

|      |       |              |
|------|-------|--------------|
| Name | Class | Index Number |
|------|-------|--------------|

**UNITY SECONDARY SCHOOL**  
**PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2022**  
**SECONDARY FOUR EXPRESS**  
**SECONDARY FIVE NORMAL ACADEMICS**

**HUMANITIES**

**2273/02**

**HISTORY ELECTIVE**

**Additional Materials: Writing Papers**

**1 Hour 40 Minutes**

# Answer Scheme



## Section A: Source-Based Case Study

How did Hitler achieve absolute power in Germany?

|            |  |            |
|------------|--|------------|
| <b>(a)</b> | <b>Study Source A.</b><br><b>Why do you think this poster was published at this time? Use the source and your knowledge to support your answer.</b>  | <b>[5]</b> |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>Message</b><br><br><i>e.g. This poster was published to praise Hitler.</i>  | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>L2</b>  | <b>Context</b><br>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers<br><br><i>e.g. This poster was published by the Nazi Party during the March 1933 election campaign. This poster clearly sought to elevate Hitler to a heroic status in the eyes of the German voters – something which Hindenburg had already achieved as Germany’s President. This stamp of approval from a respected leader was an important factor in swaying public opinion to favour the Nazi Party at the time. Evidently, this poster wanted to indoctrinate the German masses to believe that even Hindenburg trusted Hitler, hence they should too. [3m]</i>  | <b>2-3</b> |
| <b>L3</b>  | <b>Purpose – because of the intended outcome, impact on the audience</b><br>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers<br><br><i>e.g. This poster was published by the Nazis in March 1933 <b>(M)</b> to <u>convince</u> German voters that Hitler was the natural successor to Hindenburg as the one to lead Germany forward. Source A shows Hindenburg holding on to Hitler’s hand as the poster reads, “In the deepest need Hindenburg chose Adolf Hitler for Reich Chancellor.” This implies that Germany was facing a crisis at the time, and Hindenburg decided to endorse Hitler as he viewed Hitler as a solution to Germany’s troubles. [4m] <b>(O)</b> <u>This source was created so that Germans would vote for the Nazi Party in the March 1933 elections.</u> [5m]</i> | <b>4-5</b> |

|            |   |            |
|------------|---|------------|
| <b>(b)</b> | <b>Study Source B.</b><br><b>How reliable is this source as evidence about life during the Weimar Republic? Explain your answer.</b>  | <b>[5]</b> |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>Reliable and/or Not reliable due to provenance</b><br><br><i>e.g. Source B is not reliable as it was published in England, so the reporter might not have first-hand knowledge about how life was like in the Weimar Republic.</i> | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>L2</b>  | <b>Reliable based on content, with supporting source details</b><br>Award 2m for reliable, with supporting source details   | <b>2-3</b> |

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
|    | <p>Award 3m for reliable, with supporting source details, and cross refer to relevant contextual knowledge</p> <p><i>e.g. Source B is reliable as it shows that life during the Weimar Republic was <b>miserable</b>. Source B states, "Seven million unemployed, the middle class swept away. The Great Depression rapidly produced the most dreadful poverty." This suggests that the Weimar Republic was unable to solve Germany's problems and thus people suffered under its leadership. [2m]</i></p> <p><b>[XREF]</b> Source B is supported by my contextual knowledge, where I know that there was <b>massive unemployment in Germany</b>, as its economy was in shambles after the Weimar leaders agreed to pay heavy war reparations to the Allies. As a result, Germany struggled with poverty, high unemployment and a fragile economy. The <b>economic crisis</b> was exacerbated when the Weimar Republic tried to keep up with reparation payments by printing more money, eventually resulting in hyperinflation that wiped out Germans' savings and pensions overnight. Germany's economy was further paralysed by the effects of the Great Depression, causing widespread poverty and homelessness. Therefore, as Source B is supported by my contextual knowledge, this source is reliable. [3m]</p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Not Reliable based on content, with supporting source details</b></p> <p>Award 2m for not reliable, with supporting source details</p> <p>Award 3m for not reliable, with supporting source details, and cross refer to relevant contextual knowledge</p> <p><i>e.g. Source B is not reliable as evidence about life during the Weimar Republic. Source B states, "Weimar's system of democratic government became useless... There was no reason why the people should submit to tyranny against their will. They followed the tyrant voluntarily, many of them jubilant." This suggests that life during the Weimar Republic was so bad that many <b>preferred</b> Nazi authoritarian rule to the democratic government under Weimar leadership. [2m]</i></p> <p><b>[XREF]</b> However, Source B is challenged by my contextual knowledge, where I know that many Germans, particularly Jews and Nazi's political rivals such as the Communists, detested Hitler's leadership. They lost their rights to live, to be free, and to feel safe under Hitler's rule so they could not have preferred Hitler's rule to Weimar leadership. Therefore, as Source B is challenged by my contextual knowledge, this source is unreliable. [3m]</p> |     |
| L3 | <p><b>Both elements of L2</b></p> <p>Award the higher mark for a more developed answer</p>   | 4-5 |

|     |  |            |
|-----|--|------------|
| (c) | <b>Study Sources C and D.</b><br><b>Does what Source D says make Source C more useful as evidence about the Reichstag Fire? Explain your answer.</b>   | <b>[6]</b> |
| L1  | <b>Stand based on provenance / False matching</b><br><br><i>e.g. Source D does not make Source C more useful as Source D is not reliable. It was written by a German communist. As a communist, he would be biased against his political opponent, the Nazis, and thus this source is not useful.</i>  | <b>1</b>   |
| L2  | <b>Stand based on content comparison</b><br>Award 2m for comparison, one-sided<br>Award 3m for comparison, two-sided<br><br><i>e.g. Source D makes Source C more useful as evidence about the Reichstag fire <b>as they both agree that the Nazis were behind the Reichstag fire</b>. Source D states, "Merely six days before the March 1933 election, the clumsy business of the Reichstag fire happened – I cannot imagine that anyone really believes that the communist perpetrators had a role instead of it being paid Nazi work." Similarly, Source C was published in March 1933, mocking the steps taken by Hitler. The cartoon depicts Hitler was paranoid about his opponents and was always thinking of ways to get rid of them. This is seen in Source C as he considered setting "fire to a palace or something" even though his Nazi ministers reported that they have eliminated all their opponents. Both sources suggest that the Nazis were responsible for the arson attack at the Reichstag. [2m]</i><br><br><i>e.g. Source D does not make Source C more useful as evidence about the Reichstag fire <b>as they differ in the way the Reichstag fire was executed</b>. Source D states, "the clumsy business of the Reichstag fire happened... Then what about the wild prohibitions and acts of violence by the Nazis." This implies that the arson attack was a very messy and chaotic affair. However, Source C shows Hitler and his Nazi ministers in a meeting, planning how to eliminate their opponents in a methodical manner; starting from Jews, to press, to finally preparing to "set fire to a palace or something". This suggests that the Reichstag fire was meticulously planned and hence not the sloppy work as implied in Source D. [3m]</i> | <b>2-3</b> |
| L3  | <b>Stand based on content comparison, and cross refer to relevant contextual knowledge</b><br><br><b>L2 + Cross-reference:</b><br><i>e.g. Source D is supported by my contextual knowledge, where I know that the Nazis used the Reichstag fire as an opportunity to take down its political opponents. The Nazis charged a Dutch communist for being responsible for the attack and accused him for being part of a communist conspiracy. Several leaders of the Communist Party in Germany were subsequently arrested and charged with arson and treason. The Nazis used this opportunity to arrest communists, broke up their meetings and close down their newspapers, just days before the election. With the Communist Party out of the way, the Nazi Party won more votes than any</i>  | <b>4</b>   |

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
|    | <p><i>other party in the March 1933 elections. Therefore, as Source D is supported by my contextual knowledge, Source D is reliable. Since Source D is in agreement with Source C, hence Source D could make Source C more useful as evidence that the Nazis were responsible for the Reichstag fire.</i></p>   |     |
| L4 | <p><b>Stand based on purpose of Source D</b><br/> Award 4m for not useful based on purpose only<br/> Award 5m for not useful based on purpose and context<br/> Award 6m for L2 + not useful based on purpose</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b><br/> e.g. No, what Source D says <b>does not</b> make Source C more useful as evidence about the Reichstag Fire <b>because Source D has a questionable purpose.</b> Created by a German communist (C), Source D was trying (M) <b>to criticize the Nazis for being responsible for the messy execution of the Reichstag fire.</b> Source D states, “Merely six days before the March 1933 election, the clumsy business of the Reichstag fire happened – I cannot imagine that anyone really believes that the communist perpetrators had a role, instead of it being paid Nazi work.” This suggests that there could be little doubt that the Nazis were responsible for the Reichstag fire, not the communists. (O) <b>This source was created so that the international community would condemn the Nazis for the attack and not pin the blame on the communists.</b> In view of this agenda, Source D is unreliable and thus could not make Source C more useful as evidence about the Reichstag. [4m]</p> <p><b>Evaluate provenance and context:</b><br/> e.g. In addition, Source D was created by a German communist, which means that his political party was persecuted and violently shut down by the Nazis after the communists were accused of conspiring to overthrow the German government. Evidently, the writer of Source D was a victim of the Nazis’ relentless attacks and <b>thus could be one-sided in his opinion</b> of the Nazis and their involvement in the Reichstag fire. As such, Source D is unreliable and thus could not make Source C more useful as evidence about who was responsible for the Reichstag fire. [6m]</p> | 4-6 |

|           |   |            |
|-----------|---|------------|
| (d)       | <b>Study Sources E and F.</b><br><b>Does Source E prove that what the German says about the situation in Germany in Source F is correct? Explain your answer.</b>   | <b>[6]</b> |
| <b>L1</b> | <b>Explains Yes OR No, without evidence / not answering the question</b><br><br><i>e.g. Source E is about Hitler promising to improve German economy, while Source F is about the Weimar government being useless and weak.</i>   | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>L2</b> | <b>Explains Yes OR No, using content</b><br>Award 2m for Yes or No in content, unsupported<br>Award 3m for Yes or No in content, supported<br><br><i>e.g. Yes, Source E proves what the German says in Source F is correct as <b>both sources agree that the economic situation in Germany was bad.</b> [2] Source E states, "Hitler would move Germany towards economic recovery, instead of hopeless unemployment." Similarly, Source F states, "Over seven million people were also out of work and the national bank was on the brink of collapse." Both sources suggest that Germany's economy was in shambles as widespread unemployment was common. [3m]</i><br><br>OR<br><br><i>e.g. Yes, Source E proves what the German says in Source F is correct as <b>both sources agree that the political situation in Germany was bad.</b> [2] Source E states, "Hitler persuaded us that with his leadership, communism would no longer threaten to take away our jobs, our homes, our freedom.." Similarly, Source F states, "I saw the communist terror, their gangs breaking up political meetings and using their thugs to seize power in several government buildings at different times." Both sources suggest that communists disrupted the stability of German society and hence threatened peace in the country. [3m]</i><br><br>OR<br><br><i>e.g. No, Source E does <b>not</b> prove what the German says about the situation in Germany in Source F is correct as <b>both sources disagree on the sense of hope Germans had in the early 1930s.</b> [2] Source E states, "Hitler entered and was immediately hailed by his numerous followers among workers, farmers, and businessmen. It seemed to me he was the only one who offered hope." This suggests that Germans were optimistic about their future as they believed Hitler could revive the country's economy and improve their lives. However, Source F states, "The Weimar government was utterly helpless.. Nobody knew of any way to deal with it." This suggests that the situation in Germany so bad that no one knew how to get out of it, hence leaving Germans feeling a sense of hopelessness. [3m]</i> | <b>2-3</b> |
| <b>L3</b> | <b>Explains Yes AND No, using content</b><br>Award 3m for Yes and No in content, unsupported<br>Award 4m for Yes and No in content, supported<br><br><i>i.e. Both elements of L2</i>  | <b>3-4</b> |

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| L4 | <p><b>L2 + No, by referring to contextual knowledge (evaluating reliability of Source E)</b></p> <p><i>e.g. Source E does not prove what the German says about the situation in Germany in Source F is correct as Source E is unreliable. Based on my contextual knowledge, I know that Hitler used propaganda extensively, such as carefully staging the Nuremberg rallies to amplify people's enthusiasm for Hitler and to showcase the power of Nazis. Hence, when Speers attended the rally in 1931, it was likely he was indoctrinated by Nazi propaganda messages and hence believed Hitler was Germany's last hope. Therefore, Source E is not reliable and thus cannot be used to prove Source F is correct. [4m]</i></p>   | 4   |
| L5 | <p><b>Explains No, by evaluating Source E (purpose)</b></p> <p>Award 4m for not prove, based on purpose only<br/>Award 5m for not prove, based on purpose and context<br/>Award 6m for L2 + not prove based on purpose</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p><i>e.g. Source E does not prove what the German says about the situation in Germany in Source F is correct as Source E has a questionable purpose. Source E was created by a former Nazi Minister of Armaments, trying (M) to convince the international community that he only joined the Nazi Party as he truly believed Hitler was Germany's saviour. Source E states, "t seemed to me he was the only one who offered hope.. Hitler would move Germany towards economic recovery, instead of hopeless unemployment. The next day, I applied for membership in the Nazi Party." This suggests that Speer was in a desperate situation and hence believed Hitler when he professed he could save Germany. (O) This source was created so that the international community would empathize with him and not blame him for colluding with the Nazis during the war. Thus, this source is biased and unreliable. [4m]</i></p> <p><b>Evaluate provenance and context:</b></p> <p><i>e.g. In view that Source E was from a memoir written by a former Nazi Minister of Armaments after he was released from prison, this source is unreliable as Speer wanted to justify his role in aiding the Nazis to commit war crimes during WWII. It is clear this was a one-sided portrayal as he wanted to push the blame away from himself. Therefore, this source is unreliable and cannot be used to prove Source F is correct. [5m]</i></p> | 4-6 |



|           |   |            |
|-----------|---|------------|
| (e)       | <p><b>Study all the sources.</b><br/> <b>“Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany due to his skilful leadership abilities.”</b><br/> <b>How far do the sources support this statement? Use the sources and your knowledge to support your answer.</b></p>   | <b>[8]</b> |
| <b>L1</b> | <p><b>Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use</b></p> <p><i>e.g. Hitler was appointed as German Chancellor by President Hindenburg in January 1933.</i></p>  | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>L2</b> | <p><b>Yes OR No, supported by valid source use</b><br/> 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.</p> <p><b>Yes, due to his skilful leadership abilities: A, C, D, E</b><br/> <b>No, due to weakness of Weimar Rep (external circumstances): B, F</b></p> <p><b>Supports – A, C, D, E</b><br/> <i>e.g. Source A supports the statement that Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany due to his skilful leadership abilities as it shows how Hitler cleverly used propaganda to convince Germans that he was the natural successor to Hindenburg. Source A shows Hindenburg holding on to Hitler’s hand as the poster reads, “In the deepest need Hindenburg chose Adolf Hitler for Reich Chancellor.” This implies that Germany was facing a crisis at the time, and Hindenburg endorsed Hitler as Hitler was the only one capable of solving Germany’s problems. Consequently, many Germans were convinced by such Nazi propaganda and thus voted for the Nazi Party in the March 1933 elections. The win at this election was a crucial step to supporting Hitler to achieve absolute power in Germany as he was then able to pass the Enabling Act, giving him the power to pass laws without the President’s approval.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Source C supports the statement that Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany due to his skilful leadership abilities as it shows Hitler was always watchful and prepared to remove his opponents in order to ensure that only he could wield total power and control over all of Germany. Source C shows Hitler was considering setting “fire to a palace or something” even though his Nazi ministers reported that they have eliminated several of their opponents. Therefore, this suggests that Hitler was always quick to remove any threats to his rule and had planned to use the Reichstag fire as an opportunity to destroy his enemies.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Source D supports the statement that Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany due to his skilful leadership abilities as it shows how the Nazis staged the Reichstag fire and blamed the communists for it. Source D states, “Merely six days before the March 1933 election, the clumsy business of the Reichstag fire happened – cannot imagine that anyone really believes in communist perpetrators instead of paid Nazi work.” This implies that Hitler cleverly timed the arson attack so that he could arrest his strongest political rivals (i.e. communists) days before the election. In doing so, Hitler was able to discredit the communists and expand his support base and consequently gained more seats at the March 1933 elections.</i></p> | <b>2-4</b> |

|           |   |            |
|-----------|---|------------|
|           | <p><i>e.g. Source E supports the statement that Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany due to his skilful leadership abilities as it shows he was able to use his strong oratorical skills to reach out to the people. Source E states, "It seemed to me he was the only one who offered hope. He offered new ideals, a new understanding, and new tasks. Hitler persuaded us that with his leadership... Hitler would move Germany towards economic recovery." This suggests that he knew the concerns of the people and thus promised to revive Germany's economy. In doing so, Hitler was able to convince many Germans that only he could save Germany and hence they should support his rule.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Does not support – B, F</b></p> <p><i>e.g. Source B does not support the statement as Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany due to the weakness of the Weimar Republic. Source B states, "Seven million unemployed, the middle class swept away. The Great Depression rapidly produced the most dreadful poverty. I do not believe that the Germans would have followed Hitler in his hates and revenges if they had been living under reasonably good social conditions instead of suffering so much unemployment and hardship." This suggests that the Weimar Republic was incapable of solving Germany's woes. Life for people under Weimar Republic was miserable and this created a lot of resentment towards the Weimar leaders. Germans then began to turn to extremist parties like the Nazis as they claimed they were able to solve the country's economic problems with radical solutions that promised to be quick and effective.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Source F does not support the statement as Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany due to the weakness of the Weimar Republic. Source F states, "I saw the communist terror, their gangs breaking up political meetings and using their thugs to seize power in several government buildings at different times. The Weimar government was utterly helpless." This suggests that the Weimar Republic was unable to stop communist violence, thereby allowing the communists to disrupt its rule. As such, Hitler was able to achieve absolute power in Germany as the weakness of Weimar government presented an opportunity for him to seize power.</i></p> |            |
| <b>L3</b> | <p><b>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use</b></p> <p>Award 5 marks for one Yes and No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks. e.g. Both aspects of Level 2</p> <p>Award 8m = for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability or sufficiency – "evaluate the source"</p> <p><i>e.g. L2 + However, Source A is not reliable. It is propaganda election poster intended to sway public opinion to favour Hitler. It was designed to indoctrinate the German masses to believe that even Hindenburg favoured Hitler, and thus they should too. In view of this hidden agenda, this source cannot be trusted.</i></p>   | <b>5-8</b> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><i>e.g. L2 + Source B is reliable as the news article provided a balanced analysis on how Hitler achieved power in Germany. The source rightly criticised Hitler for his tyrannical leadership, yet at the same time offered the context to highlight the suffering of the German people under the Weimar leadership. Hence, this source can be trusted.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. L2 + Source C is reliable. The British cartoon suggests that Hitler was behind the Reichstag fire, and this is supported by my contextual knowledge, where I know that Hitler was indeed a dictator who wanted absolute power in Germany and hence constantly sought to remove threats (real or perceived) to his leadership. The Reichstag fire was clearly exploited by the Nazis to help Hitler to achieve absolute power in Germany in 1933-4.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. L2 + Source D is unreliable as it was written by a German communist. It pinned the blame of the Reichstag fire on the Nazis while vindicating the communists of all involvement in the attack. However, as a communist, the author was likely persecuted by the Nazis, and hence this account is one-sided and thus cannot be trusted.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. L2 + Source E is unreliable as it contained a hidden agenda. This memoir was a one-sided portrayal as Speer wanted to justify his role in the Nazis, particularly since he was a convicted individual charged with war crimes committed during WWII. Thus, this source cannot be trusted.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. L2 + Source F is not reliable. This source is a one-sided portrayal, intended to show how many Germans supported Hitler's rule since Hitler was believed to be the only leader capable of solving Germany's problems. The interview with this German was done in 1935, which meant that he might have been either influenced by Nazi propaganda or intimidated to speak only favourably of the Nazis since the Nazis were in power in Germany by then. Failing to do so might mean that he could be arrested and send to concentration camps. Hence, this source cannot be trusted.</i></p> |  |
|  | <p>*For L2/L3 award a bonus of up to 2 marks (+1/+1) for the use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks for the question must not exceed 8m</p> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To score in L2/L3 there must be source use (source details) i.e. direct reference to source content</li> <li>• Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues is not enough</li> <li>• Higher marks in L2/L3 to be awarded based on the numbers of sources used</li> </ul>  |  |

## Section B: Structured-Essay Questions

|            |  |            |
|------------|--|------------|
| <b>2</b>   | <b>This question is on World War Two in Europe.</b>  |            |
| <b>(a)</b> | <b>Explain why Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s.</b>   | <b>[8]</b> |
| <b>L1</b>  | <p><b>Describes the event</b><br/> Award 1m for each detail, up to maximum of 2m.<br/> Answers which describe the event / feature without focus on the question.</p> <p><i>e.g. After WWI, the huge German reparations and the war guilt clause in the Treaty of Versailles fostered deep resentment of the settlement in Germany.</i></p>   | 1-2        |
| <b>L2</b>  | <p><b>Identifies or describes factors</b><br/> Award 3m for each identification without description<br/> Award 4m for a detailed description</p> <p><b>Germany's territorial expansion disrupted lives</b><br/> <i>e.g. Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s because his acts of territorial expansion violated the sovereignty of other European nations. For example, in 1938, Hitler broke the peace treaty (Treaty of Versailles) by annexing Austria in 1938. In the same year, Hitler demanded control of the Sudetenland, and threatened to go to war for it, if necessary. Hence, going against the wishes of the Czechs, Britain and France signed the Munich Agreement with Hitler, thereby allowing Germany to gain control of Sudetenland. Shortly after, Hitler invaded and took over the rest of Czechoslovakia.</i></p> <p><b>Germany's growing military power posed a danger to other countries</b><br/> <i>e.g. Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s because his policies provoked other nations to attack. To expand Germany's Lebensraum or living space, Hitler violated the terms of the Treaty of Versailles by reintroducing conscription and rearmament in 1935. For example, Hitler increased the size of the German army from 100,000 to 550,000 men. He also built up its air force, Luftwaffe, and war-tested it in the Spanish Civil War. By 1939, Hitler had the strongest army in Europe.</i></p> | 3-4        |
| <b>L3</b>  | <p><b>Explains factors</b><br/> Award 5-6m for one explained factor<br/> Award 7-8m for two explained factors</p> <p><b>Germany's territorial expansion disrupted lives</b><br/> <i>e.g. Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s because his acts of territorial expansion violated the sovereignty of other European nations. For example, in 1938, Hitler broke the peace treaty (Treaty of Versailles) by annexing Austria in 1938. In the same year, Hitler demanded control of the Sudetenland, and threatened to go to war for it, if necessary. Hence, going against the wishes of the Czechs, Britain and France signed the Munich Agreement with Hitler, thereby allowing Germany to gain control of Sudetenland. Shortly after, Hitler invaded and took over the rest of Czechoslovakia. <b><u>As such, Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s because his success at acquiring territories in Europe emboldened Hitler to want to expand</u></b></i></p>   | 5-8        |

**further into the continent. Both Austria and Czechoslovakia were annexed without having to fight, thereby winning Hitler great respect and support from the German army. With this strong support, Hitler was confident his army would be able to break any resistance, which eventually caused the outbreak of WWII as Hitler set his sights on a third country, Poland. Hence, Hitler's actions threatened peace as lives and livelihoods were lost and disrupted.**

**Germany's growing military power posed a danger to other countries e.g. Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s because his policies provoked other nations to attack. To expand Germany's Lebensraum or living space, Hitler violated the terms of the Treaty of Versailles by reintroducing conscription and rearmament in 1935. For example, Hitler increased the size of the German army from 100,000 to 550,000 men. He also built up its air force, Luftwaffe, and war-tested it in the Spanish Civil War. By 1939, Hitler had the strongest army in Europe. As such, Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s because Germany's move to reintroduce conscription and rearmament posed a danger to the national security of other European countries. With a strong army, Hitler was emboldened and more confident to launch an invasion of Poland. Consequently, Hitler's aggressive actions prompted the Allied Powers to declare war on Germany and this triggered the start of WWII in Europe. Therefore, Hitler's actions threatened peace in Europe in the 1930s.**

|     |  |      |
|-----|--|------|
| (b) | <p><b>“Britain followed a policy of appeasement as it needed to buy time for rearmament against Germany.” How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.</b></p>  | [12] |
| L1  | <p><b>Describes the event, but without focus on the question</b><br/>Award 1m for each detail up to a maximum of 2m</p> <p><i>e.g. When Hitler came to power, he vowed to destroy the Treaty of Versailles and being about the union of Germany and Austria.</i></p>   | 1-2  |
| L2  | <p><b>Explains YES or NO</b><br/>Award 3m for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, up to a maximum of 6m</p>   | 3-6  |
| L3  | <p><b>Explains YES and NO</b><br/>Award 7m for an explanation of YES and an explanation of NO and further additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, up to a maximum of 10m</p> <p><b>Agree – To buy time for rearmament against Germany</b><br/><i>e.g. I agree with the statement as it allowed Britain to be more prepared for war against Germany. Britain suffered tremendous losses in WWI, and was not militarily prepared for another war. Hence in 1938, when Hitler threatened to go to war for Sudetenland, Britain followed a policy of appeasement and signed the Munich Agreement, deciding that Germany would gain control of the Sudetenland. <u>As such, Britain followed a policy of appeasement because it gave Britain the crucial time to rearm. Giving in to Hitler’s demands and not stopping his expansionist actions was a way to negotiate for more time as the British army prepare itself for war. The relative peace of a few years allowed the British uninterrupted time to build up its military. Therefore, I agree with the statement as appeasement was Britain’s strategy to delay a confrontation with Germany so as to give the British army more time to build up its military power.</u></i></p> <p><b>Disagree – Genuine sympathy for Germany over TOV</b><br/><i>e.g. I disagree with the statement as Britain followed a policy of appeasement as Chamberlain believed that Hitler’s grievances were justified. Many British politicians, including Chamberlain, thought that the Treaty of Versailles had dealt with Germany too harshly. For example, Germany lost the capability to defend itself against potential attacks and families were separated as Germany was forced to give up 10% of its land to the Allies. <u>As such, Britain followed a policy of appeasement because it had genuine sympathy for Germany over the Treaty of Versailles. Britain believed that the treaty was unfair and thus Hitler’s actions were only reasonable. Chamberlain thought that Hitler would be satisfied with negotiations and the German leader only wanted to revise the terms of the Treaty of Versailles so as to improve the plight of its people. Hence, Britain followed a policy of appeasement as Chamberlain felt that the Treaty of Versailles had been too strict, and that it is only right for Germany to regain lost lands and to rebuild its weakened forces.</u></i></p> | 7-10 |

|    |   |       |
|----|---|-------|
|    | <p>OR</p> <p><b>Disagree – Britain’s fear of communism</b></p> <p><i>e.g. I disagree with the statement as Britain followed a policy of appeasement due to Britain’s fear of communism. Many leaders in Britain hated and feared communism. It was also widely known that Hitler strongly opposed communism. He had banned the German Communist Party and put its leaders in concentration camps. <b><u>As such, Britain followed a policy of appeasement because Britain believed that a strong and united Germany under Hitler could act as a buffer against communism. Thus, Britain believed that allowing Hitler to rebuild Germany’s strength would create another strong opponent of communism and of the Soviet Union. This would help reduce the threat of Communism spreading across Europe.</u></b></i></p> <p>Other accepted reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Britain’s fear of another major war – British public would not support a war against Germany / pacifist mood</li> </ul> |       |
| L4 | <p><b>L3 plus reaches a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of ‘How far?’</b></p> <p>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers</p> <p><i>e.g. In conclusion, I agree with the statement that British appeasement was primarily a strategy of buying time for rearmament against Germany. By late 1930s, Hitler’s remilitarization plans were in full swing and so, the balance of power in Europe had already shifted in Germany’s favour. Therefore, Britain followed a policy of appeasement as it was a necessary strategy for them to delay an expected confrontation with Germany until the military balance was more favorable for Britain.</i></p>   | 11-12 |



|            |   |            |
|------------|---|------------|
| <b>3</b>   | <b>This question is on the Cold War.</b>  |            |
| <b>(a)</b> | <b>Explain why NATO was formed in 1949.</b>   | <b>[8]</b> |
| <b>L1</b>  | <p><b>Describes the event</b><br/> Award 1m for each detail, up to maximum of 2m.<br/> Answers which describe the event / feature without focus on the question.</p> <p><i>e.g. In 1947, President Truman pledged that America would go to the aid of any country threatened by armed minorities or by outside forces.</i></p>  | 1-2        |
| <b>L2</b>  | <p><b>Identifies or describes factors</b><br/> Award 3m for each identification without description<br/> Award 4m for a detailed description</p> <p><b>To strengthen Western Europe's defence</b><br/> <i>e.g. NATO was formed in 1949 to strengthen Western Europe's defence against Soviet aggression. After WWII, Stalin sought to expand its sphere of influence in Europe. For example, in 1948, Stalin imposed the Berlin Blockade, by blocking rail and road links to West Berlin, as well as cutting off communications, land and water pathways in and out of West Berlin. Stalin wanted to starve West Berlin into submission and to pressure the Western powers out of West Berlin. Stalin also hoped that the blockade would pressurize the three Western powers, USA, Britain and France, to abandon plans to unify their three zones in West Germany. This crisis over Berlin was perceived by USA as another example of USSR pursuing an aggressive plan to expand its influence in Europe.</i></p> <p><b>To contain communism and increase its own influence</b><br/> <i>e.g. NATO was formed in 1949 as USA wanted to contain communism and increase its own influence at the same time. With the removal of their common enemy, Germany, there was no further need for the USA and the Soviet Union to remain allies after WWII. Hence after the war, each superpower sought to compete for influence in Europe. American economic and security needs, as well as a desire to support post-war economic reconstruction and political self-determination of Europe, clashed with Soviet Union's ideological beliefs. For example, USA wanted Poland to be able to hold free elections to choose its own government, but USSR wanted Poland to be under Soviet influence and established a new communist government in Poland instead. Stalin went on to establish a ring of satellite states around Soviet Union, seeking to expand its communist influence in Europe.</i></p> | 3-4        |
| <b>L3</b>  | <p><b>Explain factors</b><br/> Award 5-6m for one explained factor<br/> Award 7-8m for two explained factors</p> <p><b>To strengthen Western Europe's defence</b><br/> <i>e.g. NATO was formed in 1949 to strengthen Western Europe's defence against Soviet aggression. After WWII, Stalin sought to expand its sphere of influence in Europe. For example, in 1948, Stalin imposed the Berlin Blockade, by blocking rail and road links to West Berlin, as well as cutting off communications, land and water pathways in and out of West Berlin. Stalin wanted to starve West Berlin into submission and to pressure the</i></p>   | 5-8        |



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Western powers out of West Berlin. Stalin also hoped that the blockade would pressurize the three Western powers, USA, Britain and France, to abandon plans to unify their three zones in West Germany. This crisis over Berlin was perceived by USA as another example of USSR pursuing an aggressive plan to expand its influence in Europe. <u>As such, NATO was formed in 1949 because Truman believed that an American-European alliance was necessary to strengthen the security of Western Europe. To USA, it was clear that the Soviet Union was aggressive in wanting to take over Europe and USA was afraid that if it does not step in to boost the military capabilities of Western Europe, the entire Europe might fall under Soviet control. Hence, it was necessary to form such a military alliance as it would allow American troops to be permanently stationed in Europe. Therefore, NATO was a military alliance created by USA and several Western European countries to provide collective security and to defend Western Europe against any potential attack by the Soviet Union.</u></p> <p><b>To contain communism and increase its own influence</b><br/> e.g. NATO was formed in 1949 as USA wanted to contain communism and increase its own influence at the same time. With the removal of their common enemy, Germany, there was no further need for the USA and the Soviet Union to remain allies after WWII. Hence after the war, each superpower sought to compete for influence in Europe. American economic and security needs, as well as a desire to support post-war economic reconstruction and political self-determination of Europe, clashed with Soviet Union's ideological beliefs. For example, USA wanted Poland to be able to hold free elections to choose its own government, but USSR wanted Poland to be under Soviet influence and established a new communist government in Poland instead. Stalin went on to establish a ring of satellite states around Soviet Union, seeking to expand its communist influence in Europe. <u>As such, NATO was formed in 1949 because the USA viewed a strong military alliance as vital to the prevention of communist expansion across Europe. All member countries in NATO were committed to curbing the spread of communism, and to embrace democratic and capitalist ideology. Hence, if one of its members was threatened by a communist takeover, the other countries were bound to help defend it. In doing so, USA would be able to stop the spread of communism while increasing its own influence at the same time.</u></p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|           |   |             |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| (b)       | <b>“America’s containment policy was a big success in hindering the spread of communism in Europe.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b>  | <b>[12]</b> |
| <b>L1</b> | <b>Describes the event, but without focus on the question</b><br>Award 1m for each detail up to a maximum of 2m<br><br><i>e.g. The Red Scare was hysteria over the perceived threat posed by communists during the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States.</i>   | 1-2         |
| <b>L2</b> | <b>Explains YES or NO</b><br>Award 3m for an explanation and further marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, up to a maximum of 6m  | 3-6         |
| <b>L3</b> | <b>Explains YES and NO</b><br>Award 7m for an explanation of YES and an explanation of NO and further additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, up to a maximum of 10m<br><br><b>Agree – America’s containment policy was a big success in hindering the spread of communism in Europe</b><br><i>e.g. I agree with the statement as USA was able to help countries like Britain and France to rebuild their economy after the end of WWII and hence preventing their possible fall to communism. The Marshall Plan as part of the containment policy sought to make Europe rich and strong again and prosperous enough to resist communism, by providing financial help as USA felt that a weak Europe would be attracted to communism. Between 1948 and 1952, 16 countries in Western Europe received a total of US\$13 billion in aid, loans and goods over a period of 5 years. The economic recovery of countries which received these financial aids helped prevent their fall to communism as communism soon fell in disfavour with the masses given the economic success and social prosperity that came along with democracy. <u>As such, America’s containment policy was a big success in hindering the spread of communism in Europe because people in Western European countries felt contented with what their democratic governments could offer them economically and socially. There was thus no need for the masses to support the communist party in the country. By accepting USA’s offer of assistance, Western European countries also opened themselves to USA’s influence, thereby preventing communism from gaining momentum and thus halt the spread of communism in Europe.</u></i><br><br><b>Disagree – America’s containment policy was <u>not</u> a success</b><br><i>e.g. I disagree with the statement as America’s containment policy failed to stop Eastern European countries from falling to communism. Stalin perceived that the USA was using the Marshall Plan to curb the spread of communism and to expand its own influence over Europe. Hence, the containment policy was perceived by the Soviet Union as aggressive bids by the USA to build its own empire in Europe. Consequently, Stalin forbade its satellite states in Eastern Europe from accepting the economic aid from USA. <u>As such, America’s containment policy was not a success in hindering the spread of communism in Europe because the USSR was able to prevent Eastern European countries from</u></i> | 7-10        |

|    |   |       |
|----|---|-------|
|    | <p><u>accepting the assistance from the USA, while keeping them dependent on Soviet Union for economic aid. America's containment policy further convinced Stalin it was necessary for him to step up his expansion so as to counter the threat posed by the USA. As a result, the USSR set up Cominform to tighten its control on the satellite states, further preventing these Eastern European countries from contacting USA and other non-communist countries. Hence, America's containment policy caused tensions between the superpowers to increase sharply as they adopted various measures that actively sought to undermine each other.</u></p>  |       |
| L4 | <p><b>L3 plus reaches a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of 'How far?'</b><br/>Award the higher mark in the level for more developed answers</p> <p><i>e.g. In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. Although the intentions of the containment policy was sound, it had the unintended consequence of worsening the relations between America and Soviet Union, as well convincing Stalin to tighten his grip on the satellite states in Eastern Europe. The worsening relation eventually convinced Soviet Union of the need to carry on with the aggressive spread of their ideology, communism, so as to counter the growing hostility by America towards communism. The resulting tension and increased security risks posed to countries as the two superpowers compete for influence would threaten to destabilise Europe and disrupt peace for decades to come.</i></p> | 11-12 |