



ANDERSON SECONDARY SCHOOL
Preliminary Examination (2026)
Secondary Four Express



CANDIDATE NAME:

CLASS:

INDEX NUMBER:

HISTORY

2174/02

Paper 2 Developments in the post-World War II world: The Cold War
and decolonisation in Southeast Asia, 1940s–1991

31 August 2026

1 hour 50 minutes

0800 - 0950h

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.
)

How useful is Source A as evidence about Truman's plan to provide aid to Greece and Turkey? Explain your answer.
[6]

(b) Study Source B.
)

Why did the Soviet Foreign Minister make this speech in September 1947? Explain your answer.
[5]

(c) Study Source C.
)

How reliable is this source as evidence about the need for US involvement in rebuilding post-war Europe? Explain your answer.
[5]

(d) Study Sources D and E.
)

How far does Source E make you surprised by Source D? Explain your answer.

[6]

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

'The main aim of the Marshall Plan was to achieve economic recovery in Europe.' How far do the sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.
[8]

Why was the Marshall Plan implemented in Europe?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

In the aftermath of World War II, Europe lay economically devastated and politically unstable. American leaders, including President Truman and Secretary of State George Marshall, feared that Europe's vulnerability would leave it susceptible to the spread of communism. As early as June 1947, Marshall proposed the idea of a large-scale aid programme. By May 1948, the United States officially launched the Marshall Plan, providing over \$13 billion to rebuild Western European economies.

However, the Soviet Union viewed the Marshall Plan as an instrument of American strategic influence rather than genuine humanitarian aid. The USSR accused the USA of warmongering and using economic assistance as a tool to extend its reach into Europe. This interpretation gained some credibility when, by 1949, the United States formed NATO with many of the same European nations that had received Marshall Plan aid, suggesting that American involvement in Europe extended well beyond economic recovery. These developments deepened tensions between the two superpowers and further fuelled the Cold War.

Was the Marshall Plan primarily aimed at achieving economic recovery in Europe, or was it driven by American strategic interests?

Source A: *A radio address by an opposition party leader, Henry Wallace, concerning Truman's plan to propose a loan to Greece and Turkey, broadcast on 13 March 1947.*

President Truman, in the name of democracy and humanitarianism, proposed a loan of \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey as a down payment on an unlimited expenditure aimed at opposing Communist expansion.

Today Americans are asked to support the Governments of Greece and Turkey. Tomorrow we shall be asked to support the Governments of China and Argentina. America cannot afford to spend billions and billions of dollars for unproductive purposes. President Truman cannot prevent change in the world any more than he can prevent the tide from coming in or the sun from setting. But once America stands for opposition to change, we are lost. America will become the most-hated nation in the world.

Source B: *Adapted from a speech made by Soviet Foreign Minister to the United Nations General Assembly in September 1947.*

The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan clearly show how the United Nations is ignored and its principles are violated. Recent months prove that the United States government has abandoned international cooperation and joint action among major powers. Instead, the US tries to force its will on independent nations. It openly uses economic aid meant for needy countries as a tool for political pressure. This is proven by US actions in Greece and Turkey, which completely bypass the United Nations, and by the proposed Marshall Plan in Europe. This policy directly violates the General Assembly resolution of 11 December 1946, which states that relief supplies must never be used as political weapons.

Source C: *A *memorandum by Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, William Clayton, to George Marshall, published May 1947. Clayton had been in frequent consultation with Western European leaders about their economies.*

Without further prompt and substantial aid from the United States, economic, social and political disintegration will overwhelm Europe. Aside from the awful implications which this would have for the future peace and security of the world, the immediate effects on our domestic economy would be disastrous: markets for our surplus production gone, unemployment, depression, a heavily unbalanced budget on the background of a mountainous war debt. These things must not happen.

Our resources and ability to produce goods are more than enough to provide all the help that is needed. The President must make a strong appeal to the American people to make some sacrifices, to tighten their belts a little, in order to save Europe from starvation and chaos and, at the same time, to preserve for ourselves and our children the great legacy of a free America.

**memorandum: A short written document used for internal communication within an organisation.*

Source D: *An American cartoon in 1947 about the Marshall Plan.*



* Peace-mongering is the act of aggressively advocating for peace.

Source E: A 1949 Soviet cartoon about the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). It had a title that said, 'Get out of the way, Warmongers!'



Source F: An extract from an academic about the Marshall Plan, published in 2021.

Though the economic recovery program represented approximately 3 percent of the American Gross National Product (GNP), it helped recipient countries recover from the devastation caused by World War II. In doing so, trade between the United States and Western Europe increased dramatically after 1945. Foreign investment expanded substantially as well. The United States did not fall back into depression, as many had feared might happen. European cooperation partially fostered by the program has continued. Furthermore, the United States remains the richest country in the world, long after World War II and the Great Depression.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2 'The main consequence of the Korean War was the division of Korea along the 38th parallel.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]

- 3 'The main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism was the introduction of the Malayan Union.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]

- 4 'The main cause of the First Indochina War was the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]

- The End -

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Question 1	Source A	Benn Steil; The Marshall Plan: Dawn of the Cold War; Simon & Schuster, 2018.
	Source B	http://slantchev.ucsd.edu/courses/ps142j/documents/vyshinsky-criticism-of-truman-doctrine.html
	Source C	https://www.marshallfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/The_European_Crisis_Clayton_to_Acheson_May_27_1947.pdf
	Source D	https://www.amazon.com/Marshall-Peace-Mongering-American-Post-World-Fitzpatrick/dp/B07C8B1L2R
	Source E	https://www.digitalsovietart.com/artist-portfolios/56-briskin-veniamin-1906-1982/12331-get-out-of-our-way-you-war-mongers
	Source F	https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/marshall-plan-and-us-economic-dominance

Suggested Answer / Marking Scheme

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1 (a) Study Source A.
)

How useful is Source A as evidence about Truman's plan to provide aid to Greece and Turkey? Explain your answer.
[6]

Level	Description	Marks	
L1	Useful because of provision	1m	

en
an
ce
,
u
n
de
ve
lo
pe
d

e.
g.
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
no
t
us
ef
ul
be
ca
us
e
it
w
as
m
ad
e
by
an
op
po
sit
io
n
pa
rty
le
ad
er.

L **Ut**
2 **ilit**
y
ba

2-3m

se
 d
 o
 n
 Tr
 u
 m
 an
 's
 pl
 an
 to
 pr
 ov
 id
 e
 ai
 d
 to
 Gr
 ee
 ce
 an
 d
 Tu
 rk
 ey
 ,
 ba
 se
 d
 o
 n
 so
 ur
 ce
 co
 nt
 en
 t
 (A
 wa
 rd
 2m
 for
 on
 e
 as
 pe
 ct
 [us
 efu
 l
 O

R
not
us
efu
l]
an
d
3m
for
bot
h
as
pe
cts
[i.e
.
us
efu
l
AN
D
not
us
efu
l].)

e.
g.
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
us
ef
ul
in
st
ati
ng
th
at
Tr
u
m
an
's
pl
an
to
pr

ov
id
e
ai
d
to
Gr
ee
ce
an
d
Tu
rk
ey
m
us
t
be
op
po
se
d.
as
it
w
as
ve
ry
da
m
ag
in
g
to
U
S
A.
Th
is
is
ev
id
en
t
fro

m
'A
m
eri
ca
ca
nn
ot
aff
or
d
to
sp
en
d
bil
lio
ns
an
d
bil
lio
ns
of
do
lla
rs
for
un
pr
od
uc
tiv
e
pu
rp
os
es
,
an
d
'A
m
eri
ca

*wil
l
be
co
m
e
th
e
m
os
t-h
at
ed
na
tio
n
in
th
e
w
orl
d.'*
*A
m
eri
ca
wil
l
su
ffe
r
ec
on
o
mi
ca
lly
an
d
lo
se
its
po
liti
ca*

*I
pr
es
tig
e.*

*e.
g.
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
no
t
us
ef
ul
as
ev
id
en
ce
ab
ou
t
th
e
sit
ua
tio
n
in
po
st-
W
W
II
Gr
ee
ce
an
d
Tu
rk
ey
as
it
is
on*

e-
si
de
d.
S
ou
rc
e
A
on
ly
po
rtr
ay
s
th
e
ne
ga
tiv
e
im
pa
ct
s
of
pr
ov
idi
ng
ai
d
bu
t
di
d
no
t
in
cl
ud
e
th
e
po
ss
ibl
e
be
ne
fit
s

*th
at
w
ou
ld
ari
se
fro
m
it.*

L
3

**A
ns
w
er
s
w
hi
ch
co
ns
id
er
h
o
w
th
e
re
lia
bil
ity
of
th
e
so
ur
ce
af
fe
ct
s
its
ut
ilit
y,
ba
se
d
o
n
cr**

4m

os
s-
re
fe
re
nc
e
to
ot
he
r
so
ur
ce
s
or
co
nt
ex
tu
al
kn
o
wl
ed
ge

e.
g.
Af
ter
cr
os
s-r
ef
er
en
ci
ng
to
S
ou
rc
e
B,
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
re/

ia
bl
e
an
d
th
us
us
ef
ul
in
st
ati
ng
th
at
Tr
u
m
an
's
pl
an
to
pr
ov
id
e
ai
d
to
Gr
ee
ce
an
d
Tu
rk
ey
w
as
da
m
ag
in
g
to
U
S
A.
S
ou

rc
e
B
ac
cu
se
d
U
S
A
of
vi
ol
ati
ng
int
er
na
tio
na
l
pr
ot
oc
ol
s.
Th
is
is
ev
id
en
t
fro
m
'U
.S
. .
tri
es
to
for
ce
its
wil
l
on
in
de
pe
nd
en

t
na
tio
ns
 ...
Th
is
is
pr
ov
en
by
U.
S.
ac
tio
ns
in
Gr
ee
ce
an
d
Tu
rk
ey
 ,
an
d
 T
 hi
 s
 po
 lic
 y
 dir
 ec
 tly
 vi
 ol
 at
 es
 th
 e
 G
 en
 er
 al
 As
 se
 m
 bl

y
re
so
lut
io
n'.
Th
is
m
ea
ns
th
at
U
S
A
w
as
re
ga
rd
ed
po
orl
y
in
its
int
er
na
tio
na
l
st
an
di
ng
be
ca
us
e
of
its
ac
tio
ns
.
Si
mi
lar
ly,
S

our
rc
e
A
st
at
es
th
at
U
S'
pr
op
os
al
of
pr
ov
idi
ng
ex
te
ns
iv
e
ai
d
to
co
un
tri
es
w
ou
ld
be
ha
rm
ful
for
U
S
A.
As
th
e
so
ur
ce
s
ag
re

e,
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
rel
ia
bl
e
an
d
th
us
us
ef
ul.

e.
g.
Af
ter
cr
os
s-r
ef
er
en
ci
ng
to
m
y
co
nt
ex
tu
al
kn
o
wl
ed
ge
,
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
rel

ia
 bl
 e
 an
 d
 us
 ef
 ul
 in
 st
 ati
 ng
 th
 at
 Tr
 u
 m
 an
 's
 pl
 an
 to
 pr
 ov
 id
 e
 ai
 d
 to
 Gr
 ee
 ce
 an
 d
 Tu
 rk
 ey
 w
 as
 da
 m
 ag
 in
 g
 to
 U
 S
 A.
 Tr
 u
 m
 an

ha
 d
 ex
 ag
 ge
 rat
 ed
 ab
 ou
 t
 th
 e
 thr
 ea
 t
 of
 U
 S
 S
 R
 to
 th
 e
 U
 S
 C
 on
 gr
 es
 s
 for
 th
 e
 m
 to
 ap
 pr
 ov
 e
 th
 e
 pl
 an
 ,
 an
 d
 th
 at
 an
 ge
 re
 d

St
ali
n
an
d
m
ad
e
hi
m
ta
ke
a
str
on
ge
r
st
an
ce
ag
ai
ns
t
U
S
A,
an
d
vi
e
w
ed
it
su
sp
ici
ou
sl
y.
Si
mi
lar
ly,
S
ou
rc
e
A
st
at
es

th
 at
 U
 S'
 pr
 op
 os
 al
 of
 pr
 ov
 idi
 ng
 ex
 te
 ns
 iv
 e
 ai
 d
 to
 co
 un
 tri
 es
 w
 ou
 ld
 be
 ha
 rm
 ful
 for
 U
 S
 A'.
 As
 bo
 th
 so
 ur
 ce
 s
 ag
 re
 e,
 S
 ou
 rc
 e
 A
 is

*rel
ia
bl
e
an
d
us
ef
ul.*

L L2
4 +
A
ns
w
er
s
w
hi
ch
co
ns
id
er
h
o
w
th
e
re
lia
bil
ity
of
th
e
so
ur
ce
af
fe
ct
s
its
ut
ilit
y,
ba
se
d
o
n

5m

**p
ur
p
os
e**

e.
g.
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
no
t
rel
ia
bl
e
an
d
th
us
no
t
us
ef
ul
w
he
n
co
ns
id
eri
ng
its
pu
rp
os
e.
S
ou
rc
e
A
w
as
fro
m
an

op
po
sit
io
n
pa
rty
le
ad
er.
Hi
s
pa
rty
he
ld
a
dif
fer
en
t
po
liti
ca
l
be
lie
f
fro
m
th
e
Tr
u
m
an
go
ve
rn
m
en
t
w
hi
ch
be
lie
ve
d
th
at
U

S
 su
 pp
 ort
 in
 g
 ne
 ed
 y
 co
 un
 tri
 es
 to
 co
 m
 ba
 t
 co
 m
 m
 un
 ist
 ex
 pa
 ns
 io
 n.
As
su
ch
hi
s
ob
je
cti
ve
w
as
to
s
w
ay
A
m
eri
ca
ns
to
rej
ec

t
th
e
go
ve
rn
m
en
t's
st
an
d
an
d
su
pp
ort
alt
er
na
tiv
e
pa
rti
es
lik
e
hi
s.
 Th
 is
 is
 ev
 id
 en
 t
 fro
 m
 str
 on
 g
 w
 or
 ds
 of
 cri
 tic
 is
 m
 of
 Tr
 u

*m
an
lik
e
Tr
u
m
an
ca
nn
ot
pr
ev
en
t
ch
an
ge
in
th
e
w
orl
d
an
y
m
or
e
th
an
he
ca
n
pr
ev
en
t
th
e
tid
e
fro
m
co
mi
ng
in
or
th
e
su*

n
fro
m
se
tti
ng
,
As
th
e
so
ur
ce
is
un
rel
ia
bl
e,
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
th
us
no
t
us
ef
ul.

L
5

**L4
+
U
se
fu
l,
by
ev
al
ua
ti
n
g
o
p
p
os
iti**

6m

o
n
le
ad
er
s'
p
ur
p
os
e
in
co
nt
ex
t
(u
n
de
rs
ta
n
d
re
as
o
ns
fo
r
d
o
m
es
tic
o
p
p
os
iti
o
n
to
Tr
u
m
an
's
pl
an
s)

*H
o
w
ev
er,
S
ou
rc
e
A
m
ay
sti
ll
be
us
ef
ul
in
un
de
rst
an
di
ng
th
e
re
sp
on
se
s
of
do
m
es
tic
op
po
sit
io
n
wi
thi
n
U
S
A
to
w
ar
ds*

pr
ov
idi
ng
ai
d
to
co
un
tri
es
in
ne
ed

.
W
W
ll
ha
d
ju
st
en
de
d
an
d
th
er
e
w
er
e
m
an
y
co
un
tri
es
in
ne
ed
of
ai
d.
Wi
th
th
e
C
ol

d
W
ar
sp
re
ad
in
g
an
d
E
as
ter
n
E
ur
op
e
w
as
fal
lin
g
to
th
e
U
S
S
R,
th
er
e
w
ou
ld
be
m
an
y
co
un
tri
es
th
at
ne
ed
ed
su
pp
ort

,
w
hi
ch
ca
n
be
co
stl
y.
As
su
ch
,
th
er
e
w
ou
ld
be
ac
tiv
e
op
po
sit
io
n
in
U
S
A
ar
gu
in
g
ag
ai
ns
t
ex
te
ns
iv
e
su
pp
ort
an
d
ov

er
co
m
mi
tm
en
t,
le
st
it
dr
ai
ne
d
U
S
A
of
its
fin
an
ci
al
an
d
po
liti
ca
l
str
en
gt
h.
S
ou
rc
e
A
hi
gh
lig
ht
ed
th
e
re
as
on
for
op
po
sit

io
n
le
ad
er
s
lik
e
W
all
ac
e
to
do
so

.
Th
is
is
ev
id
en
t
in
th
e
ne
ga
tiv
e
po
rtr
ay
al
of
th
e
sit
ua
tio
n
for
U
S
th
at
w
as
pa
int
ed
by

W
all
ac
e,
as
se
en
fro
m
'w
e
ar
e
lo
st'
an
d
'm
os
t-h
at
ed
na
tio
n
in
th
e
w
orl
d'.
As
su
ch
,
S
ou
rc
e
A
is
us
ef
ul
in
he
lpi
ng
us
un
de
rst

and
the
emotions
of
opposition
in
leaders'
views
towards
Truman's
financial
aid
in
USSR.

(b) Study Source B.

Why did the Soviet Foreign Minister make this speech in September 1947? Explain your answer.
[5]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Sub-Message	1m

	<i>e.g. Source B was published to tell the United Nations General Assembly that the Soviet Union opposed US actions.</i>	
L2	Specific context of September 1947 <i>e.g. The Soviets were against the creation of the Marshall Plan as it perceived it as a devious plan by the Americans to bring Western European countries under its sphere of influence.</i>	2m
L3	Main Message <i>e.g. The Soviet Foreign Minister made this speech to tell the international community that the USA is acting unilaterally and disregarding the global efforts of international cooperation. This is evident from 'This policy directly violates the General Assembly resolution'. By doing so, the USA did not respect the United Nations and other nations.</i>	3-4m
L4	Reason based on purpose <i>The Soviet Foreign Minister made this speech <u>to justify Soviet opposition to the Marshall Plan</u>. This is evident from 'Recent months prove that the United States government has abandoned international cooperation' and 'This policy directly violates the General Assembly resolution.' He wanted the international community to view the USA as disregarding the global efforts of international cooperation and acting unilaterally. By doing so, <u>he hoped that the international community would be swayed to negatively view the Marshall Plan and reject it</u>. The Soviets likely were angered by Truman's exaggeration of the threat in Greece and Turkey to push the Marshall Plan through and were also worried that the Plan would affect its chances of gaining access to the Turkish Straits (p.54), <u>and sought to counter US' move through international pressure</u>.</i>	5m

(c) Study Source C.

How reliable is this source as evidence about US involvement in rebuilding post-war Europe? Explain your answer.
[5]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Answer based on undeveloped provenance <i>e.g. Source C is reliable because it is an internal memorandum.</i>	1m
L2	Reliable, based on content only <i>e.g. Source C is reliable as evidence that USA involvement in rebuilding post-war Europe was necessary to bring benefits to both Europe and USA. This is evident from 'Without further prompt and substantial aid from the</i>	2m

	<i>United States, economic, social and political disintegration will overwhelm Europe.’ and ‘the immediate effects on our domestic economy would be disastrous.’ This shows that by helping Europe, Europe would have economic recovery. Additionally, US would also be helping itself as it would have trade partners. Hence, C is reliable.</i>	
L3	Reliable/unreliable, based on cross-reference to other sources (Award 4m for more developed responses) <i>e.g. After cross referencing Source F, Source C is reliable as both sources agree that USA involvement in rebuilding post-war Europe was necessary. In F, it states that Western Europe improved after receiving aid from USA. In turn, US benefitted from Europe’s recovery. This is seen from ‘it helped recipient countries recover from the devastation caused by World War II.’ and ‘trade between the United States and Western Europe increased dramatically after 1945’. Source C also states that it was necessary to bring benefit to Europe and USA. As both sources agree, Source C is reliable.</i> <i>e.g. After cross referencing Source A, Source C is unreliable as both sources disagree that USA involvement in rebuilding post-war Europe was necessary. Source A states that it was not necessary as it would drain US of its resources. This is seen from ‘America cannot afford to spend billions and billions of dollars for unproductive purposes.’ However, Source C states that the rebuilding was necessary to bring benefit to Europe and USA.</i>	3-4m
L4	Reliable based on provenance and tone, supported <i>L3+ e.g. Source C is reliable as evidence about US involvement in rebuilding post-war Europe when considering its purpose. Source C is an internal memorandum to George Marshall in May 1947. As Clayton had been consulting with Western leaders, he was familiar with their challenges and <u>sought to give Marshall an accurate understanding of the European situation in order for US to craft a strong foreign policy response to help the Western European countries while protecting US interests.</u> This is evident from ‘Without further prompt and substantial aid from the United States, economic, social and political disintegration will overwhelm Europe.’ and ‘Our resources and ability to produce goods are more than enough to provide all the help that is needed.’. As such, Source C is reliable.</i>	4-5m

(d) Study Sources D and E.

How far does Source E make you surprised by Source D? Explain your answer.
[6]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Answer based on undeveloped provenance or valid comparison without addressing surprise/not surprised	1m

	<i>e.g. Source E is not surprising because it is from someone in the Soviet government and he should know the truth.</i> <i>e.g. Sources D and E are different in stating that the USA was able to bring peace to Europe. D states that USA was able to bring peace, while E states that US was actively sowing conflict among countries.</i>	
L2	Surprised/ Lack of surprise without explanation <i>e.g. Source E makes you surprised by Source D as they are different in stating that the USA was able to bring peace to Europe.</i>	2m
L3	Valid comparison, addressing surprise / not surprised <i>e.g. Source E makes me surprised by Source D as they are different in stating that the USA was able to bring peace to Europe. D states that USA was able to bring peace, while E states that US was actively sowing conflict among countries. In D, it shows a big factory with a smoke cloud containing the words 'Marshall Self-Help Plan' being placed next to an empty plot of land called Western Europe. It wanted to show that the Marshall Plan was able to bring about positive industrial outcomes for western Europe should these countries take up the policy. However, in Source E, it states that USA did not bring peace but conflict. The cartoon depicted the USA as the 'warmongers'.</i> <i>As E shows that US is belligerent and responsible for creating conflict, it disagrees with D, and thus E makes me surprised with D.</i>	3m
L4	Surprised / Not surprised, based on cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge <i>e.g. After cross referencing to my contextual knowledge, Source E continues to make me surprised by Source D. I know that Stalin was appalled and angered by the Marshall plan and was worried that the US would try to advance into Eastern Europe and threaten Soviet control. This agrees with how USA was portrayed in the source. This supports E's portrayal that USA was a warmonger that was sowing discord among nations, and disagrees with D. Hence, E makes me surprised with D.</i> <i>e.g. After cross referencing Source B, Source E makes me surprised by D. Source B agrees with E that the Marshall Plan was able to bring peace to Europe. This is evident from 'U.S. tries to force its will on independent nations' and that US had used the Marshall Plan as 'political weapons' and has 'violated' the United Nations' 'resolution'. This shows that US was creating tension and unrest on the global centre stage, causing a loss of peace in the world, which would include Europe. Similarly, E states that US did not bring peace to Europe by being 'warmongers' with its 'Western Bloc'. As such, Source E continues to make me surprised by D.</i> <i>Note: Cannot cross-reference to Sources C and F because they focused on Western Europe, whereas Source E focuses on US being a warmonger in the world as that had Western Europe under its influence.</i>	4-5m

L5	L4+ Surprised / Not surprised, based on evaluation of D to its purpose and context e.g. Source D does not make me surprised with E when I consider their backgrounds. D is an American cartoonist, and would thus be a supporter of democracy in the rising Cold War tensions in 1947. US was combating the iron curtain that had fallen in Europe from 1946 onwards, where Eastern European countries taken over by Stalin were subjected to communist authoritarian rule. The American cartoonist portrayed the Marshall plan in a positive light in bringing actual improvements in Europe. This is evident from the cartoon where US was portrayed as a 'peace-monger' to counter the term warmonger used by USSR. On the other hand, the Soviet cartoon was meant to portray USA in a negative light to dissuade locals and others in the Soviet empire from falling into the trap of the USA. Stalin was worried about NATO and regarded it as a military threat to the Soviet empire. As such, he tightened control of the Soviet empire and continued to portray USA as aggressors in the Cold War rivalry.	6m

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

'The main aim of the Marshall Plan was to achieve economic recovery in Europe.'
 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. e.g. <i>USA's main aim was to achieve economic recovery in Europe as seen in the Marshall Plan that it implemented.</i>	1m
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use. (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.) Y – Sources C, D, F No – Sources A, B, C, E Yes <i>e.g. Source C supports the statement. The US wanted to ensure that Europe recovered so that the European nations would be able to thrive</i>	2-4m

economically. This is seen from 'Without further prompt and substantial aid from the United States, economic, social and political disintegration will overwhelm Europe.' and 'in order to save Europe from starvation and chaos'. This means that US wanted Europe to have economic progress to improve European lives.

e.g. Source D supports the statement. The US wanted to bring industrialization to Europe with the Marshall self-help plan. This is seen from the huge factory placed next to Western Europe, which it wants the Western European countries to accept. Hence, it is prioritizing western Europe's economic growth.

e.g. Source F supports the statement. The US had set aside budget to help war-torn countries rebuild their societies. This is evident from the term used for the aid 'economic recovery program' and 'helped recipient countries recover from the devastation caused by World War II.' Hence it had the intention of improving the situation in Europe.

OR

No

e.g. Source A does not support the statement. US' main aim was to combat USSR rivalry and Communist threats in the world. This is evident from 'an unlimited expenditure aimed at opposing Communist expansion.' The US wanted to help Greece and Turkey so that these countries would not become communist regimes. Hence, it was out of self-interest to be a stronger superpower compared to USSR.

e.g. Source B does not support the statement. The US' main aim was to preserve self-serving interests. This is seen from 'Instead, the U.S. tries to force its will on independent nations. It openly uses economic aid meant for needy countries as a tool for political pressure.' This means that USA was exploiting the economic weakness of European countries to achieve its goals of becoming a strong superpower.

e.g. Source C does not support the statement. The US wanted to ensure that Europe recovered so that USA would not be dragged down too. This is evident from "Aside from the awful implications which this would have for the future peace and security of the world, the immediate effects on our domestic economy would be disastrous" This means that US wanted to safeguard against any possible danger to its own economy and hence offered financial aid to other countries.

e.g. Source E does not support the statement. US' main aim was to start conflict in the world. This is evident from the small pirate boat that represents USA and its allies in NATO. They were portrayed as warmongers who sought to bring Western Europe under its sphere of influence through NATO, while the USSR was seen as the strong defender of peace.

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.) e.g. Both sides of L2. 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>e.g. Source E is unreliable as USSR tightly controlled the media and the Soviet cartoon would portray cartoons in alignment with its objectives in order to convince the Soviet people to believe USSR's cold war propaganda that USSR was protecting peace in the world, and USA was its enemy that sought to destroy it. Stalin saw the NATO alliance as a military threat, as NATO had provided US forces with secure bases in Europe. US was perceived as being aggressive, and USSR sought to internalize this message in its people. As such, in the cartoon, the USA was portrayed as an illegitimate pirate that sought to fight with other countries. This makes Source A biased, and thus unreliable. (+1)</i>	5-8m
----	---	------

Section B: Essays

- 2 'The main consequence of the Korean War was the division of Korea along the 38th parallel.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the main consequence of the Korean War as the division of Korea along the 38th parallel or other consequences (Award 1m for identifying 1 turning point, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing 1 turning point, 3m for describing 2 or more.) <i>e.g. A main consequence of the Korean War was it significantly intensified the Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, with far-reaching consequences beyond the Korean peninsula.</i>	1-3m
L2	Explains how the main consequence of the Korean War was the division of Korea along the 38th parallel OR Explains how other main consequence(s) of the Korean War (Award 4m for an explanation for how main consequence of the Korean War was the division of Korea along the 38th parallel (OR) how other other main	4-5m

	consequence(s) of the Korean War, and an additional mark for additional turning point(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5m.) <i>e.g. Yes, I agree that the main consequence of the Korean War was the division of Korea along the 38th parallel <u>because the armistice of 1953 cemented a division that has lasted to the present day, shaping the lives of millions of Koreans.</u> When the war ended in 1953, Korea remained divided roughly along the 38th parallel, with a communist North Korea under Kim Il Sung and a non-communist South Korea backed by the United States. The DMZ was created between North and South Korea, where both sides move their troops back about two kilometres from the border along the Military Demarcation Line. This division meant that Korean families were separated, and the two halves of the peninsula developed in completely different directions politically and economically. The continued division of Korea is one of the most visible and enduring outcomes of the war, making the division along the 38th parallel the main consequence of the Korean War.</i> OR <i>e.g. No, I disagree that the division of Korea was the main consequence of the Korean War <u>because the war significantly intensified the Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, with far-reaching consequences beyond the Korean peninsula.</u> The Korean War demonstrated that the Cold War could turn into a hot war, with the two superpowers supporting opposing sides in a military conflict. Military alliances along the Cold War rivalry lines were further extended beyond NATO, as seen in USA's extension of its anti-communist alliances around the world like the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organisation in Central Asia and the Middle East. (Pg 94). The USSR also set up its own alliance, the Warsaw Pact. It led the United States to significantly increase its defence spending and strengthen its military alliances around the world, including in Asia. It also deepened American hostility towards communist China, which had intervened in the war on the side of North Korea, thus intensifying the Cold War rivalry</i> <i>Other reasons: Accelerated the rearmament of Japan and transformed it into a key American ally in Asia</i>	
L3	Explains how the main consequence of the Korean War was the division of Korea along the 38th parallel AND Explains how other main consequence(s) of the Korean War (Award 6m for an explanation for how main consequence of the Korean War was the division of Korea along the 38th parallel (OR) how other other main consequence(s) of the Korean War, and an additional mark for additional turning point(s) or 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.	+2m

	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>I agree that the division of Korean along the 38th parallel was the main consequence of the Korean War. This is because the tensions continue to be present between the two Koreas, where negative spillover effects into neighbouring regions happen when North Korea threaten South Korea with attacks. On the other hand, the Cold War has long ended, and formal military alliances like SEATO and the Warsaw Pact no longer exist. As such, when considering the length of impact, the division is the main consequence.</i>	
--	--	--

- 3 'The main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism was the introduction of the Malayan Union.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the Malayan Union as the reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism 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. The loss of British prestige following the Japanese Occupation had already awakened a desire among locals to assert themselves and move away from British control.</i>	1-3m
L2	Explains how main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism was the introduction of the Malayan Union OR Explains how other reason(s) contributed to the rise of Malayan nationalism (Award 4m for an explanation main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism was the introduction of the Malayan Union (OR) how other reason(s) contributed to the rise of Malayan nationalism, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 m.) <i>e.g. Yes, I agree that the introduction of the Malayan Union was the main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism <u>because it directly threatened the political rights of the Malay people, pushing them to take action.</u> The Union proposed to strip the Sultans of their sovereignty, reducing them to figureheads with no real authority over their own states. The British rule would become direct in all states. The Malayan Union also removed Malay special rights and placed Malays on equal footing with other communities in terms of citizenship, which many Malays felt was deeply unfair. <u>This pushed the Malay community into political action, leading to the formation of UMNO in 1946 under Dato Onn Jaafar, which united Malays across different states in opposition to the Union. Since the Malayan Union directly caused such widespread and organised resistance, it was therefore the main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism.</u></i> OR	4-5m

	<u>e.g. No, I disagree that the introduction of the Malayan Union was the main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism because the loss of British prestige following the Japanese Occupation had already awakened a desire among locals to assert themselves and move away from British control. The swift fall of Singapore in 1942 and Japan's occupation of Malaya showed that the British were not an unbeatable colonial power. This made locals far less willing to accept British authority without question. The fact that Malays pushed back strongly against MacMichael's forceful methods of pressuring the Sultans to sign the Malayan Union treaties shows that a broader political awakening had already taken place before the Union was even introduced. The Malays also put pressure on the British by adopting a policy of non-cooperation and pressurise the British to adopt a pro-Malay scheme (Pg.157). Hence, the Japanese Occupation was therefore an important reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism.</u> <i>Other factor: Locals were already driven by a desire to protect Malaya's economic resources for the benefit of the Malayan people</i>	
L3	Explains how main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism was the introduction of the Malayan Union AND Explains how other reason(s) contributed to the rise of Malayan nationalism (Award 6m for an explanation main reason for the rise of Malayan nationalism was the introduction of the Malayan Union (OR) how other reason(s) contributed to the rise of Malayan nationalism, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.) <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> In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. While the Malays were willing to defend the political rights of the Malay people because those rights were threatened, it was because of the awakening that they gained from the Japanese Occupation. It was a paradigm shift that enabled them to consider alternatives that they previously would not have considered. Such a shift was powerful, as the Japanese Occupation not only made the Malays more empowered, it also made the British feel that they had less authority and credibility to fully say no the Malays after becoming defeated by the Japanese. Hence, it was the root cause that made the Malays be daring against the British in standing up for their rights.	+2m

- 4 'The main cause of the First Indochina War was the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the main cause of the First Indochina War was the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule 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. Refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule <u>because the Vietnamese, led by Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Minh, were determined to resist French attempts to reassert colonial control over Vietnam after World War Two</u></i>	1-3m
L2	Explains how the main cause of the First Indochina War was the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule OR Explains other cause(s) of the First Indochina War (Award 4m for an explanation of the main cause of the First Indochina War as the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule (OR) other cause(s) of the First Indochina War, and an additional mark for additional turning point(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5m.) <i>E.g. Yes, I agree that the main cause of the First Indochina War was the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule <u>because the Vietnamese, led by Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Minh, were determined to resist French attempts to reassert colonial control over Vietnam after World War Two. When the French returned to Vietnam in 1945 after the end of Japanese occupation, Ho Chi Minh had already declared Vietnamese independence. The Viet Minh refused to accept a return to French colonial rule and took up arms against the French, launching a guerrilla war that marked the beginning of the First Indochina War. The Vietnamese people's strong desire for independence and their unwillingness to submit to French authority meant that conflict was unavoidable. The Vietnamese refusal to accept French rule directly triggered the outbreak of armed conflict as the French retaliated to crush the Vietnamese and control Vietnam. It was therefore a main cause of the First Indochina War.</u></i> OR <i>e.g. No, I disagree that the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule was the main cause of the First Indochina War <u>because the French determination to reassert colonial control over Vietnam was a important cause of the conflict. After World War Two, France was determined to reclaim its empire in Indochina, viewing it as essential to restoring French prestige and economic interests following the humiliation of German occupation during the war. The French refused to recognise Vietnamese independence and sent troops back to Vietnam to reimpose colonial rule. Despite signing the preliminary agreement in March 1946 with Vietnam where it agreed to withdraw the French forces from Vietnam within five years, it did not do so. On the contrary, the French strengthened its military and political position in Vietnam. It was this French insistence on returning to Indochina that made conflict inevitable, as it left the Vietnamese with no peaceful path to independence, leading to the start of the First Indochina War.</u></i>	4-5m

	<i>Other factor: Impact of the Japanese occupation of Vietnam during World War Two had already set the conditions for conflict by weakening French authority and strengthening the Vietnamese independence movement</i>	
L3	Explains how the main cause of the First Indochina War was the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule AND Explains other cause(s) of the First Indochina War (Award 6m for an explanation of the main cause of the First Indochina War as the refusal of the Vietnamese to accept French rule (OR) other cause(s) of the First Indochina War, and an additional mark for additional turning point(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]</i> <i>E.g. In conclusion, I agree with the statement. The defiance of the Vietnamese people was the main reason for the outbreak of the First Indochina War. Although the French had superior military strength and offered political concessions, these efforts failed to stop the Vietnamese from fighting for independence. The Vietnamese remained determined to achieve independence and refused to accept French rule despite the French's use of force. Therefore, the French's actions alone could not explain the outbreak of the war. Instead, the Vietnamese people's determination to resist French rule was the root factor that led to the outbreak of the First Indochina War.</i>	+2m