness, Unit 2, pp. 151-152.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What happened during World War Two?] [P.151]** World War Two brought about the defeat of the British in Malaya in 1942. Before this, the locals did not realise that Asians could lord over the Europeans. Moreover, during the Japanese Occupation, the Japanese had given opportunities to the locals to govern Malaya – an opportunity which the British did little to provide when they ruled. During the occupation, many Malaysians experienced harsh treatment and hardship, which fuelled resentment towards all colonial powers, including the British.
 - **[Explanation] [How would this have contributed to the Malaya's independence?]** Therefore, World War Two was a turning point that shattered the myth of British invincibility, especially after the swift Japanese defeat of British forces in Malaya. The Japanese occupation exposed the vulnerability of colonial rule and showed that foreign powers could be challenged. The return of British rule after the war was met with greater scepticism, as Malaysians began to question the legitimacy of foreign control. Therefore, the wartime experiences created a new political awareness. This growing sense of political consciousness and desire for self-determination ultimately strengthened the push for independence.

The work of the Alliance, Unit 2, pp. 175-179.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What is the Alliance? How did this lead to independence in Malay?] [P.149, 175-176]** One of the main issues that the British was worried about in Malaya was on unity between the races to ensure that a political independent Malaya would be stable and free from racial strife.
 - This condition laid down by the British, created the impetus for the formation of an alliance between UMNO, MCA, and the MIC. This was known as The Alliance. UMNO represented the Malays, MCA the Chinese, and MIC the Indians.
 - The first partnership between the parties was the 1952 municipal elections. For this election, the Selangor branches of UMNO and MCA combined to win 9 out of 12 seats. By the end of 1954, the UMNO-MCA alliance won 226 out of 268 municipal and town council seats. MIC joined in 1954. In the 1955 Federal Elections, the Alliance enjoyed an overwhelming victory as they won 81 percent of the total votes and 51 out of 52 of the contested seats.
 - **[Explanation] [What did it mean for the Alliance to win the Federal Elections in 1955?]** It was not solely the Emergency that led to independence in Malaya in 1957. With the Alliance winning a convincing majority in the Federal Elections, the British had been assured of their desire for racial unity in Malaya. The overwhelming victory indicated to the British that the people of different races were willing to work together and more importantly had given the Alliance a mandate to rule Malaya. In this way, political peace and stability was assured as the various racial groups had indicated their desire to work with each other.
 - The Alliance had gained independence for Malaya. Through their political mandate, the Chief Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman from UMNO, led the Merdeka Mission in 1956 to secure independence for Malaya by 1957.
 - Hence, without the racial unity of the Alliance, the effort the Alliance made to secure a strong political mandate, the British would not have granted independence. It was only after the Alliance had proven their worth did the British given in and grant Malaya independence by 1957.

Weighing: Balanced Conclusion

Suggested Answer. Criterion: Magnitude/Degree

[Weighing Criterion] Overall, I agree that it was the Emergency that was the main reason for Malaya's independence in 1957. **[Explaining the balance]** The British had desired to hold onto Malaya for a longer period as needed to export her resources to pay off her war debt. Moreover, Malaya was a profitable colony that Britain could use to sustain her economic development in the post-war period. It was only due to the Malayan Emergency that forced the British to accelerate the timeline for Malaya's independence. If not for it, the British did not have the desire to grant political reforms so soon as there was simply no need for it yet. The work of the Alliance merely assured the British that the people and Malayan society were ready for independence, but it did not compel the British to accelerate the process towards independence unlike the Emergency.

Weighing: Balanced Conclusion**Suggested Answer. Criterion: Decisive Factors**

[Weighing Criterion] Overall, I disagree. Both the Emergency and work of the Alliance were equally important in paving the way for Malaya's independence in 1957. **[Explaining the balance]** The Emergency created an urgent need for the British to stabilise the colony by winning local support, which in turn forced them to consider political reforms and local governance more seriously and earlier than planned. At the same time, the Alliance played a vital role in proving that Malayan society was politically mature and capable of managing a multi-ethnic nation, giving the British confidence that independence could be granted responsibly. Without the Emergency, the British might not have accelerated the process, but without the Alliance, they would have lacked a trusted political partner to hand over power to. Hence, both developments were equally necessary – the Emergency created the pressure, and the Alliance provided the assurance.

4 'The main reason the French lost the First Indochina War was due to poor military planning and leadership.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]		
Unpacking of the proposed argument, "poor military planning and leadership". The proposed argument refers to the poor planning by the returning French colonial government who failed to win over the support of the people and counter the Viet Minh's guerilla warfare tactics.		
Unpacking the counter argument would be to Vietnamese strengths and how they united the people politically against the French and were tactically superior in going up against the better equipped French.		
L1	IDENTIFIES / DESCRIBES reasons. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing two or more.</i>	1-3
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason OR other reasons. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason AND other reasons. <i>Award 6 marks for explanations of both the given reason and other additional reasons. Award an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <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 factors.</i>	6-10

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations	
French Weaknesses, Poor Military Planning and Leadership, Unit 2, pp. 254.	
✓ [Evidence] [Why did the French lose the conflict to the Viet Minh militarily?] [P.236] French forces engaged in open and direct conflict with the Viet Minh, hoping to capitalise on their superior numbers and equipment. The French Expeditionary Forces had 204,000 men by 1954, against the 100,000 men in the Viet Minh. ✓ However, French forces were not trained in guerrilla warfare. Therefore, they were unable to develop effective counter-insurgency tactics against the Viet Minh. The French also made fundamental errors such as engaging the Viet Minh in faraway areas such as Dien Bien Phu. Being in a remote area, the French had serious problems reinforcing and supplying troops there. [P.246-250] Moreover, the location of the military base at Dien Bien Phu exposed the French to attack. It was located at the bottom of a valley surrounded by jungle. Viet Minh artillery could easily pound French forces in the base while the French were unable to locate the Viet Minh in the camouflage of the jungle. ○ [Explanation] [How did this disadvantage the French? Why did this lead to the French losing the war?] Hence, as the French were unable to cope with the Viet Minh's use of guerilla warfare, they suffered massive casualties and losses in the war. Their military errors allowed the Viet Minh to advance quickly against them while the French were unable to respond to Viet Minh attacks. Eventually, heavy casualties led to the French surrendering and losing the war. ✓ [Evidence] [Why did the French lack local support even before World War Two?] [P.224-229] Many locals Vietnamese had opposed the French due to the suffering under colonial rule. It was made worse during the Japanese Occupation when the locals experienced political suppression under them as well as the famine in Tonkin in 1944. This had driven many Vietnamese to support the communist as they had forced open the granaries to feed the peasants in 1945. ○ [Evidence] [Why did the French lack local support after World War Two?] [P.240] To fight against the Viet Minh, the French had indiscriminately bombed villages and carried out acts of brutality such as summary executions that made the locals oppose them further. [P. 244] The French also tried to unify the Vietnam people in Vietnam under their rule appointing the Bao Dai as the Emperor of the Associated State of Vietnam. ○ [Explanation] [How did this disadvantage the French? Why did this lead to the French losing the war?] However, Bao Dai and his government officials had dubious reputations as they had years of collaboration with the French whom the people despised. The French thus lacked the support of the	

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

people who were more willing to support the Viet Minh giving them manpower, information, and reports on the French. Lacking the support of the people meant that the French lacked a crucial resource to defeat the Viet Minh leading to their defeat in 1954.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [How did the French back home perceive the war?] [P.247]** The war was long and expensive. It also became highly unpopular as young French officers who were killed in Indochina outnumbered new officers trained in the last four years.
 - **[Explanation] [How did this disadvantage the French? Why did this lead to the French losing the war?]** The French government lacked the will to continue the fight in Indochina. After their defeat at Dien Bien Phu, it signalled to the French that pressure to end the war as it was a blow to their prestige and morale. Eventually, the French agreed to withdraw from Vietnam in the 1954 Geneva Accords.

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

Vietnamese Strengths, Effective Military Strategy, Local Support and Chinese Support, Unit 2, pp. 228-250.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [Why did the locals support the Viet Minh rather than the French? Why were the Viet Minh better rulers compared to the French?] [P.236]** Many Vietnamese had suffered under French colonial rule. They were angry at the French for collaborating with the Japanese. Through the Japanese Occupation, they realised the French were not as strong as they claimed to be. Moreover, after the war, Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Minh implemented reforms at Viet Bac that improved the lives of the locals such as re-distributing confiscated land to the peasants. They also raised literacy levels through education campaigns.
 - **[Explanation] [How did this benefit the Viet Minh? Why did it lead to the French losing the war?]** Hence, the locals were grateful to the Viet Minh for improving their living conditions. The locals provided the Viet Minh with supplies, intelligence, reports, and manpower to fight the French. The locals were thus more willing to aid the Viet Minh than the French and this gave the Viet Minh an advantage over the French forces who lacked the support of the people. The French thus lacked a crucial resource in the war, leading to their defeat.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [Why were the Viet Minh militarily stronger than the French?] [P.237]** The Viet Minh were tactically superior compared to the French. Under the leadership of General Vo Nguyen Giap, the Viet Minh engaged the French using guerrilla warfare. This included the use of hit-and-run tactics, sabotaging vital resources, and camouflage. The Viet Minh could draw French forces into the jungle where they could attack them and retreat quickly using an extensive network of underground tunnels stretching more than 300 kilometres.
 - **[Evidence] [Why was local support essential?] [P.248]** The Viet Minh could also call upon the support of an army of porters that enabled them to transport heavily artillery, arms and supplies to the battlefield. The Viet Minh lacked mechanised transport but could still fight effectively due to the support from the peasants. Over 120,000 civilians served as porters in the Battle of Cao Bang. At least half of them were women – their ‘long haired army’.
 - **[Explanation] [How did this benefit the Viet Minh? Why did lead to the French losing the war?]** The French were unable to compete with the Viet Minh as they were not trained in this type of warfare. Furthermore, the camouflage of the Viet Minh was so effective that the French had great difficulty locating the Viet Minh and subduing them such as in Operation Lea. With the French experiencing significant losses and casualties, the Viet Minh gradually depleted French forces in Vietnam and eroded their morale leading their surrender and defeat.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [How were the Viet Minh able to compete with the logistically superior French force? Why was the role of China important here?] [P.246-247]** The Chinese Communist Party supported the communist revolution in Vietnam by providing the Viet Minh with military aid such as machine guns, ammunition, and communication equipment. By 1954, they had provided more than 10,000 tonnes of equipment per month to the DRV. The Chinese also advised the Viet Minh to fight a ‘people’s war’ to win the support of the people. The Soviets had also sent artillery pieces to the Viet Minh.
 - **[Explanation] [How did this benefit the Viet Minh? Why did lead to the French losing the war?]** The French were numerically superior compared to the Viet Minh and had access to modern weaponry. Hence, the support of the Chinese was crucial here as it enabled the Viet Minh to compete with the

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

French despite their disadvantage. Access to military equipment enabled the Viet Minh to fight the French in open warfare. Coupled with the support of the people and their effective military strategies, the Viet Minh could defeat the French by gradually depleting French resources, causing significant French losses, and eroding their morale to fight. Eventually, the French were defeated.

Weighing: Balanced Conclusion**Suggested Answer. Criterion: Root cause**

[Weighing Criterion] The main reason for the defeat of the French was the strength of the Viet Minh **[Given Factor]** because as they exposed and capitalised on French vulnerabilities. **[Explaining the balance]** The Viet Minh had strong nationalist motivation, widespread local support, and a deep understanding of the terrain, which enabled them to conduct effective guerrilla warfare and siege tactics, especially at Dien Bien Phu. Their ability to transport heavy artillery through mountainous terrain and build extensive trench networks demonstrated remarkable logistical ingenuity. In contrast, French weaknesses amplified their vulnerabilities but would not have led to defeat on their own without the determined and well-organised opposition they faced.

