

2026 SECONDARY 4 G3 HUMANITIES (HISTORY) PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION

SUGGESTED MARK SCHEME

SECTION A: SOURCE-BASED CASE STUDY

- (a) Study Source A. What was the cartoonist's attitude towards US involvement in the Korean War? Explain your answer.? Explain your answer. [5]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	ANSWERS BASED ON SOURCE DETAILS ONLY Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression.	[1]
L2	ANSWERS THAT INFER ABOUT US INVOLVEMENT WITHOUT EXPLANATION OR INFER CARTOONIST'S ATTITUDE WITHOUT EXPLANATION <u>Example of answers inferring US involvement without explanation</u> - The cartoonist's attitude is that he thinks that US played an important role/ was a good guy/ was a hero/ was justified in getting involved. This is seen in how Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression. <u>Examples of answers inferring cartoonist's attitude without explanation</u> - The cartoonist's attitude is positive. In the cartoon, UN and Truman were running to intervene in the Korean War. - The cartoonist's attitude is approving/ supportive. In the cartoon, UN and Truman were running to intervene in the Korean War.	[2]
L3	ANSWERS THAT INFER ABOUT US INVOLVEMENT, EXPLAINED AND/OR INFER VAGUE ATTITUDE/FEELINGS, EXPLAINED <i>Award 3 marks for inferring US involvement OR for inferring vague attitude/feeling, with explanation.</i> <i>Award 4 marks for inferring a vague attitude by explaining what cartoonist was implying about US involvement.</i>	[3-4]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	<u>Example of answers inferring US involvement or inferring vague attitude/ feeling, with explanation [3 marks]</u> • The cartoonist’s attitude is that he thinks that US played an important role/ was a good guy/ was a hero/ was justified in getting involved. This is seen in how Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression. Since US role was necessary for the UN to ‘survive’ credibly, then the cartoonist thinks US played an important role/ was a good guy/ was a hero/ was justified in getting involved. • The cartoonist has a positive attitude of US involvement in the Korean War. This is seen in how Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression. Since the cartoonist drew US as taking action to help UN, then the cartoonist must have a positive attitude/ thought well of US involvement. • The cartoonist is happy/ likes/ appreciates/ feels optimistic/ feels hopeful about US involvement. This is seen in how Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression. Since the cartoonist drew US as taking action to help UN, aggression might be stopped. So, the cartoonist is happy/ likes/ appreciates/ feels optimistic/ feels hopeful about US involvement. <u>Example of answers inferring a vague attitude/ feeling by explaining what cartoonist was implying about US involvement [4 marks]</u> • The cartoonist has a positive attitude/ thought well of US involvement in the Korean War. This is because the cartoonist portrayed US involvement positively as a hero/ as playing an important role in the Korean War. This is seen in how Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression. Since US role was necessary for the UN to ‘survive’ credibly, then the cartoonist must have a positive attitude/ thought well of US involvement. • The cartoonist is happy/ likes/ appreciates/ feels optimistic/ feels hopeful about US involvement. This is because the cartoonist portrayed US involvement positively as a hero/ as playing an important role in the Korean War. This is seen in how Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression. Since US role was necessary for the UN to ‘survive’ credibly, then the cartoonist	

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	is happy/ likes/ appreciates/ feels optimistic/ feels hopeful about US involvement.	
L4	ANSWERS THAT INFERS A VALID ATTITUDE <i>Award 4 marks for inferring a valid attitude but not well-explained e.g., did not infer nature of US involvement.</i> <i>Award 5 marks for inferring a valid attitude by explaining what cartoonist was implying about US involvement.</i> <u>Example of answers inferring a valid attitude but not well-explained e.g., did not infer nature of US involvement [4 marks]</u> - The cartoonist was supportive/ approved of US involvement. The cartoon shows Truman with UN charging towards the League of Nations which is dead because of the lack of exercise when facing wanton aggression. This suggests US was involved by responding to aggression unlike the League. So, the cartoonist supported/ approved of US involvement. <u>Example of answers inferring a valid attitude by explaining what cartoonist was implying about US involvement [5 marks]</u> - The cartoonist was supportive/ approved of US involvement in the Korean War. [Message] This is because the cartoonist portrayed US involvement positively as a hero/ as playing an important role in the Korean War. This is seen in how Truman was holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War so that it would not end up the same way of the League of Nations which died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression. So, US got involved in Korean War to ensure that the UN did not fail its first test and end up being a failure like League of Nations. So, US being involved in Korean War was acting heroically/ playing an important role. Since US role was necessary for the UN to ‘survive’ credibly, then the cartoonist must have approved of/ was supportive of/ been praising US involvement.	[4-5]

(b) Study Sources B and C. Why are they different about who started the Korean War? Explain your answer. **[5]**

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	ANSWERS THAT LIFTS FROM PROVENANCE OR SOURCE DETAILS They are different as Source B is from the US, but Source C is from North Korea.	[1]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	They are different. According to Source B, “Communist forces attacked the Republic of Korea” but according to Source C, “Syngman Rhee’s clique launched a surprise invasion against the northern half of Korea”	
L2	COMPARES DIFFERENCE IN CONTENT OR ANSWERS BASED ON UNDEVELOPED ACCEPTANCE OF PROVENANCE - Sources B and C differ in that Source B claimed that North Korea started the Korean War, but Source C claimed that South Korea started the Korean war. According to Source B, “Communist forces attacked the Republic of Korea”. So, North Korea started the war. However, according to Source C, “Syngman Rhee’s clique launched a surprise invasion against the northern half of Korea”. So, Source C was saying that South Korea started the war. - They are different because Source B is from a democratic person, but Source C is from a communist.	[2]
L3	COMPARES PURPOSE, UNEXPLAINED Both sources differ because they have opposing intents. According to Source B, on “Communist forces attacked the Republic of Korea” and the attack was a “challenge to the efforts of the free nations to build the kind of world in which men can live in freedom and peace”. Hence, he was trying to get support for the government to send troops to help South Korea against North Korea. However, Source C said that the war broke out due to “actions of the South Korean authorities”. He said this because he wanted to get North Koreans to fight against South Korea.	[3]
L4	COMPARES CONTENT AND PURPOSE <i>Award 4 marks for answers that are not well-explained e.g., missing specific context of the Korean War.</i> <i>Award 5 marks for answers that are well-explained.</i> <u>Examples of answers that are not well-explained [4 marks]</u> Both sources differ because they have opposing purposes. According to Source B, on “June 25th, Communist forces attacked the Republic of Korea”. He also went on to say that the attack was a “direct challenge to the efforts of the free nations to build the kind of world in which men can live in freedom and peace”. So, Source B was saying North Korea started the war. Since it was from Truman who was a democratic leader, he was anti democracy and thus would blame the communists to show the world that they needed to take a hard stand	[4-5]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	against communism. However, Source C has a different purpose when it said that “the events now taking place in Korea broke out on 25 June as the result of the actions of the South Korean authorities”. He had to blame the South Koreans and the US for starting the war. This was because he needed to justify sending troops to South Korea. So, he had to blame the South in order for people to perceive the North as just fighters. [missing audience and context] <u>Example of answers that are well-explained [5 marks]</u> Both sources differ because they have opposing purposes. According to Source B, on “June 25th, Communist forces attacked the Republic of Korea”. He also went on to say that the attack was a “direct challenge to the efforts of the free nations to build the kind of world in which men can live in freedom and peace”. So, Source B was saying North Korea started the war and was a threat to peace in the world. At that time, the US was contemplating sending soldiers to be part of the UN force to support South Korea against the North. Hence, he was trying to get Americans to see the impact of North Korean aggression so as to convince Americans to support the government to send troops to help South Korea against North. So, it had to blame North Korea in order to justify fighting against them. However, Source C has a different purpose when it said that “the events now taking place in Korea broke out on 25 June as the result of the actions of the South Korean authorities”. Given that war had broken out and he needed to send North Koreans to fight against fellow Koreans in the South, Kim had to justify to North Koreans why they were fighting. Hence, Source C said South Korea started the war because it was trying to gain North Koreans’ support to fight against South Korea. That was why it had to blame South Korea for starting the war. Since both sources were trying to justify why they were fighting against the other party, they were thus different in pointing the blame for the start of the Korean War.	

- (c) Study Sources D and E. Can Source E prove that Source D is telling the truth about the Soviet Union’s role in the Korean War? Explain your answer. [6]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	ANSWERS THAT DESCRIBES SOURCE DETAILS OR BASED ON UNDEVELOPED ACCEPTANCE OF PROVENANCE Source E proves that Source D is telling the truth. According to Source D, Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not	[1]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	interfere in Korea’s internal affairs. According to Source E, the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s. Source E does not prove Source D is telling the truth because they are both Soviet sources.	
L2	ANSWERS THAT COMPARE CONTENT OF BOTH SOURCES OR ANSWERS THAT ASSESS THE RELIABILITY OF SOURCES D OR E WITHOUT COMPARING CONTENT Award 2 marks for answers that are not well-explained Award 2 marks for answers that are well-explained <u>Examples of answers that compare content of both sources [2-3 marks depending on whether the answers are well-explained]</u> - Source E proves that Source D was telling the truth because they both agreed that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. According to Source D, “the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs”. Similarly, according to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. [2 marks] - Source E proves that Source D was telling the truth because they both agreed that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. According to Source D, “the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs”. This suggests that Soviet Union did not instigate or cause the events in Korea and was thus not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Similarly, according to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. This suggests that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Since they both made the same claim, Source E proves that Source D was telling the truth. [3 marks] <u>Examples of answers that assess the reliability of Sources D or E without comparing content of both sources [2-3 marks depending on whether the answers are well-explained]</u> - Source E does not prove that Source D is telling the truth. According to Source D, “the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs” . This suggests that Soviet Union did not instigate or cause the events in Korea and was thus not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. <u>Cross-referencing with Source B</u>, it said that 2 days after the fighting started, the US had asked USSR to use its influence with the North Koreans to have them withdraw but the Soviet Government refused. [2 marks]	[2-3]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	- Source E does not prove that Source D is telling the truth. According to Source D, “the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs”. This suggests that Soviet Union did not instigate or cause the events in Korea and was thus not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. <u>Cross-referencing with Source B</u>, it said that 2 days after the fighting started, the US had asked USSR to use its influence with the North Koreans to have them withdraw but the Soviet Government refused. This suggests that the Soviets were supportive of the invasion and thus should be held responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Hence, since Source B contradicts Source D, then Source D was not telling the truth. [3 marks] - Source E cannot that Source D is telling the truth. According to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. This suggests that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Cross-referencing with Source B, it said that 2 days after the fighting started, the US had asked USSR to use its influence with the North Koreans to have them withdraw but the Soviet Government refused. This suggests that the Soviets were supportive of the invasion and thus should be held responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Hence, since Source B contradicts Source E, then Source E is not reliable. Since it is not a reliable source, it cannot be used to prove Source D is telling the truth. [3 marks]	
L3	ANSWERS THAT COMPARE CONTENT OF BOTH SOURCES + USE CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE/CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER SOURCES OR USE PURPOSE TO EVALUATE SOURCE D <i>Award 3 marks for answers that are not well-developed.</i> <i>Award 4 marks for answers that are well-developed.</i> <u>Example of answers that compare content of both sources + use contextual knowledge or cross-reference to other sources to evaluate Source D [3-4 marks, depending on whether the answers are well-explained]</u> On the surface, Source E seems to prove that Source D is telling the truth because they both agree that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. According to Source D, “ the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs”. Similarly, according to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. However, it must be noted that even though they made the same claim, Source D is not telling the truth. <u>Cross-referencing with Source B</u>, it said that 2 days after the fighting started, the US had asked USSR to use its influence with the North Koreans to have them withdraw but the Soviet Government	[3-4]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	refused. This suggests that the Soviets were supportive of the invasion and thus should be held responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. [3 marks] - On the surface, Source E seems to prove that Source D is telling the truth because they both agree that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. According to Source D, “ the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs” . This suggests that Soviet Union did not instigate or cause the events in Korea and was thus not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Similarly, according to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. This suggests that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. However, it must be noted that even though they made the same claim, Source D is not telling the truth. <u>Cross-referencing with Source B</u>, it said that 2 days after the fighting started, the US had asked USSR to use its influence with the North Koreans to have them withdraw but the Soviet Government refused. This suggests that the Soviets were supportive of the invasion and thus should be held responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Hence, since Source B contradicts Source D, then Source D was not telling the truth. [4 marks] <u>Example of answers that compare content of both sources + analyse purpose to evaluate Source D [3-4 marks, depending on whether the answers are well-explained]</u> - On the surface, Source E seems to prove that Source D is telling the truth because they both agree that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. According to Source D, “ the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs”. This suggests that Soviet Union did not instigate or cause the events in Korea and was thus not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Similarly, according to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. This suggests that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. However, it must be noted that even though they made the same claim, Source D is not telling the truth. This is because Source D was the Soviet government official making a statement to the US government a few days after the start of the Korean War. There had been ongoing tensions between US and USSR as they both mistrusted each other, with the US fearing that USSR might be spreading communist influence. Given this context, he had to tell the US government that Soviet Union was innocent and not responsible for the outbreak of war in Korea. This is to ensure that the US would not get into a conflict with the USSR over Korea. Since Source D was trying to ensure that	

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	Soviet Union would not get into trouble, then it would definitely shirk any responsibility for the war. So, Source D is not telling the truth. [4 marks]	
L4	L2 + USE PURPOSE/ CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE/CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER SOURCES TO EVALUATE SOURCE E <i>Award 5 marks for answers that are not well-developed.</i> <i>Award 6 marks for answers that are well-developed.</i> <u>Example of answers that compare content of both sources + use contextual knowledge or cross-reference to other sources to evaluate Source E [5-6 marks, depending on whether the answers are well-explained]</u> - On the surface, Source E seems to prove that Source D is telling the truth because they both agree that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. According to Source D, “the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs”. This suggests that Soviet Union did not instigate or cause the events in Korea and was thus not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Similarly, according to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. This suggests that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. However, it must be noted that Source E cannot be used to prove that Source D is telling the truth because it is not reliable in the first place. <u>Cross-referencing with Source B</u>, it said that 2 days after the fighting started, the US had asked USSR to use its influence with the North Koreans to have them withdraw but the Soviet Government refused. This suggests that the Soviets were supportive of the invasion and thus should be held responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Hence, since Source B contradicts Source E, then Source E is not reliable. Since it is not a reliable source, it cannot be used to prove Source D is telling the truth though they make the same claims. [6 marks] <u>Example of answers that compare content of both sources + analyse purpose to evaluate Source E [5-6 marks, depending on whether the answers are well-explained]</u> - On the surface, Source E seems to prove that Source D is telling the truth because they both agree that Soviet Union was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. According to Source D, “the Soviet government sticks to this same principle that foreign countries should not interfere in Korea’s internal affairs” (evidence from Source D). This suggests that Soviet Union did not instigate or cause the events in Korea and was thus not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Similarly, according to Source E, “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s”. This suggests that Soviet Union was not responsible for	[5-6]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	the outbreak of the Korean War. However, it must be noted that Source E was Khrushchev's memoirs. As a former Soviet leader, it might be possible that Khrushchev wanted to make sure that Soviet Union would not look bad and thus tried to show that it was not responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War. Since Source E is biased and unreliable, it cannot be used to prove that Source D in claiming the same thing was telling the truth. [6 marks]	

(d) Study Source F. Why was the poster circulated in China in 1951? Explain your answer. [5]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	ANSWERS THAT DESCRIBES SOURCE DETAILS AS A REASON Source F was circulated to show that US soldiers were looting and torturing civilians and Truman was portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people.	[1]
L2	ANSWERS BASED ON VAGUE CONTEXT AS A REASON OR ANSWERS THAT IDENTIFIES PROPAGANDA AS A REASON OR ANSWERS THAT IDENTIFIES A VAGUE INTENT - Source F was circulated because China just entered the Korean War to fight the US. [vague context as a reason] - Source F was circulated as a form of propaganda to influence its people. [propaganda as a reason] - Source F was trying to explain or justify why they had to be involved in the Korean War. [vague intent]	[2]
L3	ANSWERS BASED ON SOURCE MESSAGE AS A REASON <i>Award 3 marks for inferring message, not explained.</i> <i>Award 4 marks for inferring message, explained.</i> <u>Example of answers inferring message, not explained [3 marks]</u> According to Source F, US soldiers were looting and torturing civilians and Truman was portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. So, the poster was circulated to show that China was right to enter the Korean War. <u>Example of answers inferring message, explained [4 marks]</u>	[3-4]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	- According to Source F, the US soldiers were looting and torturing civilians and Truman was portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. Since the US hurting people, they have to be stopped by someone. So, the poster was probably trying to show / convince Chinese people that China was right to enter the war to stop US atrocities. Note Other possible messages (also applicable for L4 and L5): - US was evil - US had to be stopped - China’s involvement in the Korean War was justified	
L4	ANSWERS BASED ON PURPOSE WITHOUT CONTEXT OF EVENTS AT THAT TIME <i>Award 4 marks for answers that are not well-explained, such as missing message and/ or audience.</i> <i>Award 5 marks for answers that are well-explained.</i> <u>Example of answers that are not well-explained, such as missing message and/or audience [4 marks]</u> - According to Source F, the US soldiers were looting and torturing civilians and Truman was portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. So, it was circulated in 1951 to get support for China’s involvement in the Korean War. [missing message and audience] - According to Source F, the US soldiers were looting and torturing civilians and Truman was portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. Since it was circulated in 1951, it must be meant to convince Chinese people to support their government’s involvement in the Korean War. [missing message] - Source F was circulated to show that China was right to enter the Korean War to stop US from committing atrocities. According to Source F, the US soldiers were looting and torturing civilians and Truman was portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. Since the US hurting people, the source is thus trying to suggest that China was right to enter the Korean War to stop US from committing atrocities. So, it must have been circulated to get support for China’s involvement in the Korean War. [missing audience] <u>Example of answers that are well-explained [5 marks]</u> - According to Source F, the US soldiers were looting and torturing civilians and Truman was portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. Since the US hurting people, the source is thus trying to suggest	[4-5]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	that China was right to enter the Korean War to stop US from committing atrocities. The poster was thus trying to convince Chinese people that China was right to enter the war to stop US atrocities so as to get Chinese people to support China’s involvement in the Korean War.	
L5	ANSWERS BASED ON PURPOSE IN THE CONTEXT OF EVENTS AT THAT TIME <i>Note: No valid audience or message = L4</i> The source was circulated in 1951 when the Chinese had gotten involved in the Korean War which originally did not involve China and this might cause Chinese citizens to question why China got involved in a foreign war. Given this context, Source F was circulated to convince Chinese people (audience) that China was right to enter the Korean War to stop US from committing atrocities. This is seen in how Source F drew US soldiers looting and torturing civilians and Truman being portrayed as a scary looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. Since the US hurting people, the source is thus trying to tell Chinese people that China was right to enter the Korean War because they had the moral obligation to stop US from committing atrocities. Hence, the poster was thus probably circulated to convince Chinese people to support China’s involvement in the Korean War.	[6]

- (e) Study all the sources. “US involvement in the Korean War was justified”. How far do the sources support this statement? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

[8]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	WRITES ABOUT HYPOTHESIS, NO VALID SOURCE USE Source A supports the statement. According to Source A, the League of Nations had died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression and Truman was now holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War.	[1]
L2	SUPPORTS OR DOES NOT SUPPORT, SUPPORTED BY VALID SOURCE USE <i>Award 2 marks for 1 source used to show support for the statement or not show support for the statement.</i> <i>Award an additional mark for another source used – up to a maximum of 4 marks</i> <i>Note: Simply writing about issues in the sources is not enough. There must be source use, i.e. direct reference is made to a source letter or quote. Award marks</i>	[2-4]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	<i>only when there is use of source content and an explanation of how it supports/ does not support the statement.</i> Supports - Source A supports the statement as the US got involved to support the UN in handling the crisis in Korea. According to Source A, the League of Nations had died from lack of exercise in the face of wanton aggression and Truman was now holding the hand of the UN and running towards the Korean War. This suggests that Truman wanted to ensure that the UN would not suffer the same fate as League of Nations. So, US got involved to support UN act against aggression. Hence, US involvement was justified. - Source B supports the statement as US got involved for a just cause as there was injustice and a threat to peace. According to Source B, “Communist forces attacked the Republic of Korea... this is a direct challenge to the efforts of the free nations to build the kind of world in which men can live in freedom and peace”. This shows that the US acted because South Korea was unjustly attacked which threatened peace. They wanted to get involved because peace was threatened. Since, it was for a just cause, US involvement was justified. - Source E supports the statement as it shows that US got involved because South Korea was a victim of aggression and it had to prevent another country in Asia turning communist. According to Source E, Khrushchev said that “the war wasn’t Stalin’s idea, but Kim’s.” This suggests that North Korea was the aggressor and so US should help a country that fell victim to aggression. Hence, US involvement was justified. Not support - Source C does not support the statement as US all along were targeting North Korea. According to Source C, “under the direct manipulation of US imperialists, the puppet Syngman Rhee and his band had long been preparing for the aggression against the northern half of Korea”. This suggested that the US had its eyes set on North Korea all along and were the ones who goaded South Korea into starting the war. Hence, their involvement was not justified. - Source D does not support the statement as US was backing up an aggressive country. According to Source D, South Korea provoked the attack and “responsibility for these events rests upon the South Korean authorities and upon those who stand behind their back”. This suggests that US by getting involved was backing up an aggressor that started a war. Hence, US involvement was not acting on the side of justice, and its involvement was not justified. - Source F does not support the statement because it claims that the US involvement brought harm and suffering. According to Source F, the US	

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	soldiers were looting and torturing Koreans and Truman was portrayed as an evil looking soldier holding a bloodied knife after killing people. The caption says the noose of justice is waiting for them. This suggests that the US was committing evil in Korea rather than defending a just cause. Hence, US involvement in the war was not justified.	
L3	SUPPORTS AND DOES NOT SUPPORT, SUPPORTED BY VALID SOURCE USE <i>Award 5 marks for 1 source used to show support for the statement and another source used to show lack of support for the statement.</i> <i>Award an additional mark for another source used – up to a maximum of 7 marks</i> <i>Note: There must be source use, i.e. direct reference to source content – Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues in the sources is not enough.</i> • Everything in L2	[5-8]
	BONUS MARK (maximum of 2 marks): <i>Award an additional bonus mark for the use of contextual knowledge to a source in relation to reliability, sufficiency or utility, without exceeding 8 marks.</i> • Even though Source A claims that US got involved to ensure UN success, and Source B claims that US got involved because peace was threatened, it must be noted that at that time US was concerned about communism spreading in the world. It wanted to contain the spread of communism, Hence, when the US saw communist North Korea attack South Korea, it was likely worried that communism will spread to another country. So, US got involved to stop communism even if it meant supporting an authoritarian leader like Rhee who persecuted his opposition. Since US got involved in the Korean War to support an authoritarian leader simply because that leader was anti-communist, US involvement was not justified despite what Sources A and B claim.	

SECTION B

- 2 “It was the behaviour of member states that caused the League of Nations to fail.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	IDENTIFIES/ DESCRIBES GIVEN OR OTHER REASONS <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more reasons. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	[1-3]
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN REASON OR OTHER REASONS <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/ supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> - E.g. The <u>behaviour of member states</u> led to the failure of the League of Nations. Member states were not committed to punishing countries that violated League principles. When a country violated League principles, other member states were supposed to apply economic sanctions until the aggressor backed down. However, member states were unwilling to impose sanctions because doing so would hurt their own economies or would incur a great cost. This was seen in the Abyssinian Crisis of 1935–36, where Britain and France undermined League sanctions against Italy, partly to keep Mussolini as a potential ally against Hitler. The Hoare-Laval Pact further exposed their unwillingness to act decisively through the League, as they secretly proposed to hand Mussolini most of Abyssinia in exchange for peace, prioritising their national interests over League principles. Hence, member states by focusing on national interest rather than international interests allowed aggression to go unchecked. This further encouraged aggressors to act aggressively as they were not worried about being punished. This in turn led to the League unable to meet its aim of maintaining world peace. Hence, the behaviour of member states focusing on national interests led to the failure of the League. OR - E.g. Its <u>decision-making process</u> caused the League to fail. There were too few meetings and decisions were made very slowly because the voting system of the League required the unanimous agreement of all its members before a decision could be reached. Very often, it was impossible to reach a unanimous decision on any given issue. As a result, no decision was made in the end. Since no decision could be made, there would not be any solution or action taken to solve the problems that had arisen. Thus, the League of Nations failed because the decision-making process requiring unanimous decisions did not work –	[4-5]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	members were unable to reach a unanimous decision on issues, resulting in a stalemate whereby no solution could be taken to solve problems. - One of the reasons why the League of Nations was failed was because <u>major powers were not members of the League</u>. At first the defeated nations were not allowed to join. Russia was also not a member because the western nations refused to recognize its communist government. The US did not want to join because it was adopting a policy of isolationism. In other words, 3 of the great powers (Germany, USA, Russia) were not members. The non-presence of these major powers caused the League to be weak because it did not even represent the world and hence lacked legitimacy as a world body. Thus, it is difficult for the League to stop aggressors in the name of representing the world. Moreover, the fact that major powers were not members mean that they would not contribute resources (army, weapons, etc) to the League. Hence not having major powers set the League back in terms of resources it might get from member states. - Another reason why the League of Nations failed was because it <u>lacked power</u>. The League did not possess an army or police force. The League did not have power or authority to force states to accept its rulings or to enforce its principles. If countries violate any of the principles, the League was quite powerless to act. Even if states refuse to accept the League’s rulings, the League did not have the right to force states to accept. Hence states could freely ignore the League’s decisions, i.e. they can go on with aggression and thus made the League rather redundant. Moreover, the League lacked power in the sense that it did not possess an army or police force. Hence when challenged by stronger nations that would not hesitate to use force, the League would be rather powerless to act. Hence without power the League was unable to stop aggression and therefore unable to maintain peace.	
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN REASON AND OTHER REASON(S) <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given AND other reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <i>Note: Response can get up to 8 marks through two routes. (a) 2 explained reasons that are well developed with depth of treatment OR (b) 3 explained reasons with breadth of coverage but less depth of treatment</i> Everything in L2	[6-8]
	<i>Award an additional 2 marks (up to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different</i>	

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
	<i>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.</i> E.g. On the whole, I agree with the statement that it was the behaviour of the member states rather than the decision-making process that caused the League to fail. The decision process requiring unanimous decisions by all members was in theory not problematic if member states abide by international interests and act together to stop aggression. Such unanimity was not possible only because member states pursued their national interests whereby some voted not to take action against aggression when it was not in their national interests to do so. Hence, the problem lay not in the decision-making process, but the behaviour of states guided by their selfish national interests. So, I agree with the statement.	

3 “It was the ability to improve the economy that allowed the Nazis to maintain control over Germany.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

[10]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	IDENTIFIES/ DESCRIBES GIVEN OR OTHER REASONS <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more reasons. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	[1-3]
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN REASON OR OTHER REASONS <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/ supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> The <u>ability to improve the German economy</u> led to Nazis being able to maintain their control over Germany. The Nazis introduced projects to clear slums, reclaim wastelands, build superhighways, build schools, and build hospitals. German youths found employment in the National Labor Service, which worked on these public projects. A large party bureaucracy was set up, providing thousands of office work and administrative jobs. Purges of Jews and anti-Nazis from the civil service also created job opportunities for the rest of the German population. Rearmament started in 1934 and conscription was reintroduced in 1935. The increase in army size meant more weapons were needed and thus more jobs were created in factories to build guns, tanks, and aircraft for the German armed forces. Through all these policies and programmes, the Nazis reduced unemployment from over 6 million in 1933 to about 250,000 in 1939.	[4-5]

With employment, Germans' standard of living improved. Since their lives improved, Germans thus continued to support the Nazi Party's leadership. Hence, the ability to improve the German economy indeed allowed the Nazis to consolidate their power.

OR

- It was the Gestapo that led to Nazis being able to maintain control over Germany. The Gestapo spied on German citizens and could arrest those they suspected of dissent. They arrested all those who opposed Hitler and the Nazi Party. Many were sent to concentration camps which were established to deal with people who went against the Nazi government. Few could escape from the Nazis as the Gestapo had informers in all sectors of German society. People were encouraged to report on their families and neighbours who did not show total support for Hitler and the Nazi Party. **The actions of the Gestapo struck fear in Germans, and they dared not oppose Nazi rule. Hence, Nazis were able to maintain and consolidate their rule.**
- It was the Enabling Act that led to Nazis being able to maintain control over Germany. Hitler asked the Reichstag to pass the Enabling Act which would give him dictatorial powers for 4 years. He could ignore the Constitution, the Reichstag, and the President. However, to pass this Enabling Act, he needed a two-thirds majority of the Reichstag. Hitler therefore outlawed the Communist Party and arrested most of his opponents to prevent them from voting against him. He succeeded – the Nazi Party managed to get the two-third majority needed to pass the Enabling Act that was to give Hitler dictatorial power. **This resulted in political parties being pressured to dissolve themselves. By July 1933, all political parties in the country were banned through a formal law passed on 14 July 1933. Germany became a country ruled by a single party – the Nazi Party. All these moves ensured that Hitler held supreme power and that there would be no one to oppose his decisions.**
- The use of propaganda also helped the Nazis to maintain control over Germany. Under Nazi rule, all cultural activities such as musical performances, films, and art exhibitions, were aimed at shaping the minds of the Germans to think like Nazis. The Nazis organized a lot of cultural activities to encourage the Germans to support Hitler. The development of other forms of culture was not permitted. The Nazis also controlled the cinemas. Only movies approved by the Nazis could be shown. Short films highlighting the achievements of the Nazis which contained Nazi beliefs had to be screened before the start of all movies. German movies usually praised the Nazis or showed the Jews to be enemies of the Germans. The Nazis also used the radio so that Nazi messages could reach ordinary Germans in their homes. **Thus, by constantly exposing Germans to pro-Nazi messaging across multiple platforms, the Nazis were able to shape**

	public opinion and build support for the regime. Hence, the Nazis were able to maintain control over Germany. The <u>use of censorship</u> was another reason why the Nazis were able to maintain control over Germany. The Nazis controlled all forms of media and there was very strict censorship. Publications, including newspapers, could publish only what was approved by the Ministry of Propaganda. Any publication that did not follow this was closed down and people responsible were arrested or thrown into concentration camps. By suppressing alternative viewpoints and silencing dissenting voices, the Nazis ensured that Germans had little access to information that might challenge or contradict Nazi ideology, making it extremely difficult for opposition to take root.	
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN REASON AND OTHER REASON(S) <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given AND other reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <i>Note: Response can get up to 8 marks through two routes. (a) 2 explained reasons that are well developed with depth of treatment OR (b) 3 explained reasons with breadth of coverage but less depth of treatment</i> Everything in L2	[6-8]
	<i>Award an additional 2 marks (up 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.</i> E.g. I agree with the statement. While the ability to improve German economy did win the Nazi Party support, there could still be sources of discontent or disagreement. In fact, the improvement in economy did not extend to everyone – women were discouraged from higher positions and thus did not have the same economic opportunities as men. So, ultimately, despite success in improving the economy, not everyone was happy. But the unhappiness did not translate into booting the Nazis out of power because people could not express their unhappiness towards the Nazis. They would be persecuted and punished by the Gestapo for registering their unhappiness. Hence, the Nazis could maintain its control over Germany because of the use of Gestapo rather than the ability to improve the economy. So, I agree with the statement.	

- 4 “It was the use of the atomic bombs that led to Japanese defeat in World War Two.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Levels	Level Descriptors/ Examples	Marks
L1	IDENTIFIES/ DESCRIBES GIVEN OR OTHER REASONS <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more reasons. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	[1-3]
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN REASON OR OTHER REASONS <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/ supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> - E.g. It was the use of the <u>atomic bombs</u> that led to Japanese defeat. On 6 August 1945, the American bomber ‘Enola Gay’ flew over Hiroshima and dropped the atomic bomb ‘Little Boy’. Between 70,000 and 80,000 people were killed instantly. Another 70,000 or more were injured, many of whom died soon after. Almost two-thirds of the city’s buildings were destroyed. Despite this, the Japanese government still did not surrender. 3 days later, the US dropped a 2nd bomb ‘Fat Man’ on Nagasaki. About 40,000 to 80,000 people were killed instantly and many more were injured and died later from radiation effects. The dropping of the atomic bombs had such a devastating impact on the Japanese that it forced the proud Japanese who had been unwilling to surrender despite being on the road to defeat to finally surrender. Thus, the dropping of the atomic bombs brought about Japanese defeat. OR - E.g. The US <u>“island-hopping” strategy</u> contributed to Japanese defeat. They attacked islands (some of which were less defended than the main Japanese bases), conquered them and used them as bases to cut off ships that supplied the more well-defended islands. By bypassing the heavily fortified islands, the Allies managed to suffer fewer casualties and at the same time be able to cut off Japanese supplies, food, ammunition and other essentials. Island-hopping allowed the US to capture important strategic bases such as Okinawa and Iwo Jima. By capturing these bases, the US moved within striking distance of mainland Japan. They then embarked on aerial bombing of mainland Japan with the bombing intensifying in March 1945. A quarter of Tokyo was destroyed. Over 8 million civilians fled Japanese cities. Japanese factories that were already struggling with shortage of resources could not sustain production now that many workers had fled the cities. Many factories were also destroyed. In other words, the island-hopping strategy allowed the US to strike Japan mainland factories which then result in Japan unable to	[4-5]

	sustain the war effort, leading to eventual defeat. Japanese economy was on the brink of collapse and could hardly sustain the war effort. This contributed to eventual defeat. • <u>Empire-overstretch</u> led to Japanese defeat. By 1942, Japan occupied almost the whole of Southeast Asia. It was also in control of Korea and parts of China. In fact, it was still struggling in its war with China that had started in 1937. The war against China had tied down at least 2 million Japanese troops by 1941 and required a daily expenditure of US\$4 million, and China was merely 1 part of the empire. This shows that to run such a big empire, a lot of manpower (especially soldiers) and a large quantity of resources were needed. Having an over-stretched empire made it difficult for the Japanese forces to defend and control its widely scattered possessions. This is evident when the Allies went on the offensive. The Allied Powers had Britain fighting back in Southeast Asia, the US in the Asia Pacific, and the Chinese in mainland China. On the other hand, Japan stood largely alone facing all of them in these widely scattered possessions as its allies were fighting in other theaters and could not come to Japan's aid. Hence, it was hard for the Japanese to effectively defend their empire as they were unable to concentrate their forces effectively across such a vast area. Hence, their empire being overstretched caused the Japanese to be defeated. • The <u>rivalry between the Japanese navy and Japanese army</u> also contributed to Japanese defeat. The Japanese army and navy had a long-term conflict with each other. Because they saw each other as rivals, the army and navy refused to share resources or exchange military intelligence, rarely coordinating their attacks and defenses against the Allies. For example, after the Navy lost 4 aircraft carriers at Midway, it did not inform the army about the extent of the loss. Consequently, when the Americans landed on Guadalcanal, the army planned their counterattack still assuming that they would receive air support sent from the aircraft carriers. Since 4 aircraft carriers had been sunk, Japan's air power was compromised. This in turn meant that the army's supply ships had limited air cover for protection. This resulted in the supply ships being sunk thereby cutting off soldiers on the islands from reinforcements and supplies, leading to starvation and eventual defeat at Guadalcanal. This lack of coordination happened numerous times throughout the war. Hence, they could not form a unified defense against the Allied advance, allowing the Allied Powers to defeat them.	
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN REASON AND OTHER REASON(S) <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given AND other reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i>	[6-8]

2026 G3 Humanities (History) Preliminary Examination – Suggested Mark Scheme

	<i>Note: Response can get up to 8 marks through two routes. (a) 2 explained reasons that are well developed with depth of treatment OR (b) 3 explained reasons with breadth of coverage but less depth of treatment</i> • Everything in L2	
	<i>Award an additional 2 marks (up 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.</i> • Ultimately, it was the use of the atomic bombs that led to Japanese defeat. Even though island-hopping had resulted in Japan losing control of key islands and allowed the US to bomb mainland Japan, it nonetheless refused to surrender, not even when Tokyo was devastated in March 1945. The war dragged on until August. In August, with the dropping of the atomic bombs, the Japanese government saw the devastating consequences and surrendered within days. Thus, I agree with the statement that the dropping of the atomic bombs was the main reason that led to Japanese defeat.	