



NAN HUA HIGH SCHOOL
Preliminary Examination 2026

CANDIDATE
NAME

--

CENTRE
NUMBER

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

CLASS

--	--	--

INDEX
NUMBER

--	--

HUMANITIES (HISTORY)

2261/02

Paper 2 The Making of the 20th Century Modern World, 1910s-1991

25 August 2026
1 hour 50 minutes

Additional materials: Writing paper

SUGGESTED ANSWER SCHEME

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1	(a)	Study Source A. How useful is this source as evidence about UN intervention in the Korean War? Explain your answer.	[5]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Answers based on undeveloped provenance E.g. Source A is useful because it is a photograph taken during the Korean War. Therefore, it must be true.		1
L2	Useful / Not useful based on superficial reading of source (e.g. inference based on provenance without reference to evidence in the photograph) E.g. Source A is useful in showing that the UN intervention was successful in pushing North Korean forces past the 38th parallel. As this photo was taken near the Yalu River, in North Korea, near China, this tells me that the UN succeeded in pushing back the North Korean forces from South Korea.		2
L3	Useful/Not Useful based on source content <i>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed responses (evidence fully explained).</i> <i>N.B. To attain L3/3, responses must state a clear claim and the logic of why the source is useful/not useful, with evidence from the source.</i> E.g. Source A is useful in showing that the UN forces were heavily influenced/controlled by the United States during the Korean War. The photo shows UN troops holding up an American flag during the Korean War, near the Yalu River. This tells me that even though the UN troops are supposed to be a coalition of forces from different UN member nations and intervened in the Korean War for UN's purposes of ensuring collective security, that these troops are holding up the American flag shows how the troops were in fact loyal American troops in Korea to pursue American ambitions. E.g. Source A is useful in showing that the UN troops had a positive attitude towards the intervention in the Korean War/were happy to intervene in the Korean War. I know this because many of the UN troops in the photo were smiling while they were on the battlefield in Korea. Thus this tells me that they were enthusiastic about helping the South Koreans.		3-4

	E.g. Source A is useful in showing that UN intervention was supported by the US. The photo shows UN troops holding up an American flag during the Korean War, near the Yalu River. Thus this tells me that the UN forces included American troops as well. E.g. Source A is useful in showing that UN intervention was a threat to China, as the photo shows them holding up the American flag near the Yalu River at the Manchurian border separating North Korea and China. This implies that the UN troops were possibly a threatening presence to China's sovereignty and security due to the presence of American troops near the Chinese border, as I know from my contextual knowledge that the USA was opposed to China after the end of the Chinese Civil War, with the establishment of communism in China. E.g. Source A is not useful as evidence about UN intervention in the Korean War because it is only a photograph. Source A shows the UN troops holding up an American flag during the Korean War, near the Yalu River. While this may imply that the UN troops were heavily controlled by the United States and were fighting in the Korean War to achieve American interests, this is a photo of one moment in time during the Korean War. It is limited in providing information about UN operations and does not show the full extent of other countries and the United States' involvement in UN peacekeeping efforts. Thus, the photo is limited in its usefulness as evidence about UN intervention in the Korean War. (4m)	
L4	Useful/Not useful based on cross-reference Award the higher mark in the level for more developed responses. Answers which address only reliability and not utility should be given L2/2 marks. E.g. Source A is useful as it is reliable, due to my contextual knowledge that corroborates Source A about <u>how UN forces were heavily influenced/controlled by the United States during the Korean War</u>. The photo shows UN troops holding up an American flag during the Korean War, near the Yalu River. This tells me that even though the UN troops are supposed to be a coalition of forces from different UN member nations and intervened in the Korean War for UN's purposes of ensuring collective security, that these troops are holding up the American flag shows how the troops were in fact loyal American troops in Korea to pursue American ambitions. Similarly, this is supported by my contextual knowledge that the United States bore heavy influence over the United Nations in initiating and contributing to UN intervention in the Korean War. American President Truman put enormous pressure on the UN Security Council to pass resolutions to drive North Korea out of South Korea, and the US was the largest contributor of troops to the UN forces, which were under the command of US General Douglas MacArthur, who was even willing to use nuclear weapons on	4-5

	communist China if necessary. Since my contextual knowledge supports Source A, it makes Source A reliable, and hence useful. (5m)	
--	---	--

1	(b)	Study Sources B and C. How far does the cartoon in Source B prove that Attlee (Source C) can be believed? Explain your answer.	[6]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Answers based on undeveloped provenance E.g. Source B does not prove Source C can be believed because the cartoon is made by the Communist Party in Britain, which would oppose Attlee.		1
L2	Sources agree, so Source B proves Source C can be believed <i>NB: This similarity is considered a weaker response as it is not the main message of Source C.</i> E.g. Source B proves that Attlee in Source C can be believed as they agree that the United States had influence over the United Nations. Source B shows Truman whipping the “U.N. rump”, which represents the United Nations forces intervening in the Korean War, of which American General MacArthur is depicted at the head, showing American leadership and initiative in the UN efforts during the Korean War/the United States was controlling or forcing the UN to do their bidding. Similarly , Attlee in Source C said that “the United States government went to the United Nations, arranged that there should be full and free elections, and left the government of that country to the Koreans.” Thus this shows how the US had supported the UN in holding elections in Korea after World War II, before the Korean War broke out.		2
L3	Sources disagree, so Source B proves that Source C cannot be believed E.g. Source B proves that Attlee in Source C cannot be believed as they disagree on the reason why the United Nations intervened in the Korean War. Source B shows Truman whipping the “U.N. rump”, which represents the United Nations forces intervening in the Korean War, of which American General MacArthur is depicted at the head of the “Pacific War Horse”, which implies that heavy American influence and interests drove UN participation in the Korean War/the United States was controlling or forcing the UN to do their bidding. On the other hand , Attlee in Source C, referring to North Korea’s invasion of South Korea, said “Condoning such an action would have struck at the whole basis of the United Nations, which has been set up in order to try to preserve the peace of the world.” This tells me that the United Nations was compelled to intervene due to their own agenda of ensuring collective security, after having helped South Korea’s electoral transition after the war.		3
L4	Both aspects of L2 and L3		4

L5	Identifies the disagreement, and uses cross-reference to a third source or contextual knowledge to decide which can be believed e.g. Source B can prove that Atlee cannot be believed because they contradict in terms of <u>why the UN intervened in the Korean War</u>, and Source B is more reliable. Source B is more reliable because Source E agrees with Source B about <u>why the United Nations intervened in the Korean War</u>. Source B shows American General MacArthur is depicted at the head of the “Pacific War Horse”, which implies that heavy American influence and interests drove UN participation in the Korean War/the United States was controlling or forcing the UN to do their bidding. On the other hand, Source E, from a former American Prisoner-of-War who was part of the UN troops intervening in Korea, claimed that “What did we go to Korea for? To protect American business interest”. This proves that the United Nations did not intervene purely to ensure collective security, but instead to help advance American interests by ensuring that South Korea would not fall to communism, which would decrease the number of viable capitalist markets the US could sell to. Thus, as Source E agrees with Source B, this makes Source B even more reliable, proving that Source B makes Source C unbelievable.	5
L6	Identifies the disagreement, and evaluates provenance of Source B and/or Source C to decide if Source C can be believed e.g. Sources B and C disagree about <u>the reason why the UN intervened in the Korean War</u>. However, Source B cannot be used to evaluate Source C as Source B is unreliable. It is unreliable because it has a hidden motive. The intention of Source B was to convince (P) the British public (A) that the United States was controlling/manipulating/driving the United Nations’ involvement in the Korean War on the side of South Korea in order to advance American interests (M). The source was published by the Communist Party of Britain, on 11 July 1950, after United Nations Security Council had passed resolutions committing member forces to drive the North Koreans out of South Korea (C). Therefore, the Communist Party of Britain would have sympathised with the pro-communist territories of North Korea, the USSR, and China, and wanted to encourage the British public to be against UN intervention in the Korean War and pressure the British government to reject UN intervention/pull out the British forces from the UN troops (O). AND/OR e.g. Sources B and C disagree about the reason why the UN intervened in the Korean War. However, Source C has a hidden motive that makes it difficult to believe Source C on its own terms. Attlee, the British Prime Minister in Source C, wanted to convince (P) the British Parliament/politicians (A) that the United Nations had	6

	purely positive intentions to resolve the Korean War to ensure collective security (M). Attlee said this in his speech to British Parliament on 5 July 1950, after United Nations Security Council had passed resolutions committing member forces to drive the North Koreans out of South Korea (C). Thus, as the United Kingdom was also a non-communist ally of the United States, Attlee wanted the support of the British Parliament to vote in favour of British support of UN intervention in Korea, to prevent South Korea from turning communist (O).	
--	--	--

1	(c)	Study Source D. Why do you think the UN Secretary-General said this? Explain your answer.	[5]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Undeveloped provenance e.g. Trygve Lie said this because he wanted to commemorate the one-year anniversary of UN intervention in the Korean War.		1
L2	Reason based sub-message e.g. Trygve Lie said this to tell people that North Korea/the communists were at fault for the outbreak of the Korean War. e.g. Trygve Lie said this to remember/commemorate the soldiers and UN forces who died/sacrificed their lives in the Korean War. e.g. Trygve Lie said this to commend the UN forces participating in the Korean War.		2
L3	Reasons based on main message or outcome without main message identified <i>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers.</i> E.g. Trygve Lie said this to persuade (P) the international public/UN member countries (A) to support the United Nations efforts in the Korean War (O). (3m) OR E.g. Trygve Lie said this to convince (P) the international public/UN member countries (A) of the UN's beneficial efforts / noble intentions in intervening against the North Korean troops in the Korean War, to keep international peace (M). This is seen in the source when he referred to UN's military action, "Because of the courageous and self-sacrificing fight waged by United Nations		3-4

	forces in Korea, the development of collective security against war anywhere in the world has been greatly advanced". This suggests that the UN forces intervened in Korea to protect South Korea's sovereignty and seek geopolitical stability, despite the tremendous efforts and commitment it took. (4m)	
L4	Reason based on purpose (Message AND Outcome identified) <i>Responses without Purposeful verb or with wrong Audience identified should be awarded L3.</i> E.g. Trygve Lie said this to convince (P) the international public / United Nations member countries (A) of UN's beneficial efforts / noble intentions in intervening against the North Korean troops in the Korean War, to keep international peace (M). This is seen in the source when he referred to UN's military action, "Because of the courageous and self-sacrificing fight waged by United Nations forces in Korea, the development of collective security against war anywhere in the world has been greatly advanced". His praise here shows how strongly he believed that the United Nations was in the right for intervening in the Korean War to seek stability in Korea. Lie said this in the context of the Korean War reaching a stalemate, in June 1951/UN fighting in foreign affairs that did not impact member countries/on the first anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War (C). Thus, Lie wanted the international public/United Nations members to continue supporting the United Nations efforts in the Korean War (O). (5m)	4-5

1	(d)	Study Sources E and F. Having read Source F, are you surprised by Source E? Explain your answer.	[6]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Not surprised based on source type/provenance E.g. I am not surprised by Source E because it is written by a former American soldier who participated in the war.		1
L2	Not surprised based on content comparison <i>NB: This similarity is considered a weaker response as it is not the main message of Source E.</i> E.g. Having read Source F, I am not surprised by Source E as they agree that <u>the USA intervened in the Korean War to contain communism/stop the spread of communism</u> . From Source F, "Truman and his advisers were convinced that the North Korean aggression was a part of the Soviet attempt to achieve global domination through military action". This tells me that they viewed the Korean War through the ideological lens, and felt the need to intervene to stop Soviet communist expansion. Similarly, Source E claimed that "We were told about the Communist menace, how millions of 'reds' from China and Korea would overrun the world, how cruel they were and how they took over a country and killed and tortured the people." This tells me that the Americans were motivated by stopping communist aggression in Korea and hence participated in the Korean War.		2
L3	Surprised based on content comparison E.g. Having read Source F, I am surprised by Source E as they disagree on <u>the real reason why the US participated in the Korean War</u> . Source F said that "But it was only South Korea's inability to defend itself that subsequently led to American military intervention through the UN." This suggests that USA participated in the Korean War to support South Korea against the aggression of North Korea and protect South Korea's sovereignty. On the other hand, Source E claimed that "What did we go to Korea for? To protect American business interest." This suggests that Source E believed the USA intervened militarily in the Korean War against the communist forces, to protect their access to/profit from free markets in South Korea.		3
L4	Identifies the disagreement + cross reference to another source/contextual knowledge, supported <i>Award the higher mark of the level for more developed answers.</i>		4-5

	E.g. Sources E and F disagree on the real reason why the US participated in the Korean War. I am further surprised by Source E after reading Source F as my contextual knowledge contradicts with Source E <u>about the real reason why the US participated in the Korean War</u>. Source E claimed that “What did we go to Korea for? To protect American business interest.” This suggests that Source E believed the USA intervened militarily in the Korean War against the communist forces, to protect their access to/profit from free markets in South Korea. On the other hand, I know from my contextual knowledge that while the USA was initially unwilling to support Syngman Rhee’s reunification ambitions after WWII, there was a change in foreign policy after communist developments in 1949 and 1950, with the rise of communist China and the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance. Thus, the US government set out a more assertive and aggressive foreign policy in the National Security Council Paper No. 68, further warning against Soviet communist expansion globally. This hence prompted Truman to take more decisive action to safeguard Korea after the North Korean invasion.	
L5	Identifies the disagreement + Source E is not surprising because of its provenance <i>Award the higher mark of the level for more developed answers.</i> <i>N.B.: Evaluation of Source F’s provenance is more difficult to explain/link to the logic of surprise. Source E is also arguably ‘the more interesting’ source in this two-source question.</i> E.g. Even though Sources E and F disagree on the real reason why the US participated in the Korean War, I am not surprised by Source E. The claims made in Source E are expected of the American POW who had chosen to stay in China after the war. The interviewee wanted to convince (P) Americans (A) that American involvement in the Korean War was not for a righteous/noble/moral reason, but instead to pursue selfish economic agendas (M). Thus, he was very critical about the offensive behaviour/attitude of the UN troops towards the local Koreans, and claimed that “What did we go to Korea for? To protect American business interest”, instead of truly stopping the “Communist menace”. He said this after fighting in the Korean War had ended, and he was clearly sympathetic to the North Koreans and China, choosing to stay in China despite being given a dishonourable discharge by the US army (C). Thus, he wanted to clear his name/protect his reputation/convince others to support his defection from his homeland (O).	5-6

1	(e)	Study all the sources. 'The United Nations was merely a tool for the United States in the Korean War.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your view.	[8]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Identifies sources that support/do not support the view without valid source use		1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 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> <i>Responses MUST address the idea of 'merely a tool for the United States'; as in the United Nations being exploited/manipulated/heavily controlled by the United States, and/or the UN being made use of to achieve American interests/agenda. Responses for NO should link back to the role of UN (even if restating the statement), and not merely address US rationale for their involvement in the Korean War.</i> E.g. Yes, Sources A, B and E support the statement. Source A supports the statement. I can infer from <u>Source A</u> that the UN forces were heavily influenced/controlled by the <u>United States during the Korean War</u>. The photo shows UN troops holding up an American flag during the Korean War, near the Yalu River. This tells me that even though the UN troops are supposed to be a coalition of forces from different UN member nations and intervened in the Korean War for UN's purposes of ensuring collective security, that these troops are holding up the American flag shows how the UN troops were in fact loyal American troops, participating in the war to pursue American ambitions. Source B supports the statement. I can infer from <u>Source B</u> that the <u>United States had heavy influence/control over the United Nations' operations in the Korean War</u>. Source A shows Truman whipping the "U.N. rump", which represents the United Nations forces intervening in the Korean War, of which the American MacArthur is depicted at the head of the "Pacific War Horse", showing immense American leadership and control over UN efforts during the Korean War. Source E supports the statement. Source E shows that <u>the United Nations did not intervene in the Korean War for a</u>		2-4

	<u>righteous reason, but instead to advance American interests.</u> A former American Prisoner-of-War from the Korean War said that “When I went there and saw the North Korean people fighting so bravely; if they were slaves, why were they fighting in this way? What did we go to Korea for? To protect American business interest”, suggesting how the UN troops were used to protect the Americans’ access to a capitalist market in South Korea for American profit, and not for the UN’s aims of protecting the North Koreans. OR E.g. No, Sources C, D and F do not support the statement. Source C does not support the statement. Source C shows that <u>it was necessary for the United Nations to intervene in the Korean War to achieve its own objective of ensuring collective security.</u> In the source, Attlee stated that “The world was faced with an act of naked aggression committed against a sovereign state established by the United Nations. There could not be a greater insult to the United Nations.” This tells me that the North Korean invasion of South Korea harmed South Korea’s sovereignty, that had been established indirectly through UN intervention in 1948. Thus the UN intervened for their own reasons, and was not a tool to advance American interests. Source D does not support the statement. Source D shows that <u>the UN troops were fighting to ensure peace in the world.</u> From the source, Trygve Lie stated that “Because of the courageous and self-sacrificing fight waged by United Nations forces in Korea, the development of collective security against war anywhere in the world has been greatly advanced”. Therefore, Lie stated the necessity of ensuring peace in the region and world/taking a firm stance against illegal incursions on sovereign nations as seen through UN intervention in Korea, showing how the UN was not being used as a tool for the US. Source F does not support the statement. Source F shows that <u>the United States only intervened in the Korean War to protect South Korea’s sovereignty.</u> From the source, the historian stated that “But it was only South Korea’s inability to defend itself that subsequently led to American military intervention through the UN”. Hence, the US supported the UN not to advance American interests, but purely to help South Korea remove North Korean invading troops. <i>Note:</i> - <i>To be awarded L2 or L3, there must be a direct reference to source content.</i>	
--	--	--

	- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues raised by the sources is insufficient.	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use Both aspects of L2 up till 7 marks. <i>Note:</i> - Bonus of 2m (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency, etc but the total for this question must not exceed 8m. E.g. Source F further shows how the UN was not used as a tool for the USA, due to its enhanced reliability. The historian, writing in 1983 after the armistice had been signed, would have had done in-depth research on various perspectives, using multiple sources of information from all actors in the war that would have emerged two decades after the end of the Korean War. This would produce a well-considered and holistic conclusion that accounts for multiple perspectives, without an explicit bias towards any one perspective. Therefore the conclusions that the historian had come to about the reasons for US intervention in Korea should be very reliable.	5-8

Section B: Essays

- 2 'The Nazi Party was successful in securing the loyalty of the people of Germany from 1933.' How far do you agree with this statement?
Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes how the Nazi Party was successful OR unsuccessful in securing the Germans' loyalty <i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Possible answers (I agree): the Germans' loyalty was successfully secured through Nazi policies - Consolidation of Nazi Rule in Germany, i.e. factors that relate to the time period between Hitler's appointment as Chancellor and him becoming a führer (e.g. Enabling Act, Reichstag Fire, Coordination to turn Germany into a one-party state, Night of the Long Knives,) - Nazi economic policies (economic recovery, improving working conditions) - Use of education and the Hitler Youth - Use of control and fear - Use of propaganda and censorship Possible answers (I agree): the Germans' loyalty was successfully secured as seen in what Germans were willing to do for Hitler/Nazi Party - Oath of Allegiance from the army - Use of education and the Hitler Youth - Use of control and fear Possible answers (I disagree): the Germans' loyalty was not successfully secured because of the consequences of Nazi policies - Use of control and fear - Persecution of minorities Possible answers (I disagree): the Germans' loyalty was not successfully secured as seen in Germans' resistance and opposition to the Nazis - Examples of opposition and resistance to the Nazi regime (political opposition, military resistance, members of clergy, anti-Nazi youth groups)	1-3
L2	Explains how the Nazi Party was successfully able to secure loyalty of the people OR how Nazi Party was unsuccessful	4-5

Award 4 marks for an explanation of how the Nazi Party successfully secured the loyalty of the people OR how they were not successful, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.

E.g. I agree that the Nazi Party was successful in securing the loyalty of the people **due to the use of propaganda that reinforced public confidence in Hitler**. Under the leadership of Joseph Goebbels, the Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, propaganda was strategically used to stir up nationalistic sentiments among the German people. Posters and portraits of Hitler and the Nazi Party were displayed across the country to influence public opinion and instill loyalty. All films produced were required to carry pro-Nazi messages, and newsreels shown in cinemas glorified Nazi achievements. Radios were sold at low prices to ensure that every household could access Nazi broadcasts. This widespread and persistent use of propaganda helped foster a strong sense of national pride and shaped positive public perceptions of the Nazi Party. As a result, Hitler was portrayed as a heroic and infallible leader, which helped maintain his popularity and secure the Nazi Party's grip on power.

OR

E.g. I agree that the Nazi Party was successful in securing the loyalty of the Germans, due to the **use of education that gained influence over German youths**. Greater control over schools was first achieved by regulating teachers—requiring all of them to join the National Socialist Teachers' League and attend training courses that emphasised Nazi ideology and physical education. The curriculum was revised to promote Nazi values, with subjects such as history and biology infused with racial theories and nationalist propaganda, and only Nazi-approved textbooks were permitted. This allowed Hitler to shape the minds of young Germans from an early age and cultivate loyalty to his regime. At the same time, youths were further indoctrinated through organisations like the Hitler Youth, a paramilitary wing of the Nazi Party designed to prepare boys to become future Nazi leaders. The Hitler Youth offered activities such as camps, sports, and military-style physical training, all reinforced with strong doses of anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi messaging. Through this dual approach in schools and youth organisations, the Nazi Party secured a loyal generation of young supporters who would help sustain and spread Nazi ideology, strengthening the Nazis' hold on power for years to come.

OR

E.g. I agree that the Nazi Party was successful in securing the loyalty of the Germans, **as seen in the Germans' overt displays**

of loyalty to the Nazi Party and Hitler. After the Night of Long Knives where Hitler purged Ernst Rohm and other leading SA officers, President Hindenburg died. The only figure who could rival Hitler's authority was gone, and Hitler took over as Fuhrer of Germany. On 2 August 1934, the entire army swore an oath of personal loyalty to Hitler, instead of swearing loyalty to the nation or the government. The army agreed to stay out of politics and serve Hitler. In return, Hitler spent vast sums on rearmament, brought back conscription, and made plans to make Germany a great military power again. This display of loyalty to Hitler, above and beyond the German nation or the government, showed that the Nazi Party had been successful in securing a **faithful and devoted** group of supporters that had the power to oppose him. The army's oath thus signalled that the Nazi Party had been **successful in spreading and sustaining Nazi ideology**, and essentially **removed any remaining threats** to the Nazi regime.

OR

E.g. However, I disagree that the Nazi Party was successful in securing the loyalty of the people as their **use of control and fear created an environment of terror in Germany.** The SS, an elite and fiercely loyal force, was tasked with eliminating opposition to the Nazi regime. Within the SS, the SD monitored political opponents and worked to prevent spies from infiltrating the party. The Gestapo, or Secret Police, had sweeping powers to arrest anyone without trial or explanation and send them to concentration camps. These camps were established to "correct" or punish those deemed enemies of the regime. Prisoners endured harsh conditions—forced labour, minimal food, brutal discipline, beatings, and even random executions. The threat of being reported and arrested without cause created a climate of constant fear. The powerful and terrifying machinery in place limited civil liberties and freedoms, **engendering an oppressive environment of fear and control among the Germans, rather than genuine support/loyalty** to the Nazi Party.

OR

E.g. Another reason why I disagree that the Nazis were successful in securing the loyalty of the Germans is **due to the continued presence of opposition and resistance to the Nazi regime.** There was political opposition existent even after opposition groups had been destroyed, such active socialists and communists who continued to send reports back to their leaders in exile or tried to encourage workers to resist by striking or sabotaging equipment. The Gestapo claimed to have broken up 1000 opposition meetings in 1936. There were also aristocratic officers and conservatives that were suspicious of Hitler and Nazism and grew increasingly concerned about Hitler's aggressive foreign policy, demonstrating

	their resistance through assassination attempts against Hitler such as in the failed July 1944 Bomb Plot. Notably, many members of the church clergy criticised the Nazis in the sermons, and the Nazi Party sent 400 Catholic priests and some Protestant ministers to concentration camps. There were also youth groups such as the White Rose, a group of university students whom secretly distributed leaflets protesting Nazi atrocities. <u>Thus, the presence of such opposition and resistance groups revealed the Nazis' failure in securing total and true loyalty among the Germans. Despite heavy-handed and terrifying policies that was aimed at securing the people's compliance/submission to Nazi rule, threats to the Nazis' power still remained.</u>	
L3	Explains how the Nazi Party was successfully able to secure loyalty of the people AND how Nazi Party was unsuccessful <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the use of propaganda led to Hitler remaining in power AND how other factors led to it, and additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). E.g. L3 + <u>In conclusion, I disagree that the Nazis were successful in securing the loyalty of the German people.</u> While social policies such as propaganda, censorship and use of education shaped how the German people viewed both the Nazi regime and its opponents, the Nazis relied heavily on control and fear, creating an atmosphere of mutual distrust and fear that discouraged opposition. Arguably, this did not actually inspire true loyalty among the Germans, but instead motivated groups of unhappy Germans to protest such policies of fear and control. The continued presence of resistance and opposition by groups protesting Nazi rule – minor and unsuccessful as they were – showed the Nazis' inability to secure loyalty among all Germans.	6-8

- 3 'Civilian resistance against the Japanese empire in occupied territories was the most important reason for the defeat of Japan in World War II.'
How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the reasons behind the defeat of Japan in World War II <i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Other possible answers (I disagree): - Inter-service rivalry between Japanese army and navy - Overstretched Japanese empire - Japan's poor planning - US industrial production - US island-hopping strategy in the Asia-Pacific - Use of the atomic bomb	1-3
L2	Explains how civilian resistance led to the defeat of Japan OR how other factors led to it <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how civilian resistance led to the defeat of Japan OR how other factors led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that civilian resistance was a key factor that led to the defeat of Japan in World War II. The Japanese was unable to make the best use of their empire because of how brutally they had treated the people they conquered. They looted the resources of the conquered lands, abused the locals, and forced thousands into slave labour. Millions of civilians died under Japanese rule. Thus the conquered peoples began to resist in any way they could, such as with large-scale resistance movements. In China, the communists under Mao Zedong carried out an effective campaign of guerilla warfare. Many North Koreans joined the Chinese communists and later fought the Japanese back in Korea. In Vietnam, the nationalist leader Ho Chi Minh led the Viet Minh in a guerilla campaign which wore down the Japanese. This <u>hindered the Japanese from extracting resources from these territories, as they had to devote much of their resources to maintaining control over the territories they had conquered and clamping down on these resistance movements, when ironically the territories were conquered to provide resources to Japan.</u> In Malaya and Singapore, the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army fought an underground war against the Japanese, and passed information along to the Allies, <u>leading to the Allies being able to strategise better with information from the resistance movements.</u> Thus, as	4-5

the Japanese were unable to secure the support of the people they conquered, resistance against the Japanese empire by the civilians hindered Japanese war efforts terribly. Hence the Japanese army was divided in their efforts to defend their conquered territories against the Allies **and** the civilian resistance, **lacked military resources** crucial to the war effort and were **overpowered strategically**, thus contributing to Japan's defeat in World War II.

OR

E.g. Another reason that led to the defeat of Japan in World War II was the **inter-service rivalry between the Japanese Army and Navy**. The Japanese army and navy had a long-term conflict with each other since the Meiji period. In the 1930s, both services of the Japanese military had different strategic goals and ideas for how they wanted to seize territories to obtain resources to sustain Japan's economy. When the war broke out, the rivalry between army and navy prevented both groups from sharing resources and exchanging military intelligence, and even to coordinate their attacks and defences against the Allied powers. For example, in 1942, when the navy asked the army to provide troop support for an invasion of Australia, the army refused. The army remained unresponsive throughout the Pacific War and was late to recognise the threat of the US counter-offensive in late 1942. Throughout 1943, the army refused to commit major reinforcements to the Pacific Islands. Both services also could not agree on where to set Japan's defensive perimeter against the Allied forces. Hence, the Japanese war effort was divided internally, lacking unity to face the Allied forces with a properly coordinated strategy, resulting in the loss of several strategic battles such as the Battle of Midway and Battle of the Coral Sea. Faced with the overwhelming success of the US' island-hopping strategy that threatened the Japanese mainland, the Japanese army and navy were **unable to respond convincingly**, and **Japanese losses thus lowered morale and political will to keep fighting**, thus contributing to the defeat of Japan in World War II.

OR

E.g. Another reason that led to the defeat of Japan in World War II was the **United States' military strength**. The US was responsible for decimating the Japanese military, such as during the Battle of Midway in 1942, where Japan lost four of their Japanese carriers and nearly three-quarters of their experienced pilots, affecting their naval and air defence capabilities for the rest of the war, diminishing their ability to defend Japanese conquered territories. After the Battle of Midway, the US successfully executed their island-hopping strategy, using air attacks and submarines to isolate Japanese-held areas, instead of trying to capture them. The Allies then conquered the poorly-defended islands, and use them to further cut off ships

	that supplied well-defended islands, incurring fewer casualties for the Allies and coming within striking distance of mainland Japan in just a few years. This resulted in several key victories, such as in the battle to regain the Philippines. <u>This led to Japan's resources becoming severely overstretched, and they were not able to defend the entire empire.</u> The United States' final show of military might came in the form of Truman dropping the two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on 6 and 9 August 1945 respectively. The atomic bombs caused nearly 200,000 casualties in both cities, reduced the cities to ruins. <u>The overwhelming destruction of the American atomic bombs showed that the Japanese military was simply unable to match up to the dominance of American military might, which thus decimated remaining political will to continue fighting, compelling Emperor Hirohito to finally surrender, leading to the defeat of Japan in World War II.</u>	
L3	Explains how civilian resistance led to the defeat of Japan AND how other factors led to it <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how civilian resistance led to the defeat of Japan AND how other factors led to it, and additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). E.g. L3 + In conclusion, <u>I believe that American military might was the main cause of Japan's defeat in World War II.</u> Although civilian resistance in Japanese-occupied territories played an important role in straining Japanese wartime resources, Japan had remained determined and even fanatical in continuing to fight, such as in the Battle of Okinawa, where no Japanese soldier surrendered. It was the overwhelming impact of American military strategy across multiple battles and crucially, the atomic bombings, that tipped the scales for Japan. Japan had shown their willingness to stretch out the war even after Germany's surrender, and thus the atomic bombs, with its unprecedented level of destructiveness, was what finally compelled Japanese officials and Emperor Hirohito to surrender.	6-8

- 4 'The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe was due to economic reasons.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the reasons behind the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe <i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i> Economic reasons (I agree): - Economic weaknesses of Warsaw Pact - Long-term structural weaknesses of Soviet command economy - External burdens on Soviet economy - US economic superiority - Gorbachev's economic reforms (perestroika) Other possible answers (I disagree): - Mass anti-communist resistance movements in Eastern Europe - US military superiority - Gorbachev's political reforms (glasnost) - Gorbachev's foreign policy reforms (de-ideologisation/Sinatra Doctrine)	1-3
L2	Explains how economic reasons led to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe OR other reasons that led to it <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how economic reasons led to the end of communism in Eastern Europe OR other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> <i>To be awarded this level, responses MUST link to the idea of the Eastern European governments losing control/power, and/or the Eastern European people protesting and succeeded in overturning communism.</i> <i>Responses arguing about the weaknesses of the Soviet economy should show a clear link between USSR's economic situation and its impact on Eastern Europe, and should not conflate Eastern Europe and USSR's governance.</i> E.g. I agree that economic reasons contributed to the end of the communism in Eastern Europe. The long-term weaknesses of the Soviet economy greatly affected the struggling economies of communist regimes in Eastern Europe. The Soviet command economy became overwhelmed by increasing demands by the	4-5

1970s, with the Soviet government struggling to cope with many companies making different goods, and acted too slowly and made poor decisions. Thus the USSR began to experience long-term consistent decline in the rate of growth, with industrial output dropping from double-digit percentage growth to a 3 to 4 per cent decline. For Eastern Europe, as the Soviet economy was closely tied to the economies of Eastern Europe through Comecon and the Warsaw Pact, Eastern Europe economies that were heavily dependent on Soviet support began to struggle as the Soviet economy did. Besides relying on Soviet subsidies for oil and resources, Eastern European countries borrowed heavily from Western banks in the 1970s, with the Eastern European countries attaining debt levels which were among the highest in the world at that time. Thus this fueled resentment and unhappiness among the people in Eastern Europe as they became disillusioned with communism, leading to the formation of opposition groups desiring a break away from communism. For example, in the late 1970s, the Polish economy hit a crisis with rising food prices that led to a growing wave of strikes. This led to the formation of Solidarity, a trade union that led controlled strikes to push for economic reforms and free elections. This demonstrated how Eastern Europeans no longer believed in communism, and as anti-communist sentiments, protests and demonstrations grew, this caused the collapse of their respective communist governments in Eastern Europe when the USSR decided not to interfere in the internal affairs of Eastern Europe.

OR

E.g. Another reason that led to the end of Communism in Eastern Europe was **Gorbachev's political reforms**. One of his political reforms include Glasnost, which allowed open political debate by Communist Party members who disagreed with the government. It would also allow criticism of the government in the media. However, Glasnost backfired because it released much resentment against the communist government. It also exposed shortcomings of the government officials such as their inefficiency and corruption. This led to decreasing confidence in the party. The Soviets were also further exposed to aspects of the outside world, especially the better quality of life in the US and Western European countries, through popular Western culture. As a result, the positive picture of Soviet life that the government previously presented to the public quickly fell apart. Many in the Soviet bloc felt deceived and lost confidence in the vision and rule of the communist governments. This led to the rest of anti-communist sentiments that spilled over into protests, demonstrations and a clamour for freedom from Soviet influence. When opportunity for liberation presented itself through the Sinatra Doctrine, communist governments collapsed due to a lack of popularity

	<u>and support</u>, leading to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. OR E.g. Another factor that contributed to the end of the Cold War was Gorbachev's foreign policy reforms. Under Gorbachev, the USSR would no longer intervene in other countries to support communist regimes or takeover, indicating a shift away from former leaders such as Brezhnev. He referred to this policy as the "Sinatra Doctrine", explaining that he was now committed to the policy of non-intervention. He began reducing defense spending, which led to the shrinking of the Red Army. He also withdrew Soviet troops from Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, and Vietnam, signaling a shift away from ideologically driven actions aimed at spreading communism worldwide and challenging the United States. Gorbachev even convened leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries to explain his new stance. <u>These moves gave the people of Eastern Europe some hope for reform and led to the erosion of credibility and confidence towards Soviet Union's influence over Eastern European countries.</u> For example, in Poland, the democratic opposition movement Solidarity won 99 out of 100 seats in Poland's senate in the June 1989 elections, and protests against communist rule continued to take place. <u>With the Soviet army no longer propping communist regimes up, Eastern European governments had to listen to their people's demands to break away from communism, leading the collapse of communism across Eastern Europe.</u>	
L3	Explains how economic reasons led to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe AND other reasons that led to it <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of economic reasons led to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe AND other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2). E.g. L3 + In conclusion, I believe that <u>Gorbachev's foreign policy reforms were the most significant factor</u> that led to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. Although the economic struggles of being part of a weak communist alliance did fuel unhappiness towards communism over the long term, communist regimes in Eastern Europe still maintained their grip on power so long as	6-8

	previous leaders before Gorbachev insisted on using the Soviet army to ensure the longevity of the Communist bloc. Gorbachev's political reforms of glasnost also increased further unhappiness among the Soviet bloc, but it was really his foreign policy reforms that triggered the complete collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. His de-ideologisation/"Sinatra Doctrine" that committed the USSR to non-intervention was a turning point. These reforms had a profound impact on turning people's growing feelings of discontent and resentment into action, enabling the masses to confidently resist their communist governments without fear of violent reprisal, leading to the disintegration of communism in Eastern Europe.	
--	--	--

END OF ANSWER SCHEME