



ANDERSON SECONDARY SCHOOL
Preliminary Examination (2026)
Secondary Four Express



CANDIDATE NAME:

CLASS:

INDEX NUMBER:

HISTORY

2174/01

Paper 1 Extension of European control in Southeast Asia and
 challenges to European dominance, 1870s–1942

25 August 2026

1 hour 50 minutes

0800 - 0950h

Additional Materials: Writing paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

A digital answer booklet will be provided with this question paper. You must answer in the digital answer booklet. Follow the instructions on the cover page of the digital answer booklet.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer two questions.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

For examiner's use only:

Section A	/ 30m
Section B	/ 20m
Total	/ 50 marks

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

Question 1 is for all candidates.

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources you are told to use. In answering the questions, you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

1 (a) Study Source A.
)

Why do you think Nazis published this song as its official anthem in February 1930?

[5]

(b) Study Source B.
)

What can you tell about the political situation in Germany during the Great Depression? Explain your answer.

[5]

(c) Study Sources C and D.
)

How far does Source D prove that Source C is wrong about the Nazi's rise to power? Explain your answer.

[6]

(d) Study Source E.
)

How surprised are you by this source? Explain your answer.

[6]

(e) Study **all** the sources.
)

'The Germans supported the Nazi party because of the desperate economic conditions they faced.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

[8]

Did Germans support the Nazi Party because of the desperate economic conditions in Germany?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Read this carefully. It may help you answer some of the questions.

In the early 1930s, Germany was in crisis. Germany had earlier experienced hyperinflation in 1923, and after a period of calm, the German economy was devastated again by the Great Depression of October 1929. Millions became unemployed and countless families struggled to survive. The Weimar Republic, already weakened by political instability and public distrust, proved unable to address the scale of the crisis. During this time, the Nazi Party, led by Adolf Hitler, rose to prominence. Through promises of national revival and financial stability, the Nazis attracted growing support from ordinary Germans. By January 1933, Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany. However, historians continue to debate what truly drove Germans to support the Nazi Party during this turbulent period.

Did Germans support the Nazi Party because of the desperate economic conditions they faced, or because of its persuasive techniques to win support?

Source A: *An extract from the official Nazi Party anthem. Written in mid-1929, it became the anthem when its composer, an SA member Horst Wessel, was killed. Goebbels used the opportunity to transform Wessel into a Nazi martyr in February 1930.*

Raise the flag! The ranks tightly closed!
The SA marches with calm, steady steps.
Comrades shot by the Red Front and reactionaries
March in spirit within our ranks.

Clear the streets for the brown battalions,
Clear the streets for the storm division man!
Millions are looking upon the swastika full of hope,
The day of freedom and of bread dawns!

For the last time, the call to arms is sounded!
For the fight, we all stand prepared!
Already Hitler's banners fly over all streets.
The time of bondage will last but a little while now!

Source B: *An extract from a history education website published in 1996.*

The crisis of the Great Depression brought disunity to the political parties in the Reichstag. Instead of forging an alliance to enact desperately needed legislation, they broke up into squabbling, uncompromising groups. In March 1930, despite the overwhelming need for a financial program to help the German people, the new Chancellor Brüning encountered stubborn opposition to his plans. To break the bitter stalemate, he went to President Hindenburg and asked to invoke Article 48. This provoked a huge outcry from the opposition. In July 1930, as a measure of last resort, he asked to dissolve the Reichstag and call for new elections. The German people were tired of the political haggling in Berlin. They were tired of misery, suffering and weakness. These were desperate times and they were willing to listen to anyone, even Adolf Hitler.

Source C: *A Nazi Party election poster in 1932 with the title 'We workers have awoken.' The slogan at the bottom states 'We are voting for the Nazi Party (Party 2).'*



Source D: *An excerpt from a book written by renowned Austrian Jewish author, published in 1942. Born in 1881, he had grown up in Austria, before moving to England in 1934, and later to Brazil in 1940. He fled Europe to escape Nazi rule.*

It was impossible not to notice that the whole country was unhappy with this daily torture on the rack of inflation, that all we wanted was peace and order.

The murky tide of German inflation soon subsided, taking all its dirt and debris. Conditions reverted to normality. Now everyone could calculate what he had won and what he had lost. Most people, the great majority, were losers. Nothing, we kept reminding ourselves, made the German people so bitter, so mad with hatred, so ripe for Hitler as the inflation. But that was still in the distant future. Already we saw and welcomed the return of order. Fatal delusion at least gave us a decade of work, hope and even security.

Seen from today's viewpoint, those years from 1924 to 1933, from the end of German inflation to the moment when Hitler came to power, represent a pause in succession of catastrophes.

Source E: *An extract from a Dutch investigative journalist who presented his research on German tycoons who formed close ties with the Nazi government to grow their wealth, published 2022.*

On a freezing Tuesday afternoon in February 1931, August von Finck, a highly influential German banker, and Kurt Schmitt, CEO of *Allianz, met Hitler for the first time. Over the next half hour, Hitler sketched a capitalist's nightmare to the two financiers. He conjured up the specter of unemployed masses rising in a leftist revolt. Von Finck and Schmitt agreed with Hitler's view. They were absolutely convinced that riots and a major shift to the communists were inevitable. After the meeting, they left. Hitler soon received big news: von Finck and Schmitt had pledged five million reichsmarks via Allianz to arm the SA. Hitler was speechless.

**Allianz: One of the largest German insurance companies during the Weimar Republic. Schmitt became the Minister of Economic Affairs in the Nazi government in 1933. Allianz was also a company that was heavily criticised in the 1990s for being Nazi-linked.*

Source F: *An extract from a book about the lives of ordinary Germans who lived during the Weimar period, published 2018.*

Those happy childhood years began to diminish with the Great Depression of October 1929. Children felt its effect as the tightening of the family budget created disputes between their parents. When the enormous out of work numbers overwhelmed the unemployment insurance system, jobless men were forced to go begging. For the unemployed, the result was hunger and cold, growing pauperization and hopeless, dull despair.

The economic problems and human distress radicalized politics, heightening hostile emotions and triggering physical violence. Due to the atmosphere of radicalization, some children began to notice heated discussions in their families between supporters of President Hindenburg, Nazi leader Hitler, and Communist leader Thalmann. The chaotic final years of the Weimar Republic led to children taking an ideological stand that differed from the parents, and tore families apart.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2** 'The main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya was the shift towards an export-oriented economy.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]

- 3 'The main reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan was the appeal of the military to the Japanese people.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]
- 4 'The main threat to peace in Europe was the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]

- The End -

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Question 1	Source A	https://alphahistory.com/nazigermany/the-horst-wessel-song-lyrics/
	Source B	https://www.historyplace.com/worldwar2/riseofhitler/begins.htm
	Source C	https://www.alamy.com/awakening-of-the-workers-german-national-socialist-party-poster-1932-image181801271.html
	Source D	Stefan Zweig; The World of Yesterday; Pushkin Press, 1942.
	Source E	David de Jong; Nazi Billionaires; HarperCollinsPublishers, 2022.
	Source F	Konrad H. Jarausch; Broken Lives; Princeton University Press, 2018.

Suggested Answer / Marking Scheme

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

- 1 (a Study Source A.
) Why do you think Nazis published this song as its official anthem in February 1930?
 [5]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Sub-Message <i>e.g. It is to tell Germans that the SS and SA wings in the Nazis are very strong, and they can protect people.</i>	1m
L2	Specific context of February 1930 <i>e.g. This source was published because the Great Depression had hit in end 1930, and the Germans were experiencing great financial hardships and needed to have hope.</i>	2m
L3	Main Message <i>e.g. The Nazi Party published this anthem in February 1930 to tell Germans that the Nazi party will unite Germans together and bring glory and stability to the country. This is seen from 'Millions are looking upon the swastika full of hope, The day of freedom and of bread dawns!' and 'For the fight, we all stand prepared!'.</i>	3m
L4	Reason based on purpose <i>Award 5m for a more developed answer, considering both purpose and context.</i> <i>The Nazi Party published this anthem in February 1930 to portray itself as a party that would unite Germans together and bring glory and stability to the country. This is seen from "Millions are looking upon the swastika full of hope, the day of freedom and of bread dawns!" and "For the fight, we all stand prepared!" The Nazis wanted ordinary Germans to view their movement as a powerful and growing force that represented the hopes of the nation. By doing so, they hoped that Germans who were already disillusioned with the Weimar Republic would be drawn to join or support the Nazi Party. As Goebbels chose to elevate this song to the official Nazi Party anthem following the death of its author Horst Wessel, it was deliberately crafted as a propaganda tool to transform Wessel into a martyr for the Nazi cause, showing the great commitment that the Nazis had to improve the lives of the people in all aspects including economic woes during the Great Depression.</i>	4-5m

1 (b) Study Source B.
)

What can you tell about the political situation in Germany during the Great Depression? Explain your answer.
[5]

Target skill: Basic inference

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Describes the source or invalid inference	1m
L2	Valid inference, unsupported <i>Award 2 marks for 1 unsupported inference, 3 marks for 2 unsupported inferences</i>	2-3m
L3	Valid inference, supported <i>Award 5m for better quality inferences or two inferences.</i> The source tells me that the <u>political situation in Germany during the Great Depression was very unstable</u> . This is shown from Source B that "squabbling, uncompromising groups" who blocked Chancellor Bruning's plans through "stubborn opposition." Things got so bad that Bruning had to use Article 48, a special emergency power, just to get things done without going through parliament. This shows that the different political parties in the Reichstag could not work together, even though Germany was facing a serious economic crisis. Instead of cooperating to pass laws that could help ordinary Germans, they argued and refused to compromise. The source also tells me that this <u>political chaos caused many Germans to lose faith in their government</u> . The source describes the people as being "tired of the political haggling in Berlin," meaning they were fed up with politicians who seemed more interested in arguing than in solving the country's problems. On top of the hardship caused by the Great Depression, this frustration made many Germans desperate for a strong leader who could take decisive action. The source suggests this created an opportunity for Hitler by stating that people were "willing to listen to anyone, even Adolf Hitler," showing that the failure of the Weimar government's politicians helped the Nazi Party gain support among desperate Germans.	4-5m

(c) Study Sources C and D.

How far does Source D prove that Source C is wrong about the Nazi's rise to power? Explain your answer.
[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Describes sources only/Reliability based on provenance	1m
L2	Comparison of reliability based on comparison of source content Award 3m for both sides e.g. Source D <u>does not prove</u> that Source C is wrong about the Nazi's rise to power <u>as they both agreed on the attractiveness of the Nazi party to the Germans</u>. Source C states that Nazi party's attractiveness was that it was a strong alternative that attracted Germans. This is seen from the tall worker standing next to the Nazi logo who is portrayed as strong and confident, suggesting that the Nazi party strengthened him. Similarly, Source D states that Hitler's party appealed to the people's anger. This is evident from 'so ripe for Hitler'. (2m) e.g. Source D <u>proves</u> that Source C is wrong as they <u>both disagree on the reason that led to Nazi's rise to power</u>. Source C states that it was because of the Nazi party's strong and upright traits that made them attractive to the German people. This is seen from the strong worker standing next to the Nazi logo, suggesting that the Nazi party strengthened him. With the strength, the worker was able to reject the other poor political options like the current Weimar government and the communists. However, Source D states that it was because of the economic problem of inflation which inflicted misery on people that they did not fully recover from that led them turning to Hitler when another crisis hit. This was seen in the 'Nothing, we kept reminding ourselves, made the German people so bitter, so mad with hatred, so ripe for Hitler as the inflation.' (3m)	2-3m
L3	L2+Comparison of reliability based on cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge Example: <i>e.g. When cross-referencing to A, Source D cannot prove Source C is wrong as Source A disagrees with D but agrees with Source C that the Nazi party rose to power because of Nazi party strength. In A, it states that the Nazis were well-organised and capable of addressing the German people's financial troubles. This is evident from 'Millions are looking upon the swastika full of hope, The day of freedom and of bread dawns!' This agrees with A that Nazi party's strength appealed to Germans. However, Source D states that it was because of economic troubles that the Nazi was able to rise to power. This is evident from "Now everyone could calculate what he had won and what he had lost. Most</i>	4m

	people, the great majority, were losers. Nothing, we kept reminding ourselves, made the German people so bitter, so mad with hatred, so ripe for Hitler as the inflation." As such, Source D cannot prove Source C is wrong. When cross-reference to my contextual knowledge, Source D cannot prove Source C is wrong because my contextual knowledge states that it was because of the Great Depression of 1929 that led to the Nazi's power rise to power. Before the Great Depression, the Nazi party was only a minority party in 1928. However, after the Depression, Nazi party became one of the two major political parties. This is different from Source D in stating that it was because of the hyperinflation of 1923 that Germans could not recover from. As such, Source D cannot prove Source C is wrong.	
L4	Comparison of reliability using evaluation of author's purpose to decide which is wrong (Either or both sources can be evaluated) e.g. Source D cannot prove that Source C is wrong about the Nazis rise to power as it is unreliable. He was a direct victim of Nazi rule, and his personal suffering would have caused him to present the Nazi's rise to power in a manner that explained how ordinary Germans would have allowed such a destructive regime to emerge, instead of fighting against it. This is evident from the strong emphasis of how people suffered as seen from "Most people, the great majority, were losers." and "whole country was unhappy", "all we wanted was peace and order" and "ripe for Hitler". Also, he was writing this as an exile during the height of WW2, and he may have wanted to make sense of the senselessness of ongoing war in Europe when there were peace and stability before that. This retrospective purpose may cause him to oversimplify Hitler's rise to power, placing excessive weight on inflation, while downplaying other factors. This is evident from "nothing made the German people so bitter, so ripe for Hitler as the inflation" As such, Source D is unreliable, and it cannot prove that C is wrong. However, Source C is an unreliable source as it was a Nazi propaganda. It would naturally portray the Nazis in a positive light as a outstanding and capable party that could eliminate the problems of the Germans to convince them to support him. This is evident from the strong German worker that supported the Nazi party having the strength to reject the harmful political options available. As it is biased, it cannot be trusted to tell us accurately why the Nazis rose to power.	5-6m

(d) Study Source E.

How surprised are you by this source? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Answers which do not consider the concept of surprise <i>e.g. Source E shows that wealthy industrialists were willing to work with Hitler.</i>	1m
L2	Surprise/lack of surprise without explanation <i>e.g. I am not surprised by the financial support given to Hitler by German businessmen.</i>	2m
L3	Surprise/lack of surprise based on 'common sense' or undeveloped provenance (Common sense answers are those which would apply in any historical context.) <i>e.g. I am not surprised by the financial support given to Hitler by German businessmen as shown in Source E. Source E states that von Finck and Schmitt "pledged five million reichsmarks via Allianz to arm the SA" after Hitler warned them of a potential communist uprising. I am not surprised as Hitler was a convincing speaker, and the businessmen believed that he could protect them from political threats like the communists.</i> <i>I am surprised that Hitler was speechless by the amount of financial support that he had received from the two financiers. He was a charismatic speaker who could win over people's support, and yet he did not think that he could win over the financiers. This is evident from 'He conjured up the specter of unemployed masses rising in a leftist revolt. Von Finck and Schmitt agreed with Hitler's view.' and 'Hitler was speechless.'</i>	3m
L4	Surprise/lack of surprise based on cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge (Award 5m for responses which address surprise and lack of it at this level.) <i>e.g. I am surprised with Source E regarding the financial support given to Hitler by the wealthy businessmen when I compared it with Source C. In Source C, the Nazis were portrayed to be upright and uncorrupted, and a party that did not work with industrialists. This is evident from the strong German worker, who with the backing of the Nazis rejected the German Chancellor holding the slogan: The fat cats in the bacon, the people in the dirt.' This suggested that the Nazis did not associate itself with wealthy industrialists and have dealings with them. However, in Source E, it states that the Nazis conducted dealings with the wealthy industrialists and received financial support. As both sources disagree, I am surprised by Source E.</i> <i>I am not surprised with the source about the financial support given to Hitler by German industrialists when I cross-reference it to my contextual knowledge. I know that industrialists were worried about the communists in Germany winning seats in the Weimar government. They had become the</i>	4-5m

	<i>largest political party after the Great Depression, and they were worried that the communists had plans to introduce state control of businesses as the communists had in USSR. As such, many believed that Hitler was their only viable option to compete effectively with the communists.</i>	
L5	Surprise/lack of surprise based on purpose and context <i>Eg I am not surprised by the source when I consider its purpose. The source is from a Dutch investigative journalist who wanted to expose the self-serving financial relationships between German industrialists and the Nazi regime. By 1931, wealthy industrialists like von Finck and Schmitt had strong personal motivations to fund the Nazi Party as a safeguard against communism, as the Great Depression had devastated the German economy and radicalised many working-class Germans towards the left. This is evident in how Schmitt, the CEO of Allianz, "pledged five million reichsmarks via Allianz" after he and von Finck were "absolutely convinced that riots and a major shift to the communists were inevitable." In return for their financial support, these industrialists received significant rewards, as seen in how Schmitt was appointed Minister of Economic Affairs in the Nazi government in 1933 after Hitler came to power. By exposing these relationships, the journalist hoped that readers would subject present-day German industrialists with Nazi-era ties to greater scrutiny and hold them accountable for their past financial actions. As such, it is entirely unsurprising that the source reveals such close ties between big business and the Nazi Party.</i>	6m

- (e) 'The Germans supported the Nazi party because of the desperate economic conditions they faced.' How far do the sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.
[8]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use. <i>e.g. The Germans supported the Nazi party because of its Hitler's charisma.</i>	1m
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use. <i>(Award 2m for one Y or N supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4m.)</i>	2-4m

No (A, C, E)

e.g. Source A does not support the statement. The Nazi Party attracted Germans through its powerful promises of a strong party, national glory, and freedom. This is evident from "Millions are looking upon the swastika full of hope, the day of freedom and of bread dawns!" and "For the fight, we all stand prepared!" This shows that the Nazi Party successfully appealed to ordinary Germans by offering them hope of a better future, drawing mass support through its compelling promises rather than simply economic desperation.

e.g. Source C does not support the statement. The Nazi Party attracted Germans by being an unrivalled political alternative to existing political options to govern Germany. This is evident from the Nazis being portrayed as a clean and strong political option in the figure of the German worker, while standing amidst weak and corrupt political alternatives like the communists and existing Weimar leaders. Hence, the Nazis were seen as being able to bring Germany to a brighter future through their capabilities.

e.g. Source E does not support the statement. Hitler deliberately used the fear of communism as a tool to win over supporters by positioning the Nazi Party as an effective political party for the wealthy industrialists. This is evident from Hitler's claim that 'Hitler sketched a capitalist's nightmare to the two financiers. He conjured up the specter of unemployed masses rising in a leftist revolt. Von Finck and Schmitt agreed with Hitler's view.' This shows that Hitler's carefully crafted anti-communist appeal to the businessmen was crucial for the Nazis to gain support.

No (B, D, F)

e.g. Source B supports the statement. The collapse of the Weimar government during the Great Depression left Germans so desperate that they became open to extremist alternatives. This is evident from "these were desperate times and they were willing to listen to anyone, even Adolf Hitler." This shows that it was the severity of economic hardship and political dysfunction, rather than genuine belief in Nazi ideology, that pushed many Germans towards supporting Hitler.

e.g Source D supports the statement. The effects of the hyperinflation were long term, as people were in a weaker financial position that made them vulnerable to any economic shocks. When the economic shock hit, they were unable to adjust and turned to the Nazis. This is evident from 'Now everyone could calculate what he had won and what he had lost. Most people, the great majority, were losers. Nothing, we kept reminding ourselves, made the German people so bitter, so mad with hatred, so ripe for Hitler as the inflation.' This shows that the weakened economic capabilities of the Germans led to them

e.g. Source F supports the statement. The devastating human impact of the Great Depression created the conditions of despair that drove Germans towards radical politics. This is evident from "for the unemployed, the result was hunger and cold, growing pauperization and

	<i>hopeless, dull despair." This shows that the extreme economic suffering experienced by ordinary Germans made them vulnerable to extremist parties like the Nazis, suggesting that desperation rather than ideological conviction was the primary driver of Nazi support.</i>	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use. (Award 5m for one Y and N supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7m.) <i>Both sides of L2.</i> Bonus of two marks (i.e. +1, +1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. but the total for the question must not exceed 8. <i>Although Source A shows that Germans support the Nazi party because of its powerful promises, Source A is unreliable as evidence as propaganda designed to glorify the party and stir nationalist fervour rather than honestly reflect the motivations of ordinary German supporters. Joseph Goebbels created many Nazi campaigns like this anthem that sought to win the support of the Germans so as to address their fears. As such, the anthem is more likely to reflect what the Nazi Party wanted Germans to feel rather than the genuine economic desperation that drove many to support Hitler. It would likely have exaggerated the ability of the Nazi party to gain Germans' support.</i>	5-8m

Section B: Essays

- 2 'The main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya was the shift towards an export-oriented economy.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya was the shift towards an export-oriented economy or other reasons (Award 1m for identifying 1 reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing 1 reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.) <i>e.g. A main economic impact of British colonial rule was <u>the large-scale immigration of Chinese and Indian workers brought in by the British to</u></i>	1-3m

	<u>work in the mines and plantations fundamentally changed the demographic and economic landscape of Malaya</u>	
L2	Explains how the main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya was the shift towards an export-oriented economy OR Explain other economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya (s) (Award 4m for an explanation of the main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya as the shift towards an export-oriented economy (OR) other economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya, and an additional mark for further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.) <i>e.g. Yes, I agree that the main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya was the shift towards an export-oriented economy because <u>the British developed Malaya's natural resources to serve British economic interests rather than the needs of the local population</u>. After the British arrived, they shifted the Malayan economy from a subsistence-based to export-oriented economy. The British heavily invested in the rubber and tin industries, which became the backbone of Malaya's economy. Large rubber plantations were established and tin mines were expanded, with their output exported to meet growing global demand. This meant that Malaya's economy became heavily dependent on producing and selling these two commodities to the rest of the world. The British also produced and exported cash crops like pepper and sugar cane. <u>Since the British restructured Malaya's entire economy around the export of rubber, tin and other cash crops, it spurred the shift towards an export-oriented economy and was therefore the main economic impact of British colonial rule.</u></i> OR <i>e.g. No, I disagree that the shift towards an export-oriented economy was the main economic impact of British colonial rule <u>because the large-scale immigration of Chinese and Indian workers brought in by the British to work in the mines and plantations fundamentally changed the demographic and economic landscape of Malaya</u>. Many Chinese workers to work in the tin mines and went indentured Indian workers from places like Ceylon to work on the coffee, rubber and other plantations, as there were not enough local. Other businesses such as transportation firms, food processing, entertainment centres sprung up, which created more job opportunities for these immigrants to come to Malaya. The indigenous Malaya community was insufficient to meet the labour demands of these industries. <u>This created a plural society in Malaya made up of distinct ethnic communities, each occupying different economic roles. The Chinese started to take on both small and larger-scale businesses, forming the ethnic group that owned businesses. The Indians took on roles in the civil services as they were educated in English. The Malays tended to engage in agricultural activities as many retained their traditional economic roles like rice planting. Since this demographic shift had lasting consequences for Malaya's social and economic structure by cementing the rich-poor divide between racial lines based on the economic viability of their industries well beyond the colonial period, it was therefore the main economic impact of British colonial rule.</u></i>	4-5m

	<i>Other factors: Development of infrastructure such as roads, railways, and ports</i>	
L3	Explains how the main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya was the shift towards an export-oriented economy AND Explain other economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya (s) (Award 6m for an explanation of the main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya as the shift towards an export-oriented economy (OR) other economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya, and an additional mark for further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8m.) <i>Both sides of L2.</i>	6-8m
	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. 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. [as L3 plus]</i> <i>In conclusion, I agree that the main economic impact of British colonial rule was the shift towards an export-oriented economy. The growth of the rubber and tin industries created many job and business opportunities, which attracted large numbers of Chinese and Indian immigrants to Malaya. These immigrants in turn shaped the economic landscape of Malaya. Without the export-oriented economy, there would have been far fewer jobs and opportunities available, and fewer immigrants would have come to Malaya as a result. This means that the plural society and the economic differences between the different communities would not have developed in the same way. The shift towards an export-oriented economy was therefore the root cause that made all other economic changes possible, and was thus the main economic impact of British colonial rule in Malaya.</i>	+2m

- 3 'The main reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan was the appeal of the military to the Japanese people.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan as the appeal of the military to the Japanese people or other reasons (Award 1m for identifying 1 impact, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing 1 impact, 3m for describing 2 or more.) <i>e.g. The weakness of the democratic government made it unable to resist the military's growing influence leading to the rise of the militarist.</i>	1-3m

L2	Explains the reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan as the appeal of the military to the Japanese people OR Explains other reasons (Award 4m for an explanation for the reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan as the appeal of the military to the Japanese people (OR) other reasons for the rise of militarist rule in Japan, and an additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.) <i>e.g. Yes, I agree that the main reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan was the appeal of the military to the Japanese people <u>because the military's successes in the 1930s gave it a level of public support that allowed it to gain increasing influence over the Japanese government.</u> Japan's military campaigns in Manchuria in 1931 and China in the 1930s were presented to the Japanese public as great national achievements, expanding Japan's territory and securing resources for the country. This made the military appear strong, capable, and able to deliver results for Japan at a time when the democratic government seemed weak and ineffective. This made the Japanese people rally behind the military victories to support the military. <u>With strong public backing, the military was able to pressure the government and push Japan towards militarist rule. Since the military's appeal to the Japanese people gave it the public support needed to dominate the government, it was therefore the main reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan.</u></i> OR <i>e.g. No, I disagree that the appeal of the military was the main reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan <u>because the weakness of the democratic government made it unable to resist the military's growing influence.</u> Japan's democratic government in the 1920s and 1930s was plagued by corruption and was seen by many Japanese as self-serving and ineffective. Many saw the civilian governments as cooperating with Zaibatsus while the gap between rich and poor widened. Politicians were perceived as prioritising their own interests over those of the nation, which eroded public trust in the democratic system. This was seen in the signing of the London Naval Conference in 1930 by the civilian government where Japan's demands to build more warships were rejected by the Western powers and they still signed it. It was seen as a form of betrayal by the government. This weakness meant that the government lacked the authority and public confidence needed to stand up to pressure from the military. <u>Since the democratic government's inability to govern effectively created the conditions for the military to step in and take control, its weakness was therefore a more important reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan than the appeal of the military alone.</u></i> <i>Other factors: Economic hardships caused by the Great Depression that made Japanese people turn to other political alternatives</i>	4-5m
L3	Explains the reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan as the appeal of the military to the Japanese people AND Explains other reasons	6-8m

	(Award 6m for an explanation for the reason for the rise of militarist rule in Japan as the appeal of the military to the Japanese people (OR) other reasons for the rise of militarist rule in Japan, and an additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8m.) Both sides of L2.	
	Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors. 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. [as L3 plus]</i> In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. The <u>civilian government's poor decisions</u>, such as signing the London Naval Treaty and failing to control the military during the Mukden Incident, caused many Japanese to lose faith in democracy. This led to greater support for the military and made <u>its successes and ultranationalist ideas more appealing</u>. Hence, the weakness of the civilian government was the root cause for the rise of militarist rule in Japan.	+2m

- 4 'The main threat to peace in Europe was the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the main threat to peace in Europe as the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler or other reasons (Award 1m for identifying 1 reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing 1 reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.) <i>e.g. Hitler's own aggressive foreign policy and determination to expand German territory was a fundamental threat to peace.</i>	1-3m
L2	Explains how the main threat to peace in Europe as the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler OR Explain other reasons (Award 4m for an explanation for how the main threat to peace in Europe as the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler (OR) how other reason(s) threatened peace in Europe, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5m.) <i>E.g. Yes, I agree that the main threat to peace in Europe was the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler <u>because appeasement allowed Hitler to pursue his aggressive ambitions without facing any meaningful resistance, making war increasingly inevitable</u>. Britain and France repeatedly gave in to Hitler's demands in the hope of avoiding conflict, most notably at the Munich Agreement of 1938, where they allowed Hitler to annex the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia. Rather than deterring Hitler, this only encouraged him to make further demands,</i>	4-5m

	<i>as he came to believe that Britain and France would not take action to stop him. <u>By failing to draw a firm line against Hitler's aggression, the European powers effectively gave him the confidence to push further until war broke out in 1939. Since appeasement directly enabled Hitler's aggression to go unchecked, it was therefore the main threat to peace in Europe.</u></i> OR <i>e.g. No, I disagree that the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler was the main threat to peace in Europe <u>because Hitler's own aggressive foreign policy and determination to expand German territory was a fundamental threat to peace.</u> From the moment Hitler came to power in 1933, he was determined to overturn the Treaty of Versailles and expand Germany's territory through force if necessary. He remilitarised the Rhineland in 1936, annexed Austria in 1938, and invaded Czechoslovakia in 1939, each time pushing further than the last. <u>Even if the European powers had not pursued appeasement, Hitler's ambitions meant that he was willing to have a physical confrontation when he was opposed. This was particularly so when Nazi Germany became militarily self-sufficient and strong. As such, Hitler's aggression was an important threat to peace.</u></i> <i>Other factors: Failure of the League of Nations to maintain collective security left European nations without an effective mechanism to deter aggression</i>	
L3	Explains how the main threat to peace in Europe as the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler AND Explain other reasons (Award 6m for an explanation for how the main threat to peace in Europe as the willingness of European powers to appease Hitler (AND) how other reason(s) threatened peace in Europe, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8m.) Both sides of L2.	6-8m
	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. 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. [as L3 plus] E.g. In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. While European powers encouraged Hitler to take bolder aggressive actions, it was Hitler's actions of expanding outwards that was the main threat to peace. Without a radical leader like Hitler, Germany would pursue a more conservative and thus peaceful option. Hitler held the belief of creating more living space for Germans from the onset, which meant that he would have to bring Germany along to challenge other country at some point in time,</i>	+2m

	<i>making his aggressive foreign policy the root cause for threatening peace in Europe.</i>	
--	---	--