



O SYLLABUS
LEVEL OF RESPONSE MARKING SCHEME

SECTION A: SOURCE-BASED CASE STUDY

1a. Why was this cartoon published in 1933? Explain your answer. [5]		
Level	Description	Marks
L1	Describes source, no interpretation. E.g. The cartoon was published to show Hitler saluting a voter at the ballot. <i>(Description)</i>	1
L2	Answers based on sub-message OR message of source, unsupported E.g. The cartoon was published to saying that ordinary German citizens had no real freedom of choice to oppose Hitler. This is shown by the hesitant “voter” approaching the ballot box while surrounded by armed guards, suggesting intimidation instead of free participation. <i>(Sub-message)</i> OR E.g. The cartoon was published to show that Hitler's rule was not truly democratic because it relied on force and intimidation. <i>(Message, unsupported)</i>	2
L3	Answers based on source message only Or unsupported outcome <i>Award the higher mark for more developed answers.</i> E.g. The 1933 cartoon from the Daily Express was published to suggest that Hitler's rule was not truly democratic but based on force and control. This is shown by the ballot box placed on a tank, symbolising that voting is backed by military power, and by the crowd shouting “Heil Hitler,” which suggests pressure to conform. The sign “who is not with us is against us” shows that opposition is not allowed, while the presence of soldiers and Nazi symbols suggests intimidation. This shows that the cartoonist thinks that the whole voting process under Hitler was nothing but a facade and was being used to give Hitler's growing dictatorship an appearance of popular approval. <i>(Message, supported)</i> OR E.g. E.g. The cartoon was published because the cartoonist wanted the British recognise the danger posed by Hitler's increasingly dictatorial rule so that they would pressure the British government to take a firmer stance towards Nazi Germany. <i>(Intended Outcome only)</i>	3
L4	Purpose explained with Context, Audience and Intended Outcome <i>Award the higher mark for more developed answers.</i>	4-5

	E.g. The cartoon was published to warn [Verb] British readers [Audience] that <u>Hitler's rule was not truly democratic but was based on force and intimidation.</u> [Message] This is shown by the ballot box being placed on a tank and the warning that "who is not with us is against us". [Evidence] This suggests that Germans were expected to support Hitler and could not freely express political opposition, meaning that the election was being used to give Hitler's growing dictatorship an appearance of popular approval. [Explanation] At the time, Hitler had recently become Chancellor in 1933 and the Nazis were consolidating their power by suppressing political opponents and restricting political freedoms. [Context] Therefore, the cartoonist wanted British readers to recognise the danger posed by Hitler's increasingly dictatorial rule so that they would pressure the British government to take a firmer stance towards Nazi Germany. [Intended Outcome]	
--	--	--

1b) Study Source B. What is Source B saying about the motivations behind Hitler's economic policies? Explain your answer. [5]		
Level	Description	Marks
L1	Describes source, no interpretation E.g. The source is saying that, under Hitler, many highways were being built.	1
L2	Emergent Inference E.g. The source is saying that the employment statistics look good under Hitler.	2
L3	Valid inference about the motivations behind Hitler's economic policies, unsupported E.g. The source is saying that under Hitler, the improvement in employment was more about perception than real economic benefit, as large projects such as highway construction created the impression of recovery and reduced unemployment.	3
L4	Valid inference about the motivations behind Hitler's economic policies, supported with evidence and explanation <i>Award the higher mark for more developed answers.</i> E.g. The source is saying that Hitler was by political showmanship, to gain popular support and strengthen Nazi rule by creating the appearance of economic recovery, rather than merely to improve the lives of the people. The improvement in employment was more about perception than real economic benefit, as large, highly visible projects such as highway construction created the impression of recovery. This is supported by the source which says that the effects of highway building are "unlikely to reflect direct economic benefits," but instead signalled "economic competence" and an "end to austerity," leading many Germans to believe conditions, including jobs, were improving. As a result, people credited the Nazi regime for the apparent economic recovery and better employment opportunities, especially where propaganda, such as radio, reinforced this message. This suggests that Hitler's economic policies were driven by a desire to project an image of economic competence and recovery through highly visible projects, rather than solely to achieve genuine economic improvement.	4-5

1c) Study Sources C and D. How far does Source D prove that Source C is wrong? Explain your answer. [6]		
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Addresses the assertion based on general comments on provenance or context / an analysis of Source C <u>or</u> D only E.g. Source D does prove Source C wrong as they are sources from two different perspectives.	1
L2	Addresses the assertion based on content comparison (i.e. contrast) of Sources C and D <i>Award 3 marks for more developed answers.</i> E.g. Source D does prove Source C wrong as both show different views with regard to the unemployment situation in Nazi Germany. Source D presents a positive view of employment under Hitler. Frau Margit Fischer says that “there was work” and that the “horrible lines of unemployed” were gone, suggesting that most people were employed and productive. She also describes the period as “good years” and “wonderful years,” implying that many Germans felt their economic situation had genuinely improved. In contrast, Source C argues that unemployment was largely hidden and manipulated. It points out “invisible unemployment,” with Jews, women, and young men excluded from official statistics, and part-time workers counted as fully employed, showing that the official figures made the situation seem better than it really was. Hence, Hitler did not genuinely reduce unemployment. As both sources do not support each other, Source D proves that Source C is wrong.	2-3
L3	L2 + Addresses the assertion based on cross reference to other sources / contextual knowledge <i>Award 5 marks for more developed answers.</i> E.g. L2+ Source D cannot fully prove that employment genuinely improved under Adolf Hitler because it is challenged by Source B. Source B explains that projects such highway construction created the impression of economic recovery and job creation, but these effects “are unlikely to reflect direct economic benefits.” Instead, visible projects and propaganda made Germans feel that there were more jobs and stability than actually existed. This suggests that the positive view in Source D, describing “good years” and no “horrible lines of unemployed,” may reflect perceived improvements rather than real increases in employment. Hence, Source B makes Source D somewhat less reliable and cannot prove that Source C is wrong. Or E.g. L2+ However, based on contextual knowledge, I know that Hitler used propaganda to manipulate all statistics regarding the economic situation of the country in order to put him in a positive light. He also used censorship to make sure that all reports published about his regime should show only their positive aspects so it is not surprising that he would do the same with regard to the issue of “invisible unemployment” mentioned in Source C. Hence, since my contextual knowledge refutes Source D, Source D is not reliable and cannot prove that Source C is wrong.	4-5
L4	L2/L3 + Addresses the assertion based on a critical examination of source origin and purpose	6

	E.g. L2/L3+ When I consider Source D's origin and purpose, it is unreliable and does not prove that Source C is wrong. Source D is written by a member of the Nazi Women's Wing and would thus be a supporter of Hitler. She would naturally have been brainwashed by the Nazi regime to say things which would be biased towards Hitler and the Nazi party. That was why she said that they "had good years" so as to convince all Germans that Hitler was a capable leader as he was able to solve to create employment for them. Hence, they should continue to support Hitler's rule. Therefore, Source D's hidden agenda makes it biased and unreliable and does not prove that Source C is wrong regarding the unemployment situation in Nazi Germany.	
--	---	--

1d. Study Source E.

Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer. [6]

Level	Description	Marks
L1	Surprised / not surprised based on general comments on provenance / context E.g. I am not surprised as it shows a woman feeling happy about an abundant harvest. E.g. I am surprised that there were actually happy people living in Nazi Germany.	1
L2	Addresses the assertion based on source content only <i>Award the higher mark for more developed answers.</i> E.g. I am surprised by this because it presents such a peaceful and positive scene, which contrasts with how a normal person would feel while doing physically demanding work in a farm. The image shows a smiling woman working in a field, carrying a large bundle of harvested crops, likely wheat, in her arms. She is dressed in simple rural clothing, suggesting that she is a farm worker. In the background, other workers are also harvesting, and a piece of farming machinery can be seen, indicating teamwork and productivity. There are no obvious signs of discomfort nor tiredness arising from having to do manual work.	2-3
L3	L2+ Surprised / not surprised based on cross-reference to another source / contextual knowledge <i>Award the higher mark for more developed answers.</i> Surprised E.g. L2+ I am surprised by this source because I know that during Nazi Germany, women were expected to stay at home, take care of the house, and focus on having many children to support the Aryan race. They were mostly limited to roles such as nurses or cooks in the army and were not allowed to work in other jobs or participate in politics. However, this image shows a woman working on a farm, which goes against what I expected. Thus, I am surprised because Source E's portrayal of women totally contradicts my contextual knowledge. OR	3-4

	E.g. L2+ I am surprised by Source E because it presents a very positive image of work and prosperity in Nazi Germany. However, Source C suggests that the employment situation was not as successful as it appeared. Source C states that there was much “invisible unemployment” and explains that groups such as Jews, women and young unmarried men were excluded from official unemployment statistics. It says that “there has been the wholesale discharge of women and unmarried men under 25. None of these are included among the unemployed in official statistics.” This suggests that the Nazis exaggerated the success of their economic policies by presenting misleading employment figures. However, Source E shows a strong and productive female worker proudly contributing to the harvest, giving the impression that Germany was prosperous and that ordinary people benefitted under Nazi rule. Therefore, Source C makes me question the positive image shown in Source E, so I am surprised by it. OR Not surprised E.g. L2+ I am not surprised by Source E because it is supported by Source D in showing that many Germans experienced improvement and stability under Nazi rule. In Source D, Frau Fischer says that “there was order and there was work” and that “we had wonderful years.” This suggests that many Germans believed life improved during Hitler’s rule. Similarly, Source E shows a healthy and hardworking female worker proudly bringing in the harvest, creating a positive image of Germany under the Nazis. Both sources suggest that the Nazi regime was successful in organising society and encouraging people to contribute productively to the country. Therefore, Source E supports the positive view of Nazi Germany shown in Source D, so I am not surprised by it. OR E.g. L2+ I am not surprised by this source because, although Nazi ideology promoted the idea that women should focus on home, family, and having children, in reality, many women had to work outside the home, especially during the war in 1943. In 1943, Hitler was fighting a fierce war with the Allies. Germany was facing severe labour shortages. By this stage of the war, millions of German men had been conscripted into the army, leaving farms and industries without enough workers. As a result, the Nazi Party had to increasingly rely on women to take over jobs traditionally done by men, especially in agriculture. In addition, Germany needed to maintain food production to support both civilians and soldiers, making women’s participation in farming essential. So, this source matches the practical reality of women’s contributions in Nazi Germany. Hence, I am not surprised.	
L4	L2/L3 + Surprised / not surprised based on an analysis of source origin, purpose and context <i>Award the higher mark for more developed answers.</i> E.g. L2/L3 + However, upon closer look at the year in which this postcard was published, I am not surprised. In 1943, Hitler was fighting a fierce war with the Allies. Germany was facing severe labour shortages. By this stage of the war, millions of German men had been conscripted into the army, leaving farms and industries without enough workers. As a result, the Nazi Party had to increasingly rely on women to take over jobs traditionally done by men, especially in agriculture. In addition, Germany needed to maintain food production to support both civilians and soldiers, making women’s participation in farming essential. Therefore, it is expected that such propaganda would be	5-6

	used in 1943 to persuade more women to help in any way towards the war effort. Hence, I am not surprised.	
--	---	--

1e. Study all the sources.

‘Hitler’s rule was good for Germany.’ How far do the sources support this statement?

Explain your answer. [8]

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Writes about hypothesis, with no valid source use E.g. Many sources suggest that Hitler was good for Germany.	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use Award 2 marks for one Yes <i>OR</i> No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks. Sources D, E and F support the statement that Hitler’s rule was good for Germany, but Sources A, B and C do not. E.g. Source D supports the statement that Hitler’s rule was good for Germany as it claims that under his leadership the economy improved significantly, unemployment was reduced, and people experienced greater stability and prosperity. The source says, “In the thirties, things went uphill. There was order and there was work. We had good years. We had wonderful years,” which shows that many Germans felt their lives improved compared to the chaos of the Weimar Republic. It also suggests widespread acceptance of Nazi rule, with “eighty percent who lived productively and positively,” indicating a general sense of well-being during this period. [Evaluating Reliability] However, as the source comes from Frau Margit Fischcer, a member of the National Socialist Women’s League, it is likely biased and aims to present the regime in a positive light. This limits its reliability because it reflects a Nazi supporter’s perspective rather than an objective assessment, so the positive view may be exaggerated. E.g. Source E also supports the statement as it shows Hitler promoting and bestowing the importance of women’s contribution to the war effort. The poster shows a woman working actively in agriculture, harvesting crops during 1943, which was a critical war year. This poster portrays the female worker positively, indicating that the regime promoted this role as being important and respectable. At the same time, the image reinforces Nazi ideals of women’s roles linked to a supporting role rather than in a professional or political role. Hence, it supports the statement that Hitler’s rule was good for Germany. E.g. Source F also supports the statement that Hitler’s rule was good for Germany, as it suggests that most Germans accepted and supported his rule rather than being forced into submission. This can be inferred from the source stating that “the majority of Germans were not terrorised into submission” and that “most did not perceive the Gestapo to be terribly threatening to them personally,” which shows that many Germans did not suffer under Nazi rule. Furthermore, the source explains that terror was “built on indifference and co-operation” and that repression was “only targeted at selected groups such as the Jews, Communists and political opponents,” meaning most ordinary Germans had “little to fear.” Therefore, the source suggests that Hitler’s rule appeared acceptable or even beneficial to many Germans, as it maintained popular support and did not negatively affect the majority of the population.	2-4

	OR E.g. Source A does not support the statement that Hitler's rule was good for Germany, as it suggests that the German people were intimidated and forced into obedience through fear and coercion, rather than genuinely supporting him. This is evident in the cartoon, which portrays Hitler as a menacing and controlling figure watching over voters, implying that elections were not free or fair. The presence of soldiers stationed near the ballot boxes further reinforces the idea that people were being pressured or threatened into voting for him, rather than making independent choices. Therefore, the source implies that Hitler's rule was not good for Germany because it removed the people's freedom of choice in elections. E.g. Source B does not support the claim that Hitler was good for Germany because it suggests that Nazi economic success was, in reality, limited and exaggerated through propaganda rather than based on real improvements to people's lives. While the source notes that highway construction "boosted popular support," it clarifies that these projects were "unlikely to reflect direct economic benefits". By creating the appearance of success, Hitler used these projects as a tool to gain the people's trust. Therefore, the source suggests Hitler's rule was not objectively beneficial, but rather a facade designed to consolidate autocratic power through propaganda. [Evaluating Reliability - Source B can be considered reliable based on its provenance because it is written by Nico Voigtländer, a German economist whose nationality suggests he may have a deeper understanding of Germany's historical and economic context. Additionally, the research was conducted in 2014, long after Adolf Hitler and the Nazi period, meaning it benefits from hindsight and access to a wide range of historical data and evidence that would not have been available at the time. This allows for a more balanced and analytical interpretation rather than one influenced by propaganda.] +1 E.g. Source C does not support the statement that Hitler was good for Germany, as it shows that many people were excluded from official economic benefits and that unemployment remained a serious problem. The source states that under the Nazis there was "much 'invisible unemployment'," with Jews, women, and unmarried men deliberately excluded from the official statistics, and part-time workers counted as fully employed. It also notes that conscription removed hundreds of young men from the labour market, further inflating the appearance of employment. This evidence shows that many groups were marginalised and actually suffered under Nazi policies. Therefore, the source shows that Hitler's rule was not good for Germany.	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use Award 5 marks for one Yes <u>AND</u> No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks. Award 8 marks for use of contextual knowledge / motive to question a source in relation to its reliability or sufficiency – "evaluate the source" E.g. Both elements of L2 *For L2/L3 award a bonus of up to 2 marks (+1/+1) for the use of contextual knowledge / motive to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks for the question must not exceed 8 marks.	5-8

	Notes: • To score in L2/L3 there must be source use (source details) 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 is not enough. • Higher marks in L2/L3 to be awarded based on the numbers of sources used.	
--	--	--

Section B

2	'The outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference were primarily influenced by President Wilson's vision for lasting peace.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	10m
L1	Identifies / Describes given or other factors <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one factor, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one factor and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i>	1-3
L2	Explains given factor OR other factors <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given factor OR other factor, and an additional mark for additional factors / supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference were influenced by President Wilson's vision for lasting peace. Wilson was an idealist who wanted to create a more peaceful post-war world order, where conflicts could be resolved through cooperation rather than war. His ideas were reflected in his Fourteen Points, which called for principles such as open diplomacy, self-determination, and the creation of an international organisation to maintain peace. This influenced his support for the League of Nations. Wilson believed that such an organisation could provide a platform for countries to discuss disputes peacefully, regardless of their size or power. This vision materialised in the formation of the League of Nations in 1920, which initially had around 40 member nations. Although it had limitations, the League was a significant outcome of the Paris Peace Conference as it represented a new attempt at international cooperation and collective security. Therefore, Wilson's vision for lasting peace did influence the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference, especially through the creation of the League of Nations. OR	4-5

	E.g. However, other factors also influenced the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference, such as the desire of the victors to punish Germany. World War I had caused massive human and economic losses, especially for Britain and France. Britain suffered about 900,000 deaths and over 2 million wounded, while France suffered around 1.3 million deaths and more than 4 million wounded. France was especially badly affected as much of the fighting had taken place on French soil, damaging its industrial and agricultural regions and weakening its economy. These losses created a strong desire among the victorious powers, especially France, to make Germany pay for the damage caused by the war and ensure that it could not threaten Europe again. As a result, the Treaty of Versailles imposed harsh terms on Germany, including reparations, territorial losses, disarmament, and the War Guilt Clause. Therefore, the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference were not only shaped by Wilson's idealistic vision for peace, but also by the victors' desire to punish and weaken Germany. OR E.g. However, other factors also influenced the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference, such as the need to protect national interests and maintain geopolitical stability. The victorious powers were not only concerned with building a peaceful world, but also with ensuring their own security after World War I. France, in particular, wanted to prevent Germany from becoming strong enough to threaten it again, especially since Germany was located directly beside it. Britain also wanted to preserve the balance of power in Europe, so that no single country could dominate the continent. As a result, the Treaty of Versailles imposed terms that reduced Germany's power, including disarmament, territorial losses, and the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. These measures were meant to weaken Germany's military strength and create a buffer against future aggression. Therefore, the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference were also shaped by the victors' desire to protect their own national interests and maintain stability in Europe.	
L3	Explains given factor AND other factors <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given AND other factor, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or factor, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given factor).</i> E.g. Both sides of L2	6-8m
L3+	L3 + Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors. <i>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. Overall, I disagree that the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference were primarily influenced by Wilson's vision for lasting peace. While his ideals were reflected in the creation of the League of Nations, its long-term impact was limited and inconsistent. In contrast, the damage suffered by the victorious powers had	+2m

	a more lasting influence, as it shaped the harsh terms imposed on Germany in the Treaty of Versailles. These terms continued to affect Germany politically, economically, and socially long after the conference ended. Therefore, the desire to punish Germany and secure compensation had a greater long-term impact on the outcomes of the Paris Peace Conference.	
--	--	--

3	'The breaking of the Enigma code was the main reason Germany was defeated in World War II.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	10m
L1	Identifies / Describes given or other factors <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one factor, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one factor and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i>	1-3
L2	Explains given factor OR other factors <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given factor OR other factor, and an additional mark for additional factors / supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that the breaking of the Enigma code was one reason Germany was defeated in World War II. In 1943, British intelligence managed to break the German U-boats' codes, which allowed the Allies to understand and anticipate German naval movements. This was especially important in the Battle of the Atlantic, where German U-boats had been attacking Allied supply convoys. With access to decoded information, Allied convoys could steer clear of U-boats and reduce their losses. By the second half of 1943, the Allies had sunk 141 U-boats, allowing them to gain control of the Atlantic. This weakened Germany's ability to disrupt Allied supplies and ensured that Britain and the Allies could continue receiving vital resources, troops, and equipment. Therefore, the breaking of the Enigma code contributed to Germany's defeat by strengthening the Allies' fighting power through safer and more reliable supply lines, enabling them to sustain their war effort and eventually defeat German forces. OR E.g. However, there were also other reasons that led to Germany's defeat in World War II, such as the USA's industrial and military strength. After entering the war in 1941, the USA became the "Arsenal of Democracy", as it efficiently converted its factories to produce military resources. From 1942 onwards, it supplied the Allies with food, raw materials, industrial equipment, weapons, ammunition, ships, aircraft, and troops. Between 1941 and 1945, US factories produced around 250,000 aircraft and 90,000 tanks. By 1944, the USA was producing almost half of the world's weapons, more than twice the production of Germany and Japan combined. This industrial strength was especially important in the Battle of the Atlantic, where German U-boats had destroyed large numbers of Allied ships. The USA responded by rapidly building "Liberty" ships, producing three a day by 1943. As the USA was building more ships than German U-boats could sink, the Allies were able to keep supply lines open to Britain and the USSR. This meant that Allied forces could receive a steady flow of troops, weapons, fuel, food, and equipment needed to continue fighting. Over time, this strengthened the Allies' ability to launch offensives, replace losses, and overpower German forces on different fronts. Therefore, the USA's industrial and	4-5

	military strength contributed significantly to Germany's defeat by increasing the Allies' fighting capacity and enabling them to sustain the war until Germany was defeated. OR E.g. However, there were also other reasons that led to Germany's defeat in World War II, such as the USSR's contributions to the Allied war effort. The USSR played a major role in weakening Germany's military strength, defeating about 80% of German forces during the war. A key turning point was the Soviet victory at Stalingrad, which raised the morale of Soviet troops and marked the beginning of Germany's retreat. The USSR was also able to sustain its war effort through harsh but effective economic measures. Adults were expected to contribute to the war effort, while forced labour was used to meet the high demand for industrial production. The Soviets also shifted major industrial complexes to the Urals, Siberia, and Kazakhstan, placing them beyond German reach. This allowed the USSR to greatly increase production, and by 1943, it was producing more aircraft and tanks than Germany. As a result, Soviet forces could replace losses, launch counterattacks, and continuously weaken the German army. Therefore, the USSR's contribution was significant as it strengthened the Allied war effort and destroyed much of Germany's military capacity, leading to Germany's eventual defeat.	
L3	Explains given factor AND other factors <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given AND other factor, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or factor, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given factor).</i> E.g. Both sides of L2	6-8m
L3+	L3 + Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors. <i>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. Overall, I disagree that the breaking of the Enigma code was the main reason Germany was defeated. While Enigma gave the Allies valuable intelligence, the USA's industrial and military strength was more important because it provided the necessary conditions for Britain to remain in the war and continue its codebreaking efforts. American supplies, weapons, ships, and equipment helped keep Britain and the wider Allied war effort going despite German attacks on supply lines. This gave Britain the time, resources, and stability needed to work on and eventually break the Enigma code. Therefore,	+2m

	the USA's contributions were more fundamental, as they enabled the conditions under which Enigma could have a meaningful impact on Germany's defeat. OR E.g. Overall, I disagree that the breaking of the Enigma code was the main reason Germany was defeated. While Enigma helped the Allies protect supply lines and weaken German naval warfare, the USSR's contributions had a larger scale of impact. The Soviet Union destroyed a major portion of Germany's military strength and forced Germany to commit huge amounts of manpower and resources to prolonged fighting. This weakened Germany more directly and extensively than intelligence from Enigma alone. Therefore, the USSR's contributions were more important, as they had a wider and greater impact on Germany's overall defeat.	
4	'The main reason China became involved in the Korean War was to secure its own borders.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	10m
L1	Identifies / Describes given or other factors <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one factor, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i> <i>Award 2 marks for describing one factor and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i>	1-3
L2	Explains given factor OR other factors <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of given factor OR other factor, and an additional mark for additional factors / supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i> E.g. I agree that one reason China became involved in the Korean War was to secure its own borders. As UN forces pushed northwards towards the Yalu River, the border between North Korea and China, China became increasingly concerned that hostile forces would be positioned directly along its frontier. Truman and his advisors were aware of this risk, and MacArthur was advised to avoid actions that might provoke a Chinese response. This shows that China's border concerns were serious and understood by the USA. To Mao, the advance of UN forces threatened China's national security, as North Korea served as an important buffer between China and American-backed forces in South Korea. Should North Korea fall, China would face a direct security threat at its border. Therefore, China became involved in the Korean War largely to prevent enemy forces from reaching its frontier and to protect its own national security. OR	4-5

	E.g. However, there were also other reasons that led to China's involvement in the Korean War, such as its desire to defend fellow communist states. In February 1950, China and the USSR signed the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, reflecting closer cooperation between the two communist powers. China also shared ideological ties with North Korea, which was a fellow communist state under Kim Il Sung. Although Mao was initially cautious about getting involved, supporting North Korea allowed China to show solidarity with the communist bloc and resist the spread of American-backed capitalism in Asia. If North Korea collapsed, it would weaken the communist presence in the region and strengthen the position of the USA and its allies. As a result, China's involvement was not only driven by border security, but also by its desire to defend communism and support a fellow communist state. OR E.g. However, there were also other reasons that led to China's involvement in the Korean War, such as its desire to strengthen its international status. China had only become a communist state in 1949, and Mao wanted to show that the new China was not weak or easily intimidated by foreign powers. By intervening in Korea, China could demonstrate that it was willing and able to stand up to the United States, one of the world's strongest powers. This would help China gain respect within the communist bloc and establish itself as an important power in Asia. Supporting North Korea also allowed China to present itself as a defender of communism and anti-imperialism. Therefore, China's involvement was not only driven by border security, but also by Mao's desire to raise China's international standing and prove the strength of the new communist regime.	
L3	Explains given factor AND other factors <i>Award 6 marks for an explanation of given AND other factor, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or factor, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given factor).</i> E.g. Both sides of L2	6-8m
L3+	L3 + Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors. <i>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. Overall, I agree that China became involved in the Korean War mainly to secure its own borders. While support for the communist bloc was important, border security was the immediate trigger that pushed China into direct	+2m

	involvement. China only intervened when UN forces advanced towards the Yalu River, making the threat to its national security more urgent and concrete. The presence of hostile forces near China's border turned the Korean War from a distant ideological conflict into a direct security concern. Therefore, securing its own borders was the more decisive reason for China's involvement in the war.	
--	---	--

END OF LORMS