	Class	Register Number
Name		

HUMANITIES (HISTORY)

2025 Term 1 Week 6

50 mins

25/S4WA1/HI

VICTORIA SCHOOL VICTORIA SCHOO



VICTORIA SCHOOL

WEIGHTED ASSESSMENT ONE SECONDARY FOUR

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Answer Questions 1 and 2.

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

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 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.

What is the message of the source? Explain your answer. [4]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

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

The Berlin Blockade

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Berlin Blockade was a significant event during the early Cold War years, lasting from 24 June 1948 to 12 May 1949. The Soviet Union blocked all land and water routes into West Berlin. The Allies saw the blockade as an attempt by Stalin to force the Allies out of West Berlin. This was in contrast to the Soviets seeing the need for the blockade as it responded to the formation of the Bizonia in 1947 between the British and the Americans, the Trizonia in 1948 when France was added and the introduction of the Deutsche Mark by the Allies. The Soviets claimed that the actions of the Allies were in clear violation of the agreements made at the Potsdam Conference

Study the sources to find out whether the Soviet Union was provoked to take a tough stance in Berlin.

Source A: A British cartoonist's illustration of the formation of the Bizonia, 1 August 1946.



DOWN BARRIERS IN GERMANY

Source B: A message on the situation in Germany, broadcasted through Soviet radio network, 3 March 1948.

The German air is filled with Soviet tears for Germany's plight. Every tear carries a reproach against the imperialist American monster which mutilates the Fatherland. Germany is like a battlefield, strewn with hands, arms and parts of bodies, while the blood was shed in the sand. It is the United States which is solely responsible for blocking Germany's unification. The United States wants Germany to be torn apart in order to build up Western Germany's economic potentiality and create there, in the heart of Europe, a military base of American imperialism. The real cause of the trouble in Trizone is the pro-German stance of the policy leading to economic chaos and grave political consequences, not only in Western Germany but throughout Western Europe.

Source C: A note by the Soviet Government to the Governments of Great Britain, the USA and France, on the Berlin situation, 3 October 1948.

It is necessary to declare that the responsibility for the situation that has arisen in Berlin rests squarely with the Governments of Great Britain, the USA and France. The Government of Great Britain, together with the Government of the USA, began a policy of dividing Germany with separate economic unification of the American and British zones of occupation of Germany in 1946. The operation of this policy joined by France in Western Germany, separated from the rest of Germany, is increasingly leading to a growth of influence of anti-democratic and Nazi elements who are responsible for the previous aggressive policy of German imperialism and who have not given up their strivings for revenge. These are a threat not only to neighbouring countries but also to the security of the peoples of the whole of Europe.

Source D: A message from an American diplomat in Germany, to President Truman, 25 June 1948.

Russian efforts to drive the Western powers from Berlin are a crucial challenge to American Foreign Policy. Surrender would deliver to Russian vengeance, two million Germans who have defied communist totalitarianism. There are disturbing rumours of plans to evacuate because of the Russian Blockade in Berlin. Essential supplies for the German population can be delivered by air and if necessary, must be at whatever cost. We urge you to make this country's position unmistakeable by declaring that under all circumstances short of war, we will remain in Berlin and maintain supplies for the civilian population. Nothing less can adequately reassure democratic forces in Germany and elsewhere, that this country will not desert them.

Section B: Essay

Answer the question.

2 'The main reason Japan was defeated in World War II was because the Americans had more resources.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

[10]

End of Paper

1a. Study Source A. What is the message of the source? Explain your answer. [5]

L1 Misinterpretation of sources [1]

Blames the USSR for being suspicious / Praise the West for their cooperation

L2 Sub-message [2]

- The message of the source is to show that USSR was unhappy/suspicious
- UK and US are working well together

L3 Valid Message [3-4]

Eg. The message of the source is that the West was responsible for Stalin's wariness of the Western powers. This can be seen from the source as both Britain and America were merging their zones together. This means that Stalin would begin to be wary of the Western powers as the merger would mean both countries coming together to face USSR, leaving USSR outnumbered. Eg.

- The west were the ones that triggered Stalin's retaliation when they merged their zones together.
- Formation of Bizonia is likely to escalate Cold War tensions in Europe
- To criticize the formation of Bizonia
- Stalin did not approve of the creation of Bizonia and is likely to take action against the West.

Message of the cartoonist is to warn the west against actions that will trigger a retaliation from Stalin.

Answer showing disapproval and worsening relations

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How far does Source B make you surprised by Source C? Explain your answer.

[6]

L1 Answers based on undeveloped provenance [1-2]

Source B does not make me surprised by Source C because both seem to give a similar impression about the Berlin crisis as both are Soviet sources.

L2: They disagree, Source B makes me surprised about C [3]

Source B makes me surprised by Source C because they are different on who was tearing Germany apart. Source B merely blames the USA but Source C blames the West as a whole including the French and the British.

Source B makes me surprised by Source C because they different on the impact of the actions of the West. Source B believes that actions of the West would create economic chaos. Source C suggests that actions of the West would lead to rise of Nazism again in Germany.

L3 They agree, Source B does not make me surprised about C [4]

Source B does not make me surprised by Source C because they agree that actions of the West had negative impacts on Germany and Europe as a whole.

Source B suggests that the actions of the US were not motivated towards helping Germany, as it states, 'The United States wants Germany to be torn apart in order to build up Western Germany's economic potentiality and create there, in the heart of Europe, a military base of American imperialism.' This shows that the US intended to merely make use of Germany for the extension of its own power and was thus unconcerned about the lives of the people as Germany would only descend into 'economic chaos' and faced grave political setbacks as well. Similarly, Source C claims that the blockade would lead to anti-democratic ideals to rise in Germany. Source C states 'The operation of this policy joined by France in Western Germany, separated from the rest of Germany, is increasingly leading to a growth of influence of anti-democratic and Nazi elements who are responsible for the previous aggressive policy of German imperialism and who have not given up their strivings for revenge.' This goes to show that by combining the three zones under the occupation of Britain, France and the US, it would cause the rise of Nazism again, which would go against the ideals of the democratic countries.

L4 Identifies the agreement, and uses cross-reference to decide what is/not surprising [5]

Source B does not make me surprised by Source C because they agree that actions of the West had negative impact/ was wrong/ Stalin disapproved of the actions by the West.

The west's actions were wrong can be supported with CR to the Background information which says that the actions of the Allies were in clear violation of the agreements at Potsdam.

However, when I cross-refer to contextual knowledge, it disagrees with B on whose actions had truly harmed Germany as US was there to help Germany. Under Truman, US was determined to see that Germany recover so that the Germans would not hate the Allies the way they hated them in the 1920s and 30s after WWI. Thus, the US introduced various economic measures in Germany in order to help Germany strengthen itself again, so that it would not fall into the hands of authoritarian regimes again, like the Nazi government. The US also saw Germany as a potential ally against the USSR. Thus, together with the French and British zones, Trizone was formed to allow the German economy to recover. Thus, unlike what was mentioned in Source B, the US did not intend to create 'economic chaos' in Germany. Since this contradicts Source B, I am thus surprised by Source B.

L5 As in L4 but also uses evaluation of D's and E's contexts and purposes to decide that it's not surprising [6]

Source B was a message broadcast through the Soviet radio network BEFORE THE BERLIN BLOCKADE, which warning about obstacles from the US. While this was a propaganda source, it showed the anger on the Soviet side towards the West when tensions between the US and the USSR were on the rise, therefore, the message would naturally target against the US, portraying them as the villains in Germany.

Despite Stalin's expression of disapproval of the actions of the West, the West continued to antagonise the USSR by forming Bizonia, France even joined in in 1948 to form Trizonia and they introduced a new currency the Deutschmark. Hence, I am not surprised the two sources agree in their opposition to the west because by the time Source D was made, the BERLIN BLOCKADE has taken place. The Soviet had retaliated. That's why they sent a note to the Governments of Great Britain, the USA and France, to protest the actions of the West, precisely because their disapproval was ignored and to put pressure on the 3 powers to back down from the Berlin Airlift. Thus, Source B does not make me surprised by Source C.

2 'The main reason Japan was because the Americans had more resources.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

[10]

I agree with the view that Japan's defeat in World War II (WWII) was due to America's resources, which ensured that it could sustain a long war with Japan. USA's military and economic strength far exceeded that of Japan's. Japanese factories had fewer resources as the Allies had crippled Japanese supplies of raw materials and production. USA and the Allies worked hard to sink Japanese merchant vessels and to bomb their factories. USA also mobilised women in the war effort by having them work in factories. Since 1942, US were able to supply their Allies with food raw materials and weapons through their lend-lease and casr and carry. By 1944, they were known as the arsenal of democracy. In the three years following the Battle of Midway, the Japanese built six aircraft carriers. The U.S. built 17. American industry provided almost two -thirds of all the Allied military equipment produced during the war: 297,000 aircraft, 193,000 artillery pieces, 86,000 tanks and two million army trucks. In contrast, the Japanese could not keep up with USA in terms of production of war machinery and resources due to their limited manpower, industrial capabilities and

economic funding. This meant that Japan was unable to produce and replace essential weapons as quickly as USA could and had fewer troops to mobilise for war effort. Thus, Japan's military could not match up against the stronger USA. As a result, USA's strengths helped sustain them and enabled them to fight a longer war. In contrast, the Japanese lack of resources and manpower made them unable to stand up to the combined strengths of USA and the Allies weakening the Japanese military capability until the Japanese had no more resources to continue the war. When the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan, the Emperor had no choice but to agree to unconditional surrender.

However, Japan was to blame for its own defeat in World War Two. Japan's attack on Pearl Harbour in December 1941 paved the way for its invasion of Southeast Asia. However, this backfired as the Japanese empire had overstretched itself and it was difficult for the Japanese forces to maintain and defend the newly occupied Southeast Asian territories. Key military defeats by the Allies against the Japanese forces also decimated the numbers of experienced Japanese pilots and aircraft carriers. Japan struggled to keep up with the war effort with its limited funds, resources and manpower. Many of these territories occupied by Japanese troops were not satisfied with the Japanese rule. They joined anti Japanese resistance forces to fight against the Japanese troops. This meant that more resources had to be put in place to upkeep these territories. Japan struggled to keep up with the war efforts with its limited funds, resources and manpower. Japan did not have a good industrial foundation, which meant that it was unable to produce enough resources to contribute to its war effort. The Chinese in China refused to give in to the Japanese troops and put up a strong fight against them. This meant that the war dragged on for the entire course of World War Two in Asia Pacific. Japan faced key defeats from 1942 onwards. When the US began their campaign to retake the Philippines and battled with Japanese ground forces there, the Japanese lost 4 aircraft carriers, 3 battleships, 10 cruisers and 9 destroyers. but was devastated when the US forces managed to advance to take control of the island. These showed that due to an overstretched empire, the Japanese was unable to manage its resources effectively to ensure that they were able to successfully retain control of these territories. It allowed the Allies to gain an advantage over the Japanese forces, pushing their forces to rely on kamikaze tactics to survive because but, they had no other choices. Therefore, the Japanese was to blame for their own defeat in World War Two because they were too ambitious, which led to their conquests of many territories which in turn resulted to problems handling these territories which wore down their ability to sustain their empire, leaving the mainland vulnerable to direct aerial attacks from the Allies, causing great number of casualties such that they had no more available manpower to continue the war but to agree to unconditional surrender...

In conclusion, while Japan's overambitious expansion and strategic miscalculations certainly contributed to its downfall in World War II, the overwhelming resource advantage of the United States proved to be the more decisive factor. Japan's decision to attack Pearl Harbor and expand into Southeast Asia, while initially successful, stretched its limited resources thin and created a long and unsustainable war. However, even without these strategic errors, it is doubtful Japan could have ultimately prevailed. The sheer industrial might of the US, its ability to outproduce Japan in war materials by a staggering margin, and its capacity to sustain a prolonged conflict through lend-lease and its own robust economy, ultimately crippled Japan's ability to fight. While Japan's missteps hastened its defeat, it was the insurmountable disparity in resources, particularly the US's ability to act as the "arsenal of democracy," that truly sealed Japan's fate. The US simply possessed the means to wage a war of attrition that Japan, with its limited manpower, industrial capacity, and access to raw materials, could not hope to win.

OR

In conclusion, Japan was to blame for its own defeat in World War Two. While the US had an advantage over Japan in economic and military strength, leading to high attrition on the part of Japan, however, it was due to the provocation by the Japanese during Pearl Harbour attack, that brought the US into war. Ultimately, Japan was ambitious and wanted to take control over large part of Asia. The over-extension of the empire resulted to a stretch in their resources. Therefore, it made it difficult for the Japanese to maintain their hold over controlled territory and fight the Americans at the same time. It was due to the over-extended

territories, which caused the US to be wary of the ambitions of Japan, therefore involved themselves to put a stop to the aggression of Japan.