

Class:	Register No:	Name:
---------------	---------------------	--------------



**CRESCENT GIRLS' SCHOOL
SECONDARY
2024**

HUMANITIES (HISTORY)

19 August 2024

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name, register number and class in the spaces provided at the top of this page and on all separate sheets of paper used.
Write in dark blue or black pen.
You may use a soft pencil for any rough working.
Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer **two** questions.
Write all answers on the writing paper provided.

Start each question on a fresh sheet of paper.

At the end of the examination, fasten Section A and Section B SEPARATELY.

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.

Why was the poster published in September 1948? Explain your answer.

**[5
]**

(b) Study Sources B and C.

) Does Source B prove Source C wrong? Explain your answer.

**[6
]**

(c) Study Source D.

Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer.

**[5
]**

(d) Study Source E.

) Source E was published in 1947. Does it make it useless about the Berlin Blockade? Explain your answer.

**[6
]**

(e) Study all the sources.

‘The Soviet Union was provoked to take a tough stance in Berlin.’
How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

**[8
]**

The Berlin Crisis

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Berlin Blockade was one of the major international crises during the Cold War. It was an attempt by the Soviet Union to limit the ability of the United States, Britain and France to channel resources to their respective spheres of occupation within the city of Berlin, which lay entirely inside Soviet-occupied East Germany. Alarmed by the Marshall Plan, as well as efforts by the Western Allies to introduce a single currency to the zones they occupied in Germany and Berlin, the Soviets imposed a blockade on Western zones of Berlin in June 1948. This was meant to force the Allies out of Berlin by attempting to starve the people there. To counter this blockade, US President Truman ordered the Berlin Airlift. Tensions heightened as a result of the actions of the superpowers. The crisis was a result of competing occupation policies and rising tensions between Western powers and the Soviet Union.

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

Source A: A British cartoon published on 9 September 1948.



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 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 unmistakable 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.

Source D: 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 E: A cartoon by a German who was living in Britain at that time, 1947. The caption of the cartoon is 'One people, two republics, no leader.'



Source F: A view by an American History Professor specializing in the Cold War, 2024.

The traditional image of Soviet aggression in the Cold War is a result of that conflict itself, and there were significant American actions in the 18 months prior to the blockade, which had provoked the Soviets to finally take such drastic measures. These included the economic merger of the US and British zones of occupation, the announcement of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, the creation of the Wirtschaftsrat (the Economic Council) in their zone of occupation, and finally the London 6-Power Conference, which set out the basics for the creation of a separate West German state. It was only after the currency reform was expanded into the western sectors of Berlin on 23 June that the Soviets blocked access to the city. Soviet logic was clear: if the Americans wanted to create a West German state, they would have to abandon their enclave within the Soviet occupation zone.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2 'The military gained control in Japan in the 1930s due to the growth of ultranationalist groups.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- 3 'The US had themselves to blame for the outcome of the Vietnam War.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- 4 'The increase in opposition in Eastern Europe led to the decline of the USSR in the 1980s.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

End of Paper.

Acknowledgements:

- Source A Taken from https://www.johndclare.net/cold_war9.htm
- Source B Taken from <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP58-00597A000100050040-4.pdf>
- Source C Taken from <https://edsitement.neh.gov/sites/default/files/2018-08/ColdWar03.pdf>
- Source D Taken from https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/55c09dcc-a9f2-45e9-b240-eaef64452cae/43750634-b7c4-47a8-ba6c-f46e632f3d5d/Resources#b5d129c2-38f4-4a6b-9161-9cba14ba1bc3_en&overlay
- Source E Taken from <https://www.hdg.de/lemo/bestand/objekt/karikatur-one-volk-two-reichs.html>
- Source F Taken from <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/research/perspective/cold-war-history-the-berlin-blockade-and-airlift>



**CRESCENT GIRLS' SCHOOL
SECONDARY**

2024

HISTORY

19 August 2024

MARKING SCHEME

[Turn over

Section A (Source-Based Case Study)

1(a)

[5]

Levels	Descriptors	Mark Range
1	Describes source	1
2	Making Inference, unsupported	2
3	Making Inference, supported <i>Award 3m for inference, explained</i> <i>Award 4m for inference, explained with contextual knowledge</i>	3-4
4	Making Inference, supported with purpose <i>Award 4m for inference with purpose, explained</i> <i>Award 5m for inference with purpose, explained with contextual knowledge</i> Eg. Source A was published to convince the people in Britain that the Soviet Union was the main aggressor of the Berlin Crisis, so that the people in Britain would continue to support its government's effort in working with the US towards the Berlin Airlift. Source A shows the image of Stalin, being represented by a big cat, standing near a mouse hole. He seemed to have tossed one of the mice in the air, and this mouse represented the Berliners. This meant that through the Berlin Blockade imposed by Stalin, he had strike fear into the lives of the people, thus creating misery for them. At the same time, the Western powers were represented by 3 other mice scurrying around Stalin's feet. This implied that the Western powers were at the mercy of Stalin because he was inflicting fear on Berlin. They appeared lost as to how to help the Berliners. By imposing the Berlin Blockade, Stalin blocked all roads, railways and waterways leading from the Western Zones in Germany into the Western Zones in Berlin. This would cut off food and power supplies to the people in the Western Zones in Berlin, causing them to suffer. By publishing this poster, it would bring to light the problems faced in Germany, thus encouraging the people in Britain to support their government in working with the US to help the people in Berlin.	4-5

1(b)

[6]

Levels	Descriptors	Mark Range
1	Answers based on Provenance	1
2	Prove/ Not prove based on Content, unsupported	2
3	Prove/ Not prove based on Content, supported Eg. Source B proves Source C wrong on the actions of the Americans in Germany. Source B shows that the actions of the US were not motivated towards helping Germany, as it stated '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. However, Source C shows that the actions of the US were meant to help Germany, as it stated '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.' This shows that the US wanted to help the people in Berlin, who were threatened by the Soviet Blockade. This was because the blockade had denied them of essential goods, necessary for survival. Given that Source B contrasted Source C about the actions of the US in Germany, Source B proves Source C wrong.	3
4	Not prove based on Content, supported and cross-referred Eg. Source B does not prove Source C wrong on the actions of the Americans in Germany as it is unreliable. Source B shows that the actions of US were not motivated towards helping Germany, as it stated '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. However, Source C shows that the actions of the US were meant to help Germany, as it stated '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.' This shows that the US wanted to help the people in Berlin, who were threatened by the Soviet Blockade. This was because the blockade had denied them of essential goods, necessary for survival. Source B is contradicted by my contextual knowledge. 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 in order 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, Source B is unreliable about the actions of US in Germany.	4
5	Evaluation based on Provenance of Source B	5-6

	<p><i>Award 5m for answers based on content with explanation and evaluation of provenance</i></p> <p><i>Award 6m for answers based on content with cross reference and evaluation of provenance of Source C.</i></p> <p>Source B does not prove Source C wrong due to its provenance. Source B was a message broadcast through the Soviet radio network, which intended to convince the people in Soviet-controlled territories that the USSR intended to help Germany reunify but faced obstacles from the US. This is so that the people in these territories would continue to support the policies carried out by the USSR in Germany. Given that this source was meant to be a propaganda source, its aim was brainwash the people into believing that the Soviet government had the German people's interests at heart. Furthermore, this happened 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. This would mean that the source is biased and cannot be taken as a credible account about the actions of the US. On the other hand, Source C was by an American diplomat in Germany, to President Truman. Given that the American diplomat would have been observing the situation in Germany, and thus providing the President with critical information about the lives of the Germans so that the President could make the best decision to help the people in Berlin, he would be comparatively less unreliable than Source B. Thus Source B does not prove Source C wrong.</p>	
--	--	--

1(c)

[5]

Levels	Descriptors	Mark Range
1	Answers based on provenance	1
2	Surprised or Not surprised based on content, unsupported	2
3	Surprised or Not surprised based on content, supported	3
4	Surprised or Not surprised based on content, supported and cross-reference <p>Eg. I am surprised by Source D about the claim that the blockade would lead to anti-democratic ideals to rise in Germany. Source D 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</p>	4

	democratic countries. However, this is contradicted by my contextual knowledge as I know that the combination of the three zones was meant to create a single economic unit to encourage economic growth to prevent authoritarian regimes from rising again. Thus, for Source D to show that Trizone would promote a rise of anti-democratic ideals, is something surprising to me.	
5	L4 + Evaluation based on Provenance I am not surprised by Source D based on its provenance. Given that Source D was a note by the Soviet Government to the Governments of Great Britain, the USA and France, when the Berlin Blockade had already been imposed, it is likely that the Soviet Government was trying to justify its actions against the 3 powers. It even mentioned that the actions of Britain, the USA and France in Western Germany were undemocratic, even though these 3 powers were democratic countries trying to encourage democratic governments to be set up in Europe. This is to put pressure on the 3 powers to back down from the Berlin Airlift. Therefore, it is expected for the Soviet Government to shift the responsibility of the Berlin crisis on the 3 powers. Hence I am not surprised by Source D.	[5]

1(d)

[6]

Levels	Descriptors	Mark Range
L1	Answers based on provenance	1
L2	Useless &/ Or Not Useful in content, unsupported	2
L2	Useless &/ Or Not Useful in content, supported	3
L3	Not useless in content, supported, cross-referred <i>Award 4m for cross-reference, explained</i> <i>Award 5m for cross-reference, well-explained</i> Eg. No, Source E is not useless. Source E is useful in showing that a rift already occurred between the Western powers and the USSR. This would then contribute to the Berlin Blockade. Source E shows the French Foreign Minister, US Secretary of State and the British Foreign Minister seated together on the Western side of Germany. On the other side was the Soviet Foreign Minister, seated alone. He had his back facing the backs of the other 3 leaders. The caption also states 'One Volk, Two Reichs, No Fuhrer', implying that while the people in the two territories are all Germans, they were administered differently, under 2 systems, possibly referring to democratic system and communist system of governance. No Fuhrer also meant no leader, which implies that the cartoonist recognised that there was no single leader taking charge of the entire Germany. This cartoon shows the conflict between the Soviet	4-5

[Turn over

	<p>Union and the 3 Western powers in the context of heightened tensions during the Cold War. Hence, their soured relationship would eventually contribute to the Berlin Blockade. This is supported by my contextual knowledge. I know that by 1947, the US announced the Marshall Plan to the world. Democratic countries in Europe would receive aid from the US. This included Britain and France. Naturally, Britain and France would ally with US, in order to receive the financial aid. This would also mean that they were more willing to cooperate with the US even on the issue of the occupation of Germany. The Marshall Plan also created increased tensions between the US and the USSR as they sought to compete for control and influence over Europe. Therefore, the rift between the USSR and the US, together with Britain and France, would set the background for further tensions to build up later on, which would then lead to the Berlin Blockade. Therefore, even though this source was published in 1947, it is still useful in showing the existing relationships between the Western powers and the USSR, which would then lead to the Berlin Blockade in 1948.</p>	
L4	<p>L3 + Answers based on evaluation of provenance</p> <p>Eg. Source E is not useless based on its provenance. This source is by a German, who was living in Britain at the time of publication. He was merely reflecting on the relationship between the USSR and the Allied powers, and implying how the soured relationship would affect the future of Germany. Being a German, he was naturally concerned about the lack of a single leadership and the division of Germany into 2 distinctive systems of governance. He did not take sides with any power. Even though he was living in Britain at that time, he seemed to be blaming all 4 powers for their actions which had affected the unity of Germany. Therefore, he was not biased, which makes this source useful since he did not seem to take sides with any of the powers, but merely pointed out the lack of unity among the powers in administering Germany. Hence Source E is not useless.</p>	6

1(e)

[8]

Levels	Descriptors	Mark Range
1	Identifies sources that support AND/OR not support the statement, unsupported with source details	1
2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use	2-4

	<i>Award 2m for one Y or N supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4m.</i>					
3	<p>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use</p> <p>Award 5m for 1 Yes and No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7m.</p> <p>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 marks must not exceed 8.</p> <table><tr><th>Support</th><th>Does not support</th></tr><tr><td>B, D, F</td><td>A, C, E</td></tr></table> <p>Source A does not support this view because it portrays the Soviet Union as the main aggressor. Source A shows the image of Stalin, being represented by a big cat, standing near a mouse hole. He seemed to have tossed one of the mice in the air, and this mouse represented the Berliners. This meant that through the Berlin Blockade imposed by Stalin, he had inflicted fear in the lives of the people, thus creating misery for them. At the same time, the Western powers were represented by 3 other mice scurrying around Stalin's feet. This shows that Stalin was the sole aggressor in Germany, and the Western powers could not have provoked him into taking a tough stance since they were portrayed to be weaker than him in the source.</p> <p>Source B supports this view because it shows that the actions of US had caused the Soviet Union to take a tough stance in Germany. '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 wanted control in Germany and introduced policies in Germany in order to benefit the US. Thus, in order to protect its interests against the threat of US in Germany, the Soviet Union had to take a tougher stance in Germany. Hence, Source B supports this view since US were the ones who had antagonised the USSR through their actions.</p> <p>Source C does not support this view. It shows that Soviet Union was the aggressive one. Source C states 'Surrender would deliver to Russian vengeance, two million Germans who have defied communist totalitarianism.' This goes to show that the Soviet Union was not being provoked by the Western powers, rather, the Soviet Union was the aggressive one who wanted absolute control over Germany. Therefore, the Soviet</p>	Support	Does not support	B, D, F	A, C, E	5-8
Support	Does not support					
B, D, F	A, C, E					

	<p>Union was aggressive in the first place and was not provoked by the Western powers.</p> <p>(+1) Source C is reliable as it is supported by my contextual knowledge. Through the Berlin Blockade, Stalin intended to force the Allies out of Berlin. He initiated the blockade of rail and road links from the Allied zones to West Berlin. He also disrupted water and power supplies. He knew that if the Allies were to stay in Berlin, the people in Berlin would suffer. Thus, this supports the information in Source C, making it reliable. Furthermore, Source C was by an American diplomat in Germany, who was raising his concerns about the dire situation which the people in Berlin were facing, in hope of persuading President Truman to render help to the people through the Berlin Airlift. Thus, his intent was to provide help to the people in order to reduce their sufferings. This makes the source unbiased and reliable.</p> <p>Source D supports the view. Source D states that Soviet Union was provoked to take a tougher stance. Source D states 'These are a threat not only to neighbouring countries but also to the security of the peoples of the whole of Europe.' This shows that the actions of the three powers in Western Germany had led to potential security threat in Germany and other parts of Europe, thus the Soviet Union needed to take a tougher stance in Berlin in order to prevent aggression. Thus, it shows that the Soviets were provoked to take a tougher stance.</p> <p>Source E does not support the view as it shows that both sides were already hostile towards each other. Source E shows the cartoon titled 'One people, two republics, no leader.' The cartoon also shows the French Foreign Minister, US Secretary of State and the British Foreign Minister seated together on the Western side of Germany. On the other side was the Soviet Foreign Minister, seated alone. He had his back facing the backs of the other 3 leaders. This shows that the USSR was not provoked by any power. Rather, due to the Cold War tensions, both sides were already at odds with each other. With this backdrop, the Soviet Union gravitated towards more aggressive measures at Berlin, thus showing that the actions taken were not provoked by the Western powers.</p> <p>Source F supports this statement because the economic policies by the Western powers triggered a response from the USSR. It states 'It was only after the currency reform was expanded into the western sectors of Berlin on 23 June that the Soviets blocked access to the city.' This shows that Soviet Union saw the economic policies by the Western powers as a threat to its occupation over Germany. This fuelled tougher actions taken by the USSR in order to protect its interest in Germany. Thus the USSR was provoked into taking a tougher</p>	
--	---	--

	stance in Berlin due to the economic policies by the Western powers.	
--	--	--

Section B: Essay Questions

Answer **two** questions.



Level	Level Descriptors	Marks								
L1	Identifies / Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1m for identifying one reason, and 2m for identifying 2 or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2m for describing one reason, and 3m for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	1 – 3								
L2	Explains given reason or other reasons <i>Award 4m for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons / supporting detail, to a maximum of 5m.</i>	4 – 5								
L3	Explains given reason AND other reasons <i>Award 6m for an explanation of given AND other reasons, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8m (which include given reason).</i> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Level / Marks</th><th>Requirement</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>L3/6</td><td>2 weak explanations</td></tr><tr><td>L3/7</td><td>1strong explanation + 1 weak explanation</td></tr><tr><td>L3/8</td><td>2 strong explanations OR 1 strong explanation + 2 weak explanations OR 4 weak explanations</td></tr></tbody></table> <p><i>*To qualify for +2 for evaluation, answers must achieve at least L3/7 (ie. have least 1 strong paragraph).</i></p> <p>e.g. The military gained control in Japan in the 1930s due to the growth of ultranationalist groups. The ultranationalist groups included junior military officers who likely had the secret backing of senior military commanders. They were against the civilian political leaders and the zaibatsu, whom they regarded as self-serving. One group was the Showa Restoration Faction, who wanted to remove all aspects of democratic government and restore direct rule to the Emperor. There were also other groups, like the Sakurakai, Kodoha and Ketsumeidan (League of Blood), who also shared similar views in opposition to democracy. On 15 May 1932, a group of naval officers from the League of Blood and other anti-democracy activists assassinated Prime Minister Inukai Tsuyoshi. He had refused to give official recognition to the state of Manchukuo, which the military had control over. The attackers also attacked the Mitsubishi Bank, the Seiyukai headquarters and several power stations, and tried to assassinate several other government officials as well. While these attackers were arrested and put on trial, the military commanders did not condemn their actions and even issued a statement effectively excusing the officers for their actions and demanded political reforms in Japan. These actions only emboldened the ultranationalist groups to continue with their attempts to sabotage the democratic government in carrying out effective rule over the</p>	Level / Marks	Requirement	L3/6	2 weak explanations	L3/7	1strong explanation + 1 weak explanation	L3/8	2 strong explanations OR 1 strong explanation + 2 weak explanations OR 4 weak explanations	6 – 8
Level / Marks	Requirement									
L3/6	2 weak explanations									
L3/7	1strong explanation + 1 weak explanation									
L3/8	2 strong explanations OR 1 strong explanation + 2 weak explanations OR 4 weak explanations									

	<p>country. Over time, with a build-up of pressure from these ultranationalist groups, the military took up more positions in the Cabinet. By 1932, only 5 out of 15 Cabinet positions were taken up by civilian party representatives while the remaining 10 were made up of military officers. Therefore, the actions of the ultranationalist groups created obstacles to effective rule by the democratic government. The support of the ultranationalist groups towards the military then propelled the military towards increasing their power and influence within the government.</p> <p>e.g. The military gained control in Japan in the 1930s due to the weakness of the democratic government. Firstly, the Japanese Emperor Yoshihito was sickly and thus too weak to exercise his authority over Japan's government. Next, many of the Genro who advised the Emperor had also left Japan's political scene due to age. Without a strong Emperor or Genro to unify the government, divisions between the court officials, the civilian politicians and the military worsened. The civilian politicians in the Cabinet and the Diet were also divided because of the emergence of party politics. The two political parties elected into the Diet, Seiyukai and Minseito, were political rivals which wrestled for power and influence in the government. The divisions between the two parties made it challenging for the Prime Minister to gain the support of the majority. Many of the Taisho-period Prime Ministers and their Cabinets did not remain in power for long. This weakness provided the military with an opportunity to extend their influence within the government. Taking advantage of the incapability of the civilian government, the military sought to take matters into their own hands and disregarded the Prime Minister. This allowed them to gradually gain more control of the government overtime and by 1932, the military was able to make up the majority of the Cabinet. Thus, the weakness of the democratic government created an opportunity for the rise of the military as the political instability allowed the military to exert its control within the government.</p> <p>e.g. The military gained control in Japan in the 1930s due to the impact of the economic crisis. The Great Depression in 1929 resulted in the withdrawal of investments and trade from USA. Japan faced a fall in export and many of its businesses closed down. Silk, the main Japanese export, fell drastically and affected the Japanese economy significantly, causing an economic depression in Japan. Businesses collapsed and caused mass unemployment. With labour laws which were not generous to the workers, most workers only received 14 days' pay when they were dismissed. The workers protested, sometimes violently, against their employers who were typically from the elite classes. Many of them also believed that the civilian politicians were either in cahoots with the big businesses like the zaibatsus, or were receiving money from them. Rapid population increment and shortage of land for farming further escalated this economic crisis. Shortage of food was widespread across Japan, causing the Japanese to feel a sense of discontentment towards the government for not being able to solve their immediate problem. This allowed the military to gain popularity because the people were looking towards a stronger government to solve their problems. The military had been showing its strengths through overseas conquests and therefore demonstrated credibility as compared to the civilian government. Thus, the increase of popularity of the military, in contrast to the weak civilian government, enabled the military to gain more power in the government, thus allowing the military to establish control.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Award an additional 2m (to a maximum of 10m for a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be award for the response will be based on marks obtain at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6 + 2; L3/7 + 2; L3/8 + 2)</p> <p>e.g. In conclusion, I disagree with the statement as the main reason why the military gained control in Japan in the 1930s was due to the weakness of the civilian government and not due to the growth of the ultranationalist groups. Due to the weakness of the civilian government, it created political instability, thus resulting in frequent changes in the government. The weak government was thus unable to devise effective strategies to counter the impact of the economic crisis, thus the lives of the people deteriorated. With this in the background, it provided a good opportunity for the ultranationalists to create further political instability. This allowed the military to exploit the situation to gain more power in the Diet. Therefore, it was the weak government which led to its inability to solve the problems in Japan and curb the rise of military.</p>	
--	---	--



Level	Level Descriptors	Marks								
L1	Identifies / Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1m for identifying one reason, and 2m for identifying 2 or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2m for describing one reason, and 3m for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	1 – 3								
L2	Explains given reason or other reasons <i>Award 4m for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons / supporting detail, to a maximum of 5m.</i>	4 – 5								
L3	Explains given reason AND other reasons <i>Award 6m for an explanation of given AND other reasons, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8m (which include given reason).</i> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Level / Marks</th><th>Requirement</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>L3/6</td><td>2 weak explanations</td></tr><tr><td>L3/7</td><td>1strong explanation + 1 weak explanation</td></tr><tr><td>L3/8</td><td>2 strong explanations OR 1 strong explanation + 2 weak explanations OR 4 weak explanations</td></tr></tbody></table> <i>*To qualify for +2 for evaluation, answers must achieve at least L3/7 (ie. have least 1 strong paragraph).</i>	Level / Marks	Requirement	L3/6	2 weak explanations	L3/7	1strong explanation + 1 weak explanation	L3/8	2 strong explanations OR 1 strong explanation + 2 weak explanations OR 4 weak explanations	6 – 8
Level / Marks	Requirement									
L3/6	2 weak explanations									
L3/7	1strong explanation + 1 weak explanation									
L3/8	2 strong explanations OR 1 strong explanation + 2 weak explanations OR 4 weak explanations									

	<p>e.g. The US had themselves to blame for the outcome of the Vietnam War. Even though the US employed superior air power to engage in strategic bombing to disrupt North Vietnamese supply lines, they were unable to decisively defeat the Viet Cong, thus resulting in the Vietnam War dragging on. The tactics employed by the US military also resulted to high cost of civilian lives, which was later reported in the media, leading to an increase in opposition against the war back in America. During the Tet Offensive, the journalists were convinced that the US could not win the Vietnam War. Walter Cronkite of CBS News, for example, publicly criticised the US war effort on national television. Media coverage also exposed the US atrocities in the Vietnam War. This included the My Lai Massacre, in which the US soldiers murdered between 347 and 504 unarmed South Vietnamese civilians. Such reports shook the world and the Americans began to demonstrate and protest against the US involvement in Vietnam. This led to the US Congress adopting a change in stance towards the Vietnam War. This contributed to the eventual withdrawal of the US troops. Thus, it was due to the atrocities committed by the US in the Vietnam War, resulting to high cost of civilian lives, which led to the eventual withdrawal of American troops from the war. Therefore, the US had themselves to blame for the outcome of the war.</p> <p>e.g. The US was not to blame for the outcome of the war as it was the strength of the communists in Vietnam which had made the war a difficult one for the US to fight. Even though the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese had inferior military equipment, they turned to effective guerilla warfare to fight against the US troops. The Viet Cong used hidden tunnels and trails to move about and get access to weapons, ammunition and other vital equipment. They also depended on the support of the local population to launch surprise hit-and-run attacks deep in South Vietnam. They did not wear uniforms and were hard to tell apart from the peasants. They attacked and then disappeared into the jungles, villages or tunnels. The hidden system of tunnels extended over 300 kilometres underground, providing basic needs for the Viet Cong soldiers, thus allowing them to sustain the war. The Viet Cong was also determined to not give in to anything less than the complete removal of the United States from Vietnam, thus were willing to fight fiercely against the American troops. The effective use of resources to their advantage allowed the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese troops to create successful attacks on the Americans to wear them down. Their unwillingness to give up also made it frustrating for the Americans to gain a decisive victory. Thus, the resourcefulness of the communists, together with their strategies, enabled them to outlast the American in the Vietnam War, thus the US was not to blame for the outcome of the war because it was the strength of the communists in Vietnam which had contributed to the outcome.</p> <p>e.g. . The US was not to blame for the outcome of the war as it was the support of the USSR and China towards North Vietnam which contributed to the outcome of the war in Vietnam. The war in Vietnam was an opportunity for China and the USSR to show support for a fellow communist state, in light of Cold War. China provided support to Vietnam as Mao Zedong saw Vietnam as an anti-US buffer. He was concerned about a possible invasion backed by the US through South Vietnam. Thus, China had been providing North Vietnam with food, medical supplies and Soviet-made weapons. With the Sino-Soviet split, the USSR also saw the need to support another communist state, as a way to assert Soviet</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>leadership. The Soviets steadily provided more and more arms and other essential supplies to North Vietnam. By the late 1960s, the USSR was providing more support to North Vietnam than China, particularly in the form of aircraft and air defences such as surface-to-air missiles. With the provision of ammunitions from their communist allies, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong could continue to attack the US troops and create difficulties for the US to experience any positive breakthrough in the war. Overtime, they were able to prolong the fight and thus outlast the US in the war. Therefore, the support from the USSR and China contributed to the outcome of the war because the supplies they had provided to the Vietnamese enabled them to wait out in the war, thus leading to US eventual withdrawal.</p> <p><i>Award an additional 2m (to a maximum of 10m for a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i></p> <p><i>The total marks to be award for the response will be based on marks obtain at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6 + 2; L3/7 + 2; L3/8 + 2)</i></p> <p>e.g. In conclusion, I disagree that the US had themselves to blame for the outcome of the Vietnam War. This is because, it was the fighting spirit of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese which had ultimately determined the final course of the war. Even though the US had initial success and superior weapons, they were unable to wear down the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese army, who were persistent in fighting on and not giving up. They were able to take capitalize on the support from China and the USSR to maximise attacks on the US. With the strength of the communists in Vietnam, it was only a matter of time, when they would be able to outlast the US.</p>	
--	--	--



Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies / Describes given or other reasons <i>Award 1m for identifying one reason, and 2m for identifying 2 or more reasons.</i> <i>Award 2m for describing one reason, and 3m for describing 2 or more reasons.</i>	1 – 3
L2	Explains given reason or other reasons <i>Award 4m for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons / supporting detail, to a maximum of 5m.</i>	4 – 5
L3	Explains given reason AND other reasons <i>Award 6m for an explanation of given AND other reasons, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8m (which include given reason).</i>	6 – 8

Level / Marks	Requirement
L3/6	2 weak explanations
L3/7	1 strong explanation + 1 weak explanation
L3/8	2 strong explanations OR 1 strong explanation + 2 weak explanations OR 4 weak explanations

**To qualify for +2 for evaluation, answers must achieve at least L3/7 (ie. have least 1 strong paragraph).*

e.g. The increase in opposition in Eastern Europe led to the decline of the USSR in the 1980s. The lives of the people in Eastern Europe deteriorated over the decades of Soviet control. For example, in Poland, there were series of workers' strikes to push for economic reforms and free elections. They also pushed for the involvement of trade unions in decisions made by the government. Though the uprising was crushed by the Red Army, it reflected the failure of communism to provide good living standards, which undermined the claim that communist governments could be threatened by people power and be resisted by organisations. It formed the basis for further uprisings in the late 1980s. Protests against communist rule in Poland continued to take place in 1989 until free elections took place eventually. Concurrently, similar protests also took place in other parts of Eastern Europe which were under Soviet control. This gradually led to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the loss of Soviet Union influence. Therefore, the decline of Soviet Union was due to the rise in opposition in Eastern Europe, leading to a pressure for change.

*Another example of increase in opposition in Eastern Europe: In Czechoslovakia, the Prague Spring took place in 1968, which laid the ground of discontentment towards the Soviet government. Liberal reforms were introduced by the communist leader, Alexander Dubcek. He believed that the communist regime policies were not working and began to introduce more democratic reforms. The Prague Spring was dealt with by the Soviets, who sent in tanks and troops to crush Dubcek's government. While the democratic elements were temporarily removed in the 1960s, it only generated more dissent against the Soviet government. When the Soviet government became increasingly weak and unable to use force to impose its control over Czechoslovakia, demonstrations took place and the communist leaders resigned, giving in to pressure for democratic change. This contributed to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, thus resulting in the decline of Soviet power from 1989 onwards.

e.g. The decline of the USSR was due to the inherent weaknesses of the communist system. While advances in development and production had been impressive in the immediate post-war era through to the early 1970s, the Soviet economy began to stagnate from then on. The inherent flaws of the Soviet command economy, in comparison to the free market economy that the USA and Western European countries adopted, resulted in the underperformance of the Soviet economy. There was poor quality of information available to those who had to make decisions about the economy. Overemphasis on quantitative indicators, along with lack of innovation and creativity, led to poor quality of Soviet goods. Lack of checks and balances on the government, which encouraged officials to falsify statistics to meet quotas, as well as engage in corrupt practices such as bribery, also resulted in shortage of goods produced for the

people. The production of consumer goods such as clothes, electronics, housing and foodstuffs continued to be compromised over military goods in order to keep up with the arms race with the USA. All these meant that Soviet Union lacked financial means to support the communist government to crush any opposition. In March 1989, Gorbachev made clear to the Warsaw Pact leaders that the Soviet army would leave Eastern Europe and would no longer prop their countries up. From May 1989, starting with Hungary, communist governments started to topple. By November 1989, the largest demonstration in East Germany took place and one million people demanded for democracy and free elections in East Berlin. The East German government announced the opening of border and the lifting of the Berlin Wall on 9 November, an event which significantly showed the collapse of the USSR. Hence, the decline of the USSR was due to the inherent weaknesses of the communist system because communist governments started to lose control in the Communist Bloc, thus the Soviet Union was no longer able to have influence over Eastern Europe.

e.g. Perestroika and Glasnost led to the decline of the USSR in the 1980s because the policies worsened the conditions and discontentment among the people towards the Soviet government. With Perestroika, the government would relaxed its control over the kinds of goods and services that may be produced. Despite the change, there was no overall increase in output. Instead, there were chronic problems of unemployment, growth of black markets, as well as shortages in basic necessities. This was a result of the conflicting methods of cooperative ownership. This meant that private ownership of small businesses was permitted, but the state still retained control over the means of production. This meant that small business owners still had to pay high taxes and deal with dishonest officials. This led to unprofitable businesses and many of these private enterprises closed down. Some businesses also charged high prices on goods produced in order to make more profit. This led to greater dissatisfaction among consumers. Such conditions made the people realise that Gorbachev's policies did not work and became increasingly resentful of the government. Glasnost allowed the problem to be magnified before the eyes of the Soviets. With Glasnost, there was greater freedom of speech and press, which meant that people could voice their opinions and criticise government policies freely. With this relaxation, it only encouraged more dissatisfaction and criticism against Gorbachev's policies. The positive picture of Soviet life that the government previously presented to the public quickly fell apart. Many felt that they had been deceived. With these negative sentiments, opposition started to build up within the Soviet Union. Radicals and liberal groups within the government who felt that Gorbachev's policies were not good enough to improve the situation started forming groups to oppose the government in Soviet Union. This eventually led to the decline of the communist system and Soviet Union. Therefore, the Soviet Union declined due to Perestroika and Glasnost because these policies intensified the discontentment among the people, which led to the disintegration of the union eventually.

Award an additional 2m (to a maximum of 10m for a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.

	<p><i>The total marks to be award for the response will be based on marks obtain at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6 + 2; L3/7 + 2; L3/8 + 2)</i></p> <p>e.g. In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. The Soviet Union declined not due to the increase in opposition in Eastern Europe, but due to the inherent weakness of the communist system. The people who opposed the Soviet system were unhappy due to the problems like unemployment, shortages and low standard of living. Policies by the USSR, like Comecon, did not help to improve the economic situation in Eastern Europe. It was due to the weak economy, which formed the basis for discontentment in Eastern Europe. Gorbachev introduced reforms in an attempt to reverse the adverse effects of the communist system, which was already not working and leading to more discontentment in the Eastern Bloc. Therefore the opposition and uprisings only acted as a catalyst to speed up the collapse of the Soviet Union because it was the weaknesses of the communist system which caused the problems in the first place.</p>	
--	--	--