Name		Class				Index Number		

BROADRICK SECONDARY SCHOOL
SECONDARY 4 EXPRESS [HISTORY]
PRELIMINARY EXAM 2024

HUMANITIES **2261/02**

Paper 2 History August 2024

Additional Materials: Humanities Writing Booklets 1 hour 50 minutes

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST
Write your name, class and index number on all the work you hand in.
Write in dark blue or black pen on both sides of the writing paper.
Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Section A
Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B
Answer any **two** Questions.

Write all your answers in the Humanities Writing Booklets provided.
Answer each section in a new booklet.
Begin each answer on a fresh page.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.
The total number of marks for this paper is 50.

Target Grade:
Actual Grade:
For Examiner's Use
50

Parent's Signature: _____

This document consists of **6** printed pages, including this cover page.

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

Question 1 is **compulsory** 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 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 this source as evidence of Hitler's aim for Germany? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Source B.

Are you surprised by the view expressed by Lord Halifax in Source B? Explain your answer. [5]

(c) Study Sources C and D.

How far does Source C prove that Chamberlain (Source D) was wrong about Hitler? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Source E and F.

Do these two sources agree with one another? Explain your answer. [6]

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

'Hitler alone is to be blamed for Germany's road to World War II in Europe.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

Is only Hitler to be blamed for Germany's road to World War II in Europe?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

On coming to power in 1933, Hitler found it necessary to pursue a cautious foreign policy while consolidating his power at home. Between 1933 and 1935, Hitler had begun to undermine the armaments limitation clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. In 1937, Hitler stepped up the pace. The Hossbach Memorandum of November records a meeting between Hitler and his chiefs of staff in which Hitler stated that Germany must be prepared for war with the western powers, especially France, by 1942-1943 latest. The policy that Britain and France adopted was appeasement even though they were aware of the potential threat posed by Hitler. However, on 3 September 1939, Britain and France declared war on Germany. World War II in Europe had begun.

Is only Hitler to be blamed for Germany's road to World War II in Europe?

Source A: *A British cartoon published in 1939 in a magazine, titled,* "Germany shall never be encircled".



"GERMANY SHALL NEVER BE ENCIRCLED."

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

Source B: *A diary entry by a British politician, Henry Channon, 1937. Channon's diary entry is referring to Lord Halifax's first visit to Nazi Germany in November 1937. Lord Halifax was one of Britain's most senior politicians.*

I had a long conversation with Lord Halifax about Germany and his recent visit. He told me he liked all the Nazi leaders, even Goebbels, and he was much impressed, interested and amused by the visit. He thinks the regime is absolutely fantastic, perhaps even too fantastic to be taken seriously. But he is very glad that he went, and thinks positively of the leadership.

Source C: *An online extract from a historical website on Hitler's foreign policy and his road to war.*

At the meeting, Hitler discussed his plans for foreign policy in the years ahead. Here, according to Hossbach*, Hitler stated that the time for a war for *Lebensraum*** was near.

Hitler declared that the primary targets for this desired 'living space' were Austria and Czechoslovakia. The question, Hitler stated, was not if, but when and how.

Hitler also identified a time frame in which the war for *Lebensraum* would ideally take place: 1943-45. At this stage, the Nazis believed that the German industry would be fully mobilised for war. Hitler declared that action could possibly take place before this date if other countries had internal problems that would make the war for *Lebensraum* easier.

***Hossbach** - The Hossbach Memorandum was a note compiled by Colonel Count Friedrich Hossbach of a secret meeting between Hitler and his top military and political leadership on 5 November 1937.

****Lebensraum** – living space

Source D: *An adapted extract from a historian's account, published in 2012.*

Chamberlain was well aware that key members of the German elite felt that Hitler was trying to drive Germany into war. But when British Cabinet members discussed German foreign policy on 30 August 1938, they were less certain in their own view. Other intelligence – like the opinion of the British Ambassador to Berlin – Sir Nevile Henderson – argued against Hitler being determined to cause another European conflict. Even Chamberlain and his Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, simply couldn't believe that a chancellor of Germany, and thus leader of a cultured European nation, could actually want another war.

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

Source E: *A cartoon published in the USA, October 1930. It shows Hitler (wearing a "Hitler Party" headgear) coming out of the paper roll of the Versailles Treaty.*



Source F: *From the Programme of the German Workers' Party, February 1920*

1. We demand the union of all Germans, on the basis of the right of the self-determination of peoples, to form a Great Germany.
2. We demand equality of rights for the German people in its dealings with other nations, and abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles and Saint-Germain.
3. We demand land and territory (colonies) for the nourishment of our people and for settling our surplus population.

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

2 'The London Naval Conference, 1930 was the main reason that allowed the Japanese military to gain greater control of the government.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

3 'The Marshall Plan, 1947, was the main event that escalated the cold war tensions between the superpowers in the 1940s.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

4 'The Tet Offensive, 1968, was the main reason that made the USA government lose popular support from its American public.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- End of Paper -

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A: https://www.loc.gov/item/2009631849/
Source B: http://www.adespicabletruce.org.uk/page59.html
Source C: https://www.theholocaustexplained.org/life-in-nazi-occupied-europe/foreign-policy-and-the-road-to-war/
Source D: Rees, L. "Hitler's Charisma: Leading Millions Into the Abyss" Pantheon Books, 2012
Source E: https://hti.osu.edu/opper/lesson-plans/treaty-of-versailles/images/the-source
Source F: J. Remak (ed.), The Nazi Years (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp.28-29

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

[Elective History]
2024 BRD Sec 4 Express Prelims

Section A
Source Based Case Study

(a) Study Source A.

How useful is this source as evidence of Hitler's aim for Germany?
Explain your answer. [5]

L1	**Answer based on provenance or based on unexplained assertions** E.g. Source A is useful as it was published in a British magazine.	1
L2	**Useful or Not useful based what it tells about Hitler's aim for Germany, supported with evidence** *Award 2m for one aspect (useful OR not useful)* E.g. This source is useful because it tells me that Hitler's aim for Germany was to gain control over the world so that Germany is never again subjugated by another power. This is evident from Hitler putting his arms around the large globe of the world and trying to exercise control over as much territories as he can possibly cover and the cartoon says "Germany shall never be encircled". [2] OR E.g. This source is not useful because it is the viewpoint of the British so naturally it would be biased to say that the Hitler's aims for Germany was to gain control over the world so that Germany is never again subjugated by another power. This is evident from Hitler putting his arms around the large globe of the world and trying to exercise control over as much territories as he can possibly cover and the cartoon says "Germany shall never be encircled". [2]	2
L3	**Useful based on brief context of 1939 or Useful + Not useful** E.g. This source is useful because Hitler has already shown an aggressive form of nationalism by 1939 so the source also shows how his aim for Germany was to gain control over the world so that Germany is never again subjugated by another power. This is evident from Hitler putting his arms around the large globe of the world and trying to exercise control over as much territories as he can possibly cover and the cartoon says "Germany shall never be encircled".	3

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

L4	**Answers which argue that the source is useful based on assertions about Hitler's expansionist foreign policy (must have the word/term "reliable"). Cross-reference to contextual knowledge or other sources. (Source C / E / F)** E.g. This source is useful because it tells me that Hitler's aim for Germany was to gain control over the world so that Germany is never again subjugated by another power. This is evident from Hitler putting his arms around the large globe of the world and trying to exercise control over as much territories as he can possibly cover and the cartoon says "Germany shall never be encircled". Source A is useful because it is reliable as it is supported by my contextual knowledge where I know that Hitler had lost no time in imposing his expansionist foreign policy in Europe and by 1939, Germany had already invaded many parts of Europe such as Austria, Sudetenland and the whole of Czechoslovakia by claiming that Germany was only defending itself from being encircled.	4
L5	**Answers which argue that the source is useful based on assertions about Hitler's expansionist foreign policy (must have the word/term "reliable"). Uses evaluation of the author's purpose to decide on utility and reliability.** E.g. This source is useful because it tells me that Hitler's aim for Germany was to gain control over the world so that Germany is never again subjugated by another power. This is evident from Hitler putting his arms around the large globe of the world and trying to exercise control over as much territories as he can possibly cover and the cartoon says, "Germany shall never be encircled". Coming from a British cartoonist, this was a useful source because it is reliable in revealing Hitler's ultimate true desire for Germany. It was likely that the cartoon was drawn to criticize Hitler's manipulations in his official claim on his aggressive foreign policy to prevent Germany from being encircled. Yet his aggressive actions would now let him gain even more control, encircle and take-over the whole world. The cartoonist was probably warning the British government not to continue with the policy of appeasement with Hitler because he cannot be trusted.	5

(b) Study Source B.

Are you surprised by the view expressed by Lord Halifax in Source B?
Explain your answer. [5]

L1	**Provenance or unexplained assertions or answers which do not consider the concept of surprise** E.g. Yes, I am surprised because it was not possible for Lord Halifax to say this.	1
L2	**Surprised / Not surprised based on content, supported**	2-3

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	Award 3 marks only if there is an attempt at an explanation of how the content is or is not surprising. E.g. Yes, I am surprised because Lord Halifax held Hitler in such high regard and truly believed in the good of his leadership. This is seen from "He told me he liked all the Nazi leaders" and "But he is very glad that he went, and thinks positively of the leadership." [2] It is surprising to see British officials being so supportive of Hitler. [3] OR E.g. No, I am not surprised because it is possible for Hitler to convince Lord Halifax that he was a trustworthy and capable leader of Germany. This is seen from "He told me he liked all the Nazi leaders" and "But he is very glad that he went, and thinks positively of the leadership." [2] It is not surprising because even the British officials had misjudged Hitler. [3]	
L3	**Not surprised / Surprised, based on cross-referencing to contextual knowledge or other sources** E.g. I am not surprised because it is possible for Hitler to convince Lord Halifax that he was a trustworthy and capable leader of Germany and for Lord Halifax to believe in the good of Hitler's leadership. This is seen from "He told me he liked all the Nazi leaders" and "But he is very glad that he went, and thinks positively of the leadership." From my contextual knowledge, while Hitler was planning for a massive rearmament programme to build up Germany's defences from 1933, he kept emphasising to the Allies that he was a supporter of peace and progress in order to allay their fears. Since my contextual knowledge supports what Source B says, so it is not at all surprising to see Lord Halifax expressing happy and appeased views about Hitler and Nazi Germany. OR E.g. I am surprised by the view expressed by Lord Halifax in Source A because it looks as though Britain really likes Germany and believed that both countries would work well together. This is seen from, "But he is very glad that he went, and thinks positively of the leadership." However, Source E challenges the view in Source B because it suggests that even from 1930, there were views in the USA that Hitler was not a man to be trusted because he was clearly defying the Treaty of Versailles and trying to make Germany bigger and stronger. So it is surprising that Lord Halifax in 1937 still believes in the goodness of the German regime and want to work with them. This is evident from Source E where Hitler crawls out bigger and stronger from the Treaty of Versailles which is unable to contain him.	4
L4	**Not surprised, based on context of 1930s.**	5

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	E.g. I am not surprised because it is possible for Hitler to convince Lord Halifax that he was a trustworthy and capable leader of Germany. This is seen from "He told me he liked all the Nazi leaders" and "But he is very glad that he went, and thinks positively of the leadership." Coming from the context of 1930s, Britain was in a pacifist mood because of the devastation in the aftermath of WWII. Many British were publicly disgusted towards war and Lord Halifax, as one of the senior politicians in the British government, would have realized that there was not much public support in a war against Germany. Lord Halifax was a firm advocator of the appeasement policy that was adopted by Britain from 1935. Moreover, Lord Halifax would have felt that Hitler was not considered a threat since he showed himself to be strongly anti-communist. He would have already been much inclined to accept the actions of Germany and be willingly and easily convinced by Hitler's repeated emphasis on supposedly keeping the peace in Europe. Hence, it is not at all surprising to see Lord Halifax airing such positive views of Hitler and Nazi Germany.	

(c) Study Sources C and D.

How far does Source C prove that Chamberlain (Source D) was wrong about Hitler? Explain your answer. [6]

L1	**Yes/No: Answers based on underdeveloped provenance** E.g. Yes, Source C proves that Chamberlain was wrong as it was said by Hitler so of course he will prove that Chamberlain was wrong.	1
L2	**They agree / are similar, so Source C does not prove Chamberlain was wrong** E.g. No, both sources agree with one another / are similar, so Source C does not prove that Chamberlain was wrong about Hitler. Both sources say that Hitler alone was the one who was trying to wage WWII in Europe / to be blamed for causing WWII in Europe. This is evident from Source C, "Hitler discussed his plans for foreign policy in the years ahead." And from Source D, "Chamberlain was well aware that key members of the German elite felt that Hitler was trying to drive Germany into war."	2
L3	**They disagree / are different, so Source C proves Chamberlain was wrong** e.g. Yes, Source C disagrees with Source D / are different, so Source C proves that Chamberlain was wrong about Hitler. Source C clearly shows that Hitler was already trying to wage WWII in Europe as early as 1937 / was to be blamed for causing WWII in Europe but Chamberlain in Source D was still in a state of denial, refusing to believe that Hitler was capable or was wanting to wage war in Europe / Chamberlain is to be blamed for allowing Hitler to wage WWII in Europe. This is evident from Source C, "Hitler discussed his plans for foreign policy in the years ahead." From Source D,	3

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	"Even Chamberlain and his Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, simply couldn't believe that a chancellor of Germany, and thus leader of a cultured European nation, could actually want another war."	
L4	**Both aspects of L2 and L3**	4
L5	**Identifies the disagreement, uses cross-reference to decide that Chamberlain was wrong (Evaluation of Source C done) [Reliability of Source C must be stated]** e.g. Yes, Source C disagrees with Source D / are different, so Source C proves that Chamberlain was wrong about Hitler. Source C clearly shows that Hitler was already trying to wage WWII in Europe as early as 1937 / was to be blamed for causing WWII in Europe but Chamberlain in Source D was still in a state of denial, refusing to believe that Hitler was capable or was wanting to wage war in Europe / Chamberlain is to be blamed for allowing Hitler to wage WWII in Europe. This is evident from Source C, "Hitler discussed his plans for foreign policy in the years ahead." From Source D, "Even Chamberlain and his Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, simply couldn't believe that a chancellor of Germany, and thus leader of a cultured European nation, could actually want another war." Moreover, Source C is a reliable source to prove that Chamberlain was wrong because Source C is supported by Source F. Source F also clearly indicates that Hitler himself was to be blamed as he himself was keen on expanding Germany's power right from 1920. This is evident from Source F, "We demand...abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles...We demand land and territory (colonies)". This shows that Hitler himself is to be blamed for causing WWII in Europe.	5
L6	**As in L5 but also uses Evaluation of D to decide whether Source C proves it wrong.** L5 + Moreover, Chamberlain (Source D) was really wrong about Hitler because you can clearly tell that he was an undecided and confused leader himself. He was initially already convinced by Hitler's own top officials that Hitler wants war in Europe but later on because of being influenced by his own British officials who had underestimated Hitler, then became uncertain of the foreign policy that Germany was undertaking. Appeasement was the wrong policy that Chamberlain had chosen because Hitler become more emboldened in demanding for more territories without being stopped by the League of Nations until it was too late and war had occurred in Europe.	6

(d) Study Source E and F.

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

Do these two sources agree with one another? Explain your answer. [6]

L1	**Answers based on underdeveloped provenance** E.g. The two sources agree with one another as they are about Hitler and the German Workers' Party.	1
L2	**Basic Comparison - similarity or/and difference** Award 2m for one aspect and 3m for both similarity and difference (No mention of the Treaty / Even if mentioned, nothing much elaborated) E.g. The two sources agree because they are both similar in suggesting that Hitler was keen on going against the Treaty of Versailles / Hitler was going to expand Germany's power in Europe. This is from Source E where Hitler crawls out bigger and stronger from the Treaty of Versailles which is unable to contain him. And from Source F, "We demand...abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles...We demand land and territory (colonies)".[2] OR/AND E.g. The two sources disagree because they are different. Source E suggests that Hitler was no longer under the control of the Treaty of Versailles which was unable to contain him, but Source F suggests that he was still under the control of the Treaty since he was demanding all his rights and still protesting against the terms of the Treaty. This is from Source E where Hitler crawls out bigger and stronger from the Treaty of Versailles which is unable to contain him. And from Source F, "We demand...abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles...We demand land and territory (colonies)".[3]	2-3
L3	**Comparison which highlights the fault of the Treaty of Versailles and Hitler is paving Germany's road to WWII due to him wanting to break the Treaty.** E.g. The two sources agree because they are both similar in suggesting that it was the Treaty of Versailles has resulted in Hitler's desire to expand Germany's power in Europe. This is from Source E where Hitler crawls out bigger and stronger from the Treaty of Versailles which is unable to contain him. And from Source F, "We demand...abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles...We demand land and territory (colonies)".	4
L4	**As in L3 + difference in purpose**	5-6

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	E.g. L3 + The two sources are different in purposes. Source E wants to convince the American citizens in 1930 to believe that Hitler is planning to disobey all the terms of the Treaty and he is not a leader to be trusted in 1930 or in future as he is going to violate all the terms of the Treaty. This was done so that the Americans would be more aware of the dangers of Hitler and the Nazi Party and pressurise their government to be cautious in USA's own diplomatic approach in dealing with Germany. This is from Source E where Hitler crawls out bigger and stronger from the Treaty of Versailles which is unable to contain him. However, Source F is different as it wants to convince the German workers in 1920 to believe that Hitler was the right leader for them as he will do more things to restore the national pride and glory to the German people, to be treated as equals again and to expand Germany's lands. This is done so that the German workers will actively support Hitler and the party for their own interests and for the improvement of Germany. [5] This is from Source F, "We demand...abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles...We demand land and territory (colonies)". [6]	

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

'Hitler alone is to be blamed for Germany's road to World War II in Europe.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

L1	**Writes about the hypothesis, but no valid source use** E.g. Yes, Hiter alone is to be blamed. He was trying to invade many countries and he started on his conscription and rearmament from 1933.	1
L2	**Yes OR No, supported by valid source use.** *Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.* **YES (Sources A, C, D, E, F)** E.g. Yes, Source A supports that Hitler alone is to be blamed as it suggests that Hitler had a clear and decisive plan in mind for waging an aggressive foreign policy in Europe which consists of taking over as many territories such as possible so that Germany is never again subjugated by another power. This is evident from Hitler putting his arms around the large globe of the world and trying to exercise control over all that he can possibly cover and the cartoon	2-4

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

says "Germany shall never be encircled".[2]

E.g. Yes, Source C supports that Hitler alone is to be blamed as it clearly shows that Hitler was already trying to wage WWII in Europe as early as 1937 and was already making concrete plans with his German officials. This is evident from Source C, "Hitler discussed his plans for foreign policy in the years ahead."[3]

E.g. Yes, Source D supports that Hitler alone is to be blamed as it suggests that even the top officials in Germany had recognised that their leader, Hitler, was trying to push his country to wage WWII in Europe. This is evident from Source D, "Chamberlain was well aware that key members of the German elite felt that Hitler was trying to drive Germany into war."[4]

E.g. Yes, Source E supports that Hitler alone is to be blamed this view as it suggests that he was keen on going against the Treaty of Versailles and was going to expand Germany's power in Europe. This is from Source E where Hitler crawls out bigger and stronger from the Treaty of Versailles which is unable to contain him.[4]

E.g. Yes, Source F supports that Hitler alone is to be blamed as he himself was keen on expanding Germany's power right from 1920. This is evident from Source F, "We demand...abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles...We demand land and territory (colonies)".[4]

NO (Sources B, D, E, F)

E.g. No, Source B does not support this view. It suggests that it was the misjudgement of Britain towards Hitler that was to be blamed for Germany's road to WWII in Europe. Lord Halifax in Source B showed that Britain really liked Germany. This is seen from, "But he is very glad that he went, and thinks positively of the leadership."[2]

E.g. No, Source D does not support this view. It suggests that it was the misjudgement of Britain towards Hitler that was to be blamed for Germany's road to WWII in Europe. Chamberlain in Source D was still in a state of denial, refusing to believe that Hitler was capable or was wanting to wage war in Europe. From Source D, "Even Chamberlain and his Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, simply couldn't believe that a chancellor of Germany, and thus leader of a cultured European nation, could actually want another war."[3]

E.g. No, Source E does not support this view. It suggests that it was the Treaty of Versailles that was to be blame for WWII since it resulted in Hitler's desire to expand Germany's power in Europe. This is from Source E where Hitler crawls out bigger and stronger from the Treaty of Versailles which is unable to

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	contain him.[4] E.g. No, Source F does not support this view. It suggests that it was the Treaty of Versailles that was to be blame for WWII since it resulted in Hitler's desire to retaliate aggressively against the unfairness of the terms and wanting to expand Germany's power in Europe. From Source F, "We demand...abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles...We demand land and territory (colonies)".[4]	
L3	**Yes AND no, supported by valid source use.** *Award 5m for one Yes and No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a max of 7m.* **For L2 and L3, award up to 2 bonus marks *(+1/+1)* for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark for the question must not exceed 8 marks.** e.g. L2 + Moreover, when I relook at Source A, even though it was a political cartoon published by the British to criticize Hitler's ambitions, it remains a reliable source to prove that Hitler alone was to be blamed for WWII in Europe. Hitler had manipulated Germany's desire not to be subjugated by other powers and took it to a whole new level by aggressively controlling even more territories in the world. Hitler's aggressive foreign policy did not change from the start right up to the end of WWII in Europe in 1945. [+1]	5-8

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

2	'The London Naval Conference, 1930 was the main reason that allowed the Japanese military to gain greater control of the government.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
L1	**Identifies/Describes the event or other events** *Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.* E.g. The London Naval Conference, 1930 would have paved the way to allow the Japanese military to gain greater control of the government. The civilian government was forced to sign the London Naval Conference despite it being highly unfavourable to Japan because the government believed that Japan was not ready to confront the Western powers. [2] Other reasons include the Mukden Incident, 1931 which saw the Kwantung Army blowing up railway tracks at Mukden. [3]	1-3
L2	**Explains how the event OR Explains how other event(s) escalated the gain in greater control of the government** *Award 4 marks for a basic explanation of the given factor OR how other factor(s) escalated the reason and an additional mark for additional factors or developed explanation, to a maximum of 5 marks.* E.g. The London Naval Conference, 1930 would have paved the way to allow the Japanese military to gain greater control of the government. This is because the failure of the civilian government in achieving its initial aims of reviewing the 1922 Washington Naval Conference made the military powers and the citizens very discontented with the civilian government. The civilian government was forced to sign the London Naval Conference despite it being highly unfavourable to Japan because the government believed that Japan was not ready to confront the Western powers. Thus, it paved the way to the increased rise in militarism as the military felt the only way to defend Japan's interests was to adopt a more aggressive foreign policy. For instance, Japan has demanded to build more warships but it was rejected by the Western powers.[4] Even when several Japanese ministers in the Cabinet refused to agree to the terms of the treaty, they were removed from their positions. However, it was presented in the press and by the navy commanders as a form of betrayal by the civilian government.	4-5

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	This shifted the citizens' trust from the civilian government to the military government, paving the way to the rise of militarism in Japan by the 1930s. [5] e.g. The Mukden Incident in 1931 would have paved the way to allow the Japanese military to gain greater control of the government. This is because the successful invasion of Manchuria by the Japanese army was extremely welcomed and popular with the Japanese public. The Japanese media also hyped up the invasion, touting it as a divine wind bringing about a new spirit of solidarity. Many of the Japanese citizens saw Manchuria as a solution to Japan's economic problems and believed it to be a watershed in foreign and domestic policies. These gave further impetus to the rising Japanese military in initiating a new era of territorial expansionism. For instance, the Kwantung Army took foreign policy into its own hands in September 1931 and blew up the railway tracks at Mukden and shifted the blame onto the Chinese government. [4] The Army took control over Manchuria and renamed it Manchukuo. In reality, the Prime Minister and the civilian government in Japan were unable to control Ishiwara (the Colonel in charge of the Kwantung Army) and his supporters. This gave the military even more say in Japan's foreign policy.[5]	
L3	**Explains how the given factor AND Explains how other reason(s) contributed to increasing tensions** *Award 6-8 marks for an explanation of given factor and another factor.* *Or* *Award 8 marks for three explained factors.* e.g. As L2 plus: [8] *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).* e.g. As L3 plus: In conclusion, the London Naval Conference, 1930 was the contributing factor that paved the way to allow the Japanese military to gain greater control of the government. Japan's inability to confront the Western Powers even in view of the unfairness of the Treaty and the media and the naval commanders portrayal of the ultimate betrayal by their own civilian government made it clear that it was time for the Japanese military to take matters into their own hands to protect the national interests of Japan. However, it was the Muken Incident, 1931 that was the primary decisive factor that allowed the Japanese military to shine and gain immense popularity with the Japanese public and	6-8

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	cemented the start of gaining even greater control of the civilian government. The successful invasion of Manchuria by the military, with its rich natural resources became hyped up by the Japanese press as being key to Japan's livelihood and its prosperity. In the context of all the international economic threats and the Great Depression that hit Japan, the Japanese military's invasion of Mukden and the control of Manchuria gave it even greater say in Japan's foreign policy. [+2]	

3	'The Marshall Plan, 1947, was the main event that escalated the cold war tensions between the superpowers in the 1940s.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
L1	**Identifies/Describes the event or other events** *Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.* E.g. The Marshall Plan was presented by the USA as a design to put Europe back on its feet with thousands of millions of dollars on offer, generally as a gift.[1] It was clear to Stalin and to many countries that the Plan offered hope to counter any appeal that communism might have. [2] Soviet control of Eastern Europe in the 1940s was another main reason that escalated the cold war tensions between the superpowers in the 1940s. Stalin adopted "salami tactics". [3]	1-3
L2	**Explains how the Marshall Plan OR Explains how other event(s) escalated the cold war tensions** *Award 4 marks for a basic explanation of the given factor OR how other factor(s) escalated the cold war tensions and an additional mark for additional factors or developed explanation, to a maximum of 5 marks.* e.g. The Marshall Plan, 1947, was the main event that escalated the cold war tensions between the superpowers in the 1940s. This is because it heightened the suspicions of Stalin who believed the USA was tying Western Europe to it the same way that USSR had controlled Eastern Europe. But to Stalin, this angered him as the USA did not need a defensive buffer in the way the USSR did. He was concerned that the US domination of Western Europe was the first step for it to advance into Eastern Europe and threaten Soviet control there. He was worried that Truman's involvement in Germany's quick recovery was to use Germany against the USSR. He denounced the Plan as a plot by which	4-5

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	imperialists could take over weak countries like central Europe and instructed the bloc to refuse it, thus worsening the fragile relationship between the superpowers. [4] For instance, the Marshall Plan was presented by the USA as a design to put Europe back on its feet with thousands of millions of dollars on offer, generally as a gift. It was clear to Stalin and to many countries that the Plan offered hope to counter any appeal that communism might have.[5] e.g. Soviet control of Eastern Europe in the 1940s was another main reason that escalated the cold war tensions between the superpowers in the 1940s. This is because despite the issue of Eastern Europe that had already caused earlier tensions at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, the situation between the superpowers continued to worsen. Stalin was determined to control the Eastern Europe governments to protect the USSR from future attacks. For instance, Stalin adopted "salami tactics" and removed political opponents and parties one by one to ensure that the communist governments led by politicians loyal to him took power across Eastern Europe. But to Truman, his actions were evidence that he was building an empire that would be detrimental to the democratic, capitalist ideology that the USA held onto. [4] Truman sought Churchill's assistance and Churchill's iron curtain speech alarmed many Americans as it warned them of the immediate dangers of the USSR. This quickly worsened the tensions between the superpowers.[5]	
L3	**Explains how the given factor AND Explains how other reason(s) contributed to increasing tensions** *Award 6-8 marks for an explanation of given factor and another factor.* *Or* *Award 8 marks for three explained factors.* e.g. As L2 plus: [8] *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).* e.g. As L3 plus: In conclusion, Soviet control of Eastern Europe was the contributing factor that resulted in the worsening tensions between the superpowers in the 1940s. Stalin's salami tactics caused fear to Truman as it meant that Eastern Europe was becoming a Communist controlled territory. Bugaria, Romania and even Poland quickly fell under Communism. It made Truman seek USA's old-time ally, Churchill's help in the Iron Curtain speech	6-8

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	which resulted in Containment policy of the USSR. However, it was the Marshall Plan that was the primary decisive event that quickly changed the ideological conflict into an economic one because it was widely seen by the USA's allies as an incredibly generous offer, thus binding the allies like Britain, France and even Italy closer together against communism. This immediately triggered a counter-reaction by Stalin in creating the Comecon in order to rival the USA's Marshall Plan and to prevent all the Communist states from any control or influence from the USA. Europe was now divided both politically and economically, thus widening and deepening even more mistrust between the superpowers. [+2]	

4	'The Tet Offensive, 1968, was the main reason that made the USA government lose popular support from its American public.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
L1	**Identifies/Describes the event or other events** *Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.* E.g. The Tet Offensive, 1968, was the main reason that made the USA government lose popular support from its American public. The Tet Offensive involved around 80,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnam Army troops that launched a surprise attack on the city of Hue and the US military base at Khe Sanh in the northern part of South Vietnam. [2] Other reasons include the role of the media which saw the American journalists showing graphic images of USA's involvement such as the "Saigon Execution". [3]	1-3
L2	**Explains how the event OR Explains how other event(s) escalated the loss of popular support from its American public** *Award 4 marks for a basic explanation of the given factor OR how other factor(s) escalated the loss and an additional mark for additional factors or developed explanation, to a maximum of 5 marks.* E.g. The Tet Offensive, 1968, was the main reason that made the USA government lose popular support from its American public. This is because despite the fact that the American and South Vietnamese troops being able to retake the lost towns, it still required large amounts of artillery and air power. It made the American public raise hard questions and doubt the legitimacy of the	4-5

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	US government sending hundreds of thousands of American troops and billions of dollars each year despite repeated assurances that victory in the Vietnam War was imminent. For instance, the American public questioned the facts that despite having so many troops and spending so much on the war, why had the communists been able to launch a major offensive that took US forces completely by surprise? [4] Also, whilst the South Vietnamese towns were retaken, it caused the deaths of many civilians and the ancient city of Hue was destroyed. [5] E.g. The role of the media was another reason. This is because evidence indicates the press is responsible for revealing the naked, uncensored truth regarding war to the American public. As news reports became increasingly negative, public opinion compelled the government to downsize troop deployment; therefore, forcing an adjustment to America's policy in Vietnam. For instance, the media showed the American public the horrors of the US government's tactics in Vietnam like Operation Trail Dust 1961 where Napalm and Agent Orange were used to clear foliage in the jungle which was the natural hiding place for the Vietcong. They also wanted to see along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the Vietcong's supply route. Napalm did clear much of the undergrowth but it also stuck to humans and caused horrific injuries. Agent Orange also cleared the foliage, but many innocent civilians' farms and crops were lost, and animals were killed.[4] Also, the revelation of the My Lai Massacre resulted in the loss of American support and anti-war protests continued to build as the conflict wore on. In 1968 and 1969, there were hundreds of protest marches and gatherings throughout the country. [5]	
L3	**Explains how the given factor AND Explains how other reason(s) contributed to loss of popular support** *Award 6-8 marks for an explanation of given factor and another factor.* *Or* *Award 8 marks for three explained factors.* e.g. As L2 plus: [8] *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).* e.g. As L3 plus: In conclusion, the Tet Offensive, 1968, was the contributing reason that made the USA government lose popular support from its American public. It was that turning point in USA's Vietnam War that shattered the confidence of the American public on the legitimacy of the USA's presence and role in Vietnam. The bitter fighting and the fact that USA was even caught offguard by the North's invasion into Hue and the US military base at Khe Sanh	6-8

Downloaded from SingaKids.com

	in the northern part of South Vietnam convinced the American public that the USA was fighting a losing battle. However, it was the role of the media that played a decisive role in shifting the American sentiments against the USA's government. The USA journalists started to criticize and show the events in Vietnam in a negative light and it heightened the unhappiness of the public opinion on the USA's needless and horrific involvement in the Vietnam War. With the atrocities that were shown through countless of graphic images such as the "Napalm Girl" and the "Saigon Execution, the anti-war sentiments increased to the extent that there was continued mass public opposition against the war. [+2]	

Downloaded from SingaKids.com