

Name:

Register Number:

Class:



南橋中學

NAN CHIAU HIGH SCHOOL

**PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2024
SECONDARY FOUR**

For Marker's Use

HISTORY

2174/01

Paper 1

19 August 2024, Monday

1 hour 50 minutes

Additional Material: Writing Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name, class and index number on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Section A

Answer **all parts** of Question 1.

Section B

Answer two questions.

Start your answer for Section B on a fresh page.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work for Sections A and B separately.

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

The total marks for this paper is 50.

Section A: Source-based Case Study

Question 1 is **compulsory** for all candidates.

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources you are told to use. In answering the questions, you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

1 (a) Study Source A.

What is the cartoonist's attitude towards the Nazi-Soviet Pact? Explain your answer using details from the cartoon. [5]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How different are these two sources? Explain your answer. [6]

(c) Study Source D.

How surprised are you by what Stalin says about Chamberlain? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Source E.

What is the message of this cartoon? Explain your answer. [5]

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

'Stalin was right to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939.'

How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

The Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact

The Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, otherwise known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was signed on 23rd August 1939 by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union shortly before World War II. In the Pact, the two former enemies agreed to take no military action against each other for the next 10 years. With Europe on the brink of another major war, Soviet leader Joseph Stalin viewed the Pact as a way to keep his country on peaceful terms with Germany, while giving him time to build up the Soviet military. The Soviet army was severely weakened after Stalin's Great Purge in 1937, where he had imprisoned or executed many military generals and officers for going against him. On the other hand, Hitler wanted to reclaim the Polish Corridor and the city of Danzig. He was confident that the Polish forces could be defeated easily. Hence, the Pact ensured that Germany would be able to invade Poland unopposed by the Soviet Union. However, the Pact fell apart on 22 June 1941 when Nazi forces invaded the Soviet Union. Did Stalin make the right decision by signing this Pact in 1939?

Source A: *A British cartoonist's depiction of the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, October 1939. The caption reads 'Someone is taking someone for a walk'.*

21



SOMEONE IS TAKING SOMEONE FOR A WALK

Source B: *A radio broadcast on 3 July 1941 by Josef Stalin to the Russian public, a few days after the German attack on 22 June 1941.*

It may be asked: how could the Soviet Government have consented to conclude a non-aggression pact with such treacherous monsters as Hitler and Ribbentrop? Was this not a mistake on the part of the Soviet government? Of course not! It was a pact that Germany proposed to us in 1939. No single peace-loving State could decline a peace treaty even though it was headed by such monsters and cannibals as Hitler and Ribbentrop...We secured for our country peace for a year and a half and the opportunity of preparing our forces to repulse fascist Germany should it risk an attack on our country despite the pact. This was a definite advantage for us and a disadvantage for fascist Germany.

Source C: *An American historian's view on the Nazi-Soviet Pact during the 1960s.*

With the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, the Soviet government provided the narrative that the Western powers were to be blamed for the outbreak of war in 1939. They claimed that the Western powers aided and encouraged Nazi rearmament, appeased and encouraged Hitler aggression, and then in 1939, attempted to direct German

expansion eastward, in the Soviet direction. However, Stalin had his miscalculations, for he had no idea that he had created a Nazi monster that would quickly devour all of Continental Europe – and turn to eye a now-isolated Soviet Union. Moreover, Stalin certainly knew that Germany had already entered an anti-communist coalition, the Anti-Comintern Pact, which they negotiated with Japan in 1936.

Source D: *A secretly recorded conversation between Stalin and a British and American delegation in Moscow in October 1941. The delegation were discussing British and American supplies to the Soviet Union.*

Stalin explained how he had decided to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939. He thought that Chamberlain had been a disaster for Britain and for Russia. He felt that Chamberlain and his Conservative Party fundamentally disliked and distrusted the Russians. Moreover, Chamberlain did not send a Cabinet Minister to Russia in 1939 to discuss an alliance against Hitler. Hence, Stalin saw war coming and felt that if he could not get an alliance with Britain, then he must not be left alone, isolated, only to be victim of the victors when the war was over. However, he had made clear to Hitler that never at any time would he be a party to fighting Britain alongside Germany.

Source E: *A British cartoon from May 1939. The bear represents the Soviet Union, while the pole star refers to Danzig, a city which Poland had rights to control and develop.*



Source F: *An American cartoon drawn in 1939 after the Nazi-Soviet Pact.*



Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2 'The main reason for the success of the tin industry in Malaya by 1900 was the political stability brought by the British.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 3 'The poor reputation of the League of Nations in the 1920s was due to its inability to resolve conflicts.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 4 'The United States was to blame for the outbreak of World War II in Asia-Pacific.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

- End of Paper -

Copyright Acknowledgments:

- Source A <https://www.johndclare.net/RoadtoWWII8.htm>
Source B Geoffrey Roberts, Stalin, the Pact with Nazi Germany, and the Origins of Post-war Soviet Diplomatic Historiography, *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol.4, No.4 (Fall 2002), pp. 94.
Source C *Ibid*, pp. 95-6.
Source D <https://www.nationalreview.com/2019/08/german-soviet-non-aggression-pact-1939-upset-balance-of-power>
Source E <https://magazine.punch.co.uk/image/I0000RP5yhP.74qM>
Source F <https://www.johndclare.net/RoadtoWWII8.htm>

LORMS

1 (a) Study Source A.

1(a) What is the cartoonist's attitude towards the Nazi-Soviet Pact? Explain your answer. [5]

Markers' Report

Most of the students are able to attain L3/4 or L3/5 for this question. Weaker answers only describe the cartoon and fail to explain the cartoonist's attitude towards the Nazi Soviet Pact. You also need to explain the message of the source which suggests that the Pact only brought "temporary peace", will not last long

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>L1: Describes the cartoon 1</p> <p><i>e.g. This source shows both Stalin and Hitler walking side by side as friends after the signing of Nazi-Soviet Non-aggression Pact.</i></p> <p>L2: Attitude of the cartoonist, without inference of message 2-3</p> <p><i>3m for support with source details</i></p> <p><i>e.g. This cartoonist is <u>dismissive / critical / skeptical / negative / scornful/ doubtful</u> towards the Nazi-Soviet Pact [2], as seen from how both are having guns behind their back but deceiving one another through fake smiles on their faces. This is also seen in the sarcastic tone of 'someone is taking someone for a walk', showing the cartoonist's criticism about the two leaders being deceptive. [3]</i></p> <p>L3: Attitude of the cartoonist, with inference of message 4-5</p> <p><i>4m for interpretation of message, 5m for developed explanation.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. This cartoonist is <u>dismissive / critical / skeptical / negative / scornful/ doubtful</u> towards the Nazi-Soviet Pact, and believes that the Nazi-Soviet Pact is bound to break down / will not last long (Message). The cartoonist was mocking the uneasy relationship between the Soviet Union and Germany after the signing of the Pact in 1939. In the source, although Stalin and</i></p>	5

	<p>Hitler got what they wanted as they strolled down together down the 'Eastern Frontier' after the conquest of Poland, both countries had to live next door to each other after the occupation of Polish territories which would only make them wary of each other. In reality, <u>they were merely waiting for the opportunity to attack and destroy the other with the pistol hiding behind their own backs.</u> The caption, 'Someone is taking someone for a walk' shows the <u>true intention of both dictators which was meant to deceive or cheat the other party.</u> The cartoonist foresees that it was only a matter of time before one betrayed the other / this marriage of convenience would not last long, given their continued distrust towards each other all along.</p>	
--	--	--

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How different are these two sources? Explain your answer.

[6]

Most candidates are able to identify either or both the difference and similarity of these two sources. For difference in purposes, most were able to explain the intended msg and outcome of Source B but could not identify the biasness in Source C which were published during the Cold War Period.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>L1: Answer based on undeveloped provenance 1</p> <p>L2: Difference or similarity 2-3</p> <p>(Award the higher mark for answers with supported evidence)</p> <p>e.g. Sources B and C differ in showing <u>whether the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact was beneficial for Soviet Union in 1939.</u> Source B suggests that it was beneficial for Soviet Union as Stalin was able to buy time to rearm and ensure that it would not enter into a war with Germany so soon. Source B states that "We secure for our country peace for a year and a half and the opportunity of preparing our forces to repulse fascist Germany should it risk an attack on our country." On the other hand, Source C shows that the Pact was not beneficial for Soviet Union as</p>	6

it backfired and that Hitler only became more bold. Source C states that “However, Stalin had his miscalculations for he had no idea that he had created a Nazi monster that would quickly devour all of Continental Europe – and turn to eye a now-isolated Soviet Union.”

e.g. The sources are similar as they both agree that **Stalin knew that Hitler or Nazi Germany could not be trusted after all**. Source B states that “No single peace-loving State could decline a peace treaty even though it was headed by such monsters and cannibals as Hitler and Ribbentrop...” This suggests that **Stalin disliked the Nazi leaders** and knew that they had ulterior motives when approaching the Soviet to sign the Pact in 1939. Similarly, Source C states that “Moreover, Stalin certainly knew that Germany had already entered an anti-communist coalition, the Anti-Comintern Pact, which they negotiated with Japan in 1936.” This shows that **Stalin was highly suspicious of Hitler’s anti-communist stance**. Hence, both sources are similar in showing that the Soviet leader distrust the Nazi and their alliance forged in 1939 was merely a marriage of convenience.

**L3: Both aspects of Yes AND No
4**

**L4: Difference in Purpose of both sources
5-6**

(Award the higher mark if both purposes are well-analysed)

e.g. Both sources are different **in terms of their purposes and provenance**. Source B is a radio broadcast made by Stalin on 3 July 1941. As it was a few days after the German attack or Operation Barbarossa, **Stalin wanted to justify his reason of why he signed the Pact in 1939, especially when people started to question and criticize him for making the wrong decision**. In the source, Stalin acknowledged and described that Hitler and the Nazi Party could never be trusted. However, given the circumstances faced by Soviet Union in 1939, he had no better option. In the end he managed to secure peace for 1

	<p>½ years so that the country had more time to rebuild her army which was badly affected after the Great Purge of 1937. By making this speech, Stalin hoped to reassure the Russians that he had well considered all his options and wanted the Russians to continue to support his government. Based on my knowledge, the occupation of eastern Poland by Stalin as a ‘land buffer’ was also a reason why Stalin decided to sign the Pact. Stalin believed that Soviet casualties and destruction can be reduced if war broke out between the two countries. <u>On the other hand</u>, Source C is from an American historian’s view on the Nazi-Soviet Pact during the Cold War period. From the source, we can tell that the historian criticized the Soviet government’s decision for signing the Pact in 1939. In the source, he blamed Stalin for his short-sightedness to secure peace temporarily which in turn encouraged and gave the Nazi unopposed space and time to conquer most of the European continent. By downplaying the potential threat faced by the Soviet due to the appeasement policy adopted by Britain and France, he hoped that people would view the Soviet in a more unfavorable way, emphasizing that their decision to sign the Pact was a wrong one. The historian’s view was influenced by the Cold War rivalry between the two superpowers and it was not uncommon to see how historians offered contrasting opinions on historical events, criticizing each other.</p>	
--	--	--

(c) Study Source D.

How surprised are you by what Stalin says about Chamberlain? Explain your answer. [6]

The focus is about what Stalin says about Chamberlain. Weaker students did not focus their answers on Chamberlain but other issues. The context of this source is that the British and American delegation was in Moscow in Oct 1941, (After Operation Barbarossa). So why did Stalin “openly criticised Chamberlain”? Was he still the British PM then?

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p>L1: Answers which do not consider the concept of surprise 1</p> <p>L2: Surprise/lack of surprise based on common sense reasoning 2-3</p> <p><i>3m for both sides / answers supported with evidence</i></p> <p><i>e.g. I am surprised when Stalin says that Chamberlain did not want to cooperate via an alliance. This is surprising give the clear signs of Nazi aggressiveness during the late 1930s.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. I am not surprised that the Stalin Chamberlain for being a poor leader and making wrong decisions since Chamberlain had indeed been the architect behind appeasement, which was a disaster as mentioned by the source.</i></p> <p>L3: Surprise/lack of surprise based on cross-reference to CK or other sources 4-5</p> <p><i>5m for strong use of CK, or explaining both surprised/not surprised</i></p> <p><i>e.g. I am not surprised that <u>Stalin puts the blame on Chamberlain for the Soviet decision to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact.</u> Stalin says ‘Chamberlain and his Conservative Party fundamentally disliked and distrusted the Russians...Chamberlain did not send a Cabinet Minister to Russia in 1939 to discuss an alliance against Hitler’. This blames Chamberlain for pushing the Soviets to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact. This is not surprising since based on my contextual knowledge, where Chamberlain had indeed constantly appeased Hitler, with a key reason being because he trusted Hitler over Stalin, seeing the Nazis as more trustworthy than the communists. Chamberlain was also impressed by Hitler’s anti-communist credentials. Chamberlain also repeatedly gave in the Hitler’s demands such as in the Munich Agreement, proving Stalin’s point on him being ‘a disaster for Britain and for Russia’ and hence pushing him to form an alliance with Hitler.</i></p> <p><i><u>Can CR to source C</u> – also says that Soviet govt blamed the Western powers for encouraging and aiding Nazi rearmament,</i></p>	6

appeased and encouraged Hitler aggression □ backs up C's claim on Chamberlain's disastrous foreign policy.

e.g. I am surprised that Stalin says that Chamberlain was a poor leader and 'had been a disaster for Britain'. This is because I know that Chamberlain's decisions were actually popular amongst a many sections of the British public who genuinely did not want Britain to be involved in conflict with Germany over its actions in Europe. Moreover his actions were motivated by desire to also give Britain time to rearm. Hence it is surprising that Stalin would consider Chamberlain so negatively when appeasement was a popular attitude not only in Britain but in France as well.

L4: Not Surprise based on understanding of provenance / purpose / context
6

e.g. I am not surprised when Stalin says Chamberlain was to blame for the Nazi-Soviet Pact / Chamberlain was the reason why the Soviets signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact, given his purpose and timing. Source D is a secretly recorded conversation between Stalin and a British and American delegation discussing the two countries' supplies to the Soviet Union. This happened after the outbreak of WWII when Germany invaded Soviet Union in 1941. It is expected that Stalin would take this occasion to push the blame to ex-British Prime Minister, Chamberlain for not wanting to cooperate with Soviet Union against Nazi Germany. This would then justify the difficult situation that Soviet Union faced in 1939 and make it seem as if they had no choice but to accept the proposal of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. This is within expectation since Stalin was trying to secure the American and British supplies at a time when his country was invaded and American assistance was necessary since military supplies were running low in his country. This would allow the British and Americans to be more forthcoming and willing to help Soviet Union in spite of the past history. Given this motive, I am not surprised that Stalin would pin the blame on Chamberlain to this delegation.

(d) Study Source E.

What is the message of this cartoon? Explain your answer.

[5]

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<p>L1: Describe the cartoon, no interpretation. 1</p> <p><i>e.g. This cartoon shows Hitler looking out of the window staring at the night sky.</i></p> <p>L2: Sub-messages [Award 3 marks if supported from the source.] 2-3</p> <p><i>e.g. The message of this cartoon is to tell us that Hitler wanted to occupy or retake the free city of Danzig which was given to Poland after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. In the source, it shows that Hitler is staring at Danzig and thinking of ways to reoccupy it.</i></p> <p>L3: Main message [Award 5 marks if supported from the source] 4-5</p> <p>Key idea: Soviet Union as the main obstacle to Nazi plans to expand to Danzig/Poland</p> <p><i>e.g. The message of this cartoon is to <u>warn that Hitler had plans to reoccupy Danzig/invoke Poland</u>, a former German city that was given to Poland after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, but was <u>worried that Soviet Union would become a potential obstacle to his plan</u>. In the source, Hitler was seen standing at the balcony staring into the night sky. His aim was to retake Danzig, the Pole Star, but standing between him and Danzig is the Bear that represents the USSR. Hence, this cartoon suggests that <u>it was just a matter of time that Germany would invade Poland</u>, if Hitler could find a way to overcome the obstacle of Soviet Union / find a way to deal with the Soviet threat on the Eastern Front.</i></p>	5

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

‘Stalin was right to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939.’ How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

[8]

Question	Answer	Marks
(e)	<p>L1: Write about the hypothesis, no valid source use 1</p> <p>L2: Yes or No, supported by valid source use 2-4</p> <p><i>e.g. Sources B, D, F support the view that Stalin was right. Sources A, C, E does not support the view that Stalin was right</i></p> <p><i>Source B supports the view that Stalin was right to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 as it gives Soviet Union time and space to prepare for war against Germany. Due to the Pact, Soviet Union was also spared from war destruction when Second World War broke out. Source C states that “... We secured for our country peace for a year and a half and the opportunity of preparing our forces to repulse fascist Germany should it risk an attack on our country despite the pact.” Hence, this suggests that Stalin was right as the Pact was beneficial to Soviet Union as the Russians were unprepared to go to war in 1939.</i></p> <p><i>Source D supports the view that Stalin was right to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 as he needed to protect his country’s interests and avoid war at all costs. Due to the British’s reluctance to work with Soviet Union against Nazi Germany, Stalin had no choice but to secure a pact with Nazi Germany so that war can be avoided. Source C states that “Stalin thought that Chamberlain and the Conservative Party.... Fundamentally disliked and distrusted the Russians.... Stalin saw war coming, and Russia must know where she stood.... he must not be left alone, isolated, only to be victim of the victors when the war was over.” Hence, this suggests that Stalin was right as the Pact temporarily secured peace in Soviet Union.</i></p> <p><i>Source F supports the view that Stalin was right to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 as Soviet Union occupied eastern Polish territories which later acted as a land buffer against the Nazis when Operation Barbarossa started in 1941. This is evident from the source which shows that the bedfellows of the wolf representing Nazi Germany and the bear representing Soviet Union, smiling and looking hungrily at the Little Red Riding (representing Poland) when</i></p>	8

she entered the bedroom. Hence, this suggests that Stalin was right as the Pact allowed him to occupy the eastern region of Poland and using it as a form of buffer when war broke out in 1941.

Source A does not support the view that Stalin was right to sign the Nazi Soviet Pact in 1939 as Soviet Union or Stalin was highly suspicious of the Nazi Germany. Even though the Pact allowed both countries to share the Polish territories, it inevitably means that both Soviet Union and Nazi Germany would share a common border. From the cartoon, Low questions the real “friendships” or alliance between the two dictators as they were seen holding a pistol, hiding behind their backs, ready to attack if one party broke the pact. Hence, this shows that Stalin was wrong to sign the pact as the shared border between the two countries brought them closer to war.

Source C does not support the view that Stalin was right to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 as Stalin had completely miscalculated Hitler’s aggression and pursuit of occupying most parts of the European continent. By signing the pact, it inevitably gave Germany the opportunity to invade Poland unopposed. Based on the source, it shows that the “Nazi monster [with the pact] would quickly devour all of Continental Europe – and eventually turn to its rear to eye a now-isolated Soviet Union. Hence, this suggests that Stalin was wrong to sign the pact as it led to the outbreak of World War II and the vulnerable situation faced by the Soviet after the Nazis occupied most parts of Continental Europe, including France.

Source E does not support the view that Stalin was right to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 since it shows that Hitler was highly aggressive and had designs on the East. It shows that Hitler was looking longingly towards the Pole Star and the Bear, suggesting Hitler to be fundamentally aggressive and hence the pact would somewhat help to deter German attacks.

L3: Yes AND no, supported by valid source use

5-8

Bonus of two marks (i.e. +1, +1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. but the total for the question must not exceed 8

Students can evaluate Source B for its reliability. □ The purpose of addressing the Russian public when Soviet Union was caught by surprise by the German invasion on 22 June 1941. Hence, this is an immediate response from the Soviet leader to address the situation and look back at how his policy, the pact with Nazi Germany was

	<p>beneficial after all for Soviet Union. It would be to justify his decision to the Soviet citizens and make the Soviet government look better despite the pact having backfired, especially now that he had to rally them to fight in this war.</p> <p>Students can evaluate Source F for its lack of sufficient information in understanding why Stalin or Soviet Union agreed to the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact. □ The cartoon shows the “Wow!” response from the Little Red Riding Hood but it was in fact not surprising as the policy of appeasement failed. Moreover, the alliance between Soviet Union and Nazi Germany was partly due to the fear of communism and slow progress taken by the British and French governments to persuade the Soviet to join forces against the Nazis.</p>	
--	--	--

Section B: Essay Questions

General remarks

- Students are writing too little for essay questions - poor time management?
- Remember that a good explanation of given factor is worth 5m → so how can some of your paragraphs be even shorter than your response for message questions?
- Give yourself 40 minutes for this section in order to score well. (20 min per essay)

2. ‘The main reason for the success of the tin industry in Malaya by 1900 was political stability brought by the British.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Markers Report

- + It was heartening that many students chose Qn 2, a very crucial chapter that can be in both sections
- + Students had good content knowledge about how British intervention made Malaya more stable, citing examples of the resolution of the succession disputes and Larut Wars (with the Pangkor Treaty), and the introduction of the Residency System. Many were also able to describe some of Hugh Low’s successes in bringing more political stability.
- + Many students were able to **link** political stability to tin industry’s success (e.g. attracting more investors and ensuring greater productivity of the industry)

Areas for improvement

- Many students struggled to write a good alternative factor **because they are not nimble with the content presented in the TB**. Numerous other impacts that the

British brought (such as infrastructure development, influx of migrants) were also causes of the tin industry's success.

- Sensitivity to timing - Question is scoped to 1900. Hence, examples such as the standardisation of currencies to Straits Dollar were not relevant (after 1900).

Level	Descriptor	Marks
1	<p>Identifies/Describes reasons for the success of the tin industry in Malaya</p> <p><i>Award 1m for identifying one reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing one reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.</i></p> <p>Possible reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political stability • Infrastructure development (specifically railroads) • Suez Canal • Greater demand for tin (industrial revolution, tin canning and plating industries) worldwide • Role of migrants (influx of immigrants that provided labour + European businessmen bringing capital and technology) • Better healthcare provided by British - ensured that migrant labour were healthy and able to work productively 	1-3
2	<p>Explains how political stability brought by the British led to success of the tin industry OR explains how other reason(s) did so</p> <p><i>Award 4m for an explanation of how political stability led to success of the tin industry OR how other reason(s) did so, and an additional mark for additional reasons or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks</i></p>	4-5
3	<p>Explains how political stability brought by the British led to success of the tin industry AND explains how other reason(s) did so</p> <p><i>Award 6m for an explanation of how political stability led to success of the tin industry AND how another reason(s) did so, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks</i></p> <p>Given Factor e.g. Yes, the tin industry was able to succeed in Malaya due to the political stability brought by the British, as British intervention resolved some of the existing chaos and local disputes in Malaya. Prior to British intervention there were frequent wars among</p>	6-8

tin miners from different Chinese secret societies, as evidenced by the Larut Wars. There was no proper land survey to demarcate the various tin mines and Chinese miners fought over control of tin mines and water courses. Coupled with succession disputes, there was political chaos and instability. **With British intervention, particularly from Hugh Low's residency onwards, conditions for political stability were created. For instance, Low introduced the Perak State Council, bringing together the Sultan, the Resident (himself) and Malay, Chinese and British representatives, giving different parties a say in the government of the state. He was also able to take over tax collection, regulate land use and introduce land titles. All of this reduced what were previously sources of conflict.** Subsequently, the formation of the FMS further promoted stability by allowing greater administrative efficiency and better communications between the FMS. With this stability came more certainty for investments and willing labourers to take up employment, attracting a steady flow of European capital and Chinese labour which would then help to enhance the tin industry and establish it as a key pillar of the Malayan economy.

Other Factors

e.g. However, besides political stability, another reason for the success of the tin industry is the **development of transport infrastructure that improved connectivity, allowing for trade to flourish.** With British colonial rule, infrastructure such as new roads, bridges, harbours and railways were built to connect tin mines. **The first railway line was opened in 1885 and connected Taiping in Larut to Port Weld in the North. Over time, four railway lines were in operation by 1896, with the FMS facilitating better coordination.** All of these allowed for ease of transportation of tin to the ports for transshipment and trade, making the entire process more smooth. **Additionally, it facilitated the movement of people to take up jobs in the tin mines.** With this favourable infrastructure, conditions were more conducive for the tin industry to flourish and be more productive.

e.g. In addition, another more long-term reason for the success of the tin industry is the **opening of the Suez Canal**, which also increased the volume of trade from Malaya to the rest of the world. **With the Suez Canal opening in 1869, sailing from Britain to Malaya only took six weeks instead of the four months it took before the canal was introduced.** The Straits of Melaka became an important waterway in the region and became busier as it became the shortest route to travel from Europe to Asia. This increased trade between Southeast Asia and the rest of the world, encouraging

	<p>European expansion overseas. This set the broader context for the success of the tin industry by making foreign markets more accessible to the Malayan economy, enabling Malaya to become export-oriented and to bring its tin to the European markets, hence the success of the tin industry.</p>	
	<p>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3+2 bonus marks, i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2.</p> <p>e.g. Overall, I believe political stability was still the main factor for the success of the tin industry. Though the opening of the Suez Canal was a key background / contextual factor, <u>it was only until the issues of political instability were solved that the tin industry skyrocketed in success and Malaysians could take advantage of the favourable geographical position in which they were located with respect to the Suez Canal (time). Moreover, transportation advancements were dependent on a strong British administration that was politically stable (dependency).</u> Hence, political stability was still the fundamental reason for the tin industry's success.</p>	

3. 'The poor reputation of the League of Nations in the 1920s was due to its inability to resolve conflicts.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Marker's Report

- + Most students were able to explain at least one factor for the League of Nations' poor reputation, particularly the **absence of the United States** and how it damaged the credibility of the League of Nations.

Areas for Improvement

- Many students did not read the question carefully – the scope of 1920s limits where you can draw examples from. Examples from the 1930s, such as the Abyssinian Crisis, or disarmament conferences in the 1930s would be rejected
- Students need to have the discipline to link back to the event/question focus = poor reputation of the League.

- Instead of just writing about the factor **weakened the League**, go one step further to **show how it then affected the reputation of the league**
 - E.g. Made the League look like a paper tiger? Made it look hypocritical? Irrelevant? Biased? Helpless? Untrustworthy? Made League's goals of collective security / peacekeeping seem unrealistic?

Level	Descriptor	Marks
1	<p>Identifies/Describes reasons for the poor reputation of the League of Nations</p> <p><i>Award 1m for identifying one reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing one reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.</i></p> <p><u>Possible reasons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability to resolve conflicts / enforce peace / stop aggressor countries • Membership of the League / Absence of Americans • Inability to achieve disarmament <Part of content drawn from TB248, Chp 7> • Association with the unpopular Treaty of Versailles 	1-3
2	<p>Explains how the League's failure to enforce peace led to poor reputation OR explains how other reason(s) damaged the League's reputation</p> <p><i>Award 4m for an explanation of how failure to enforce peace led to the League's poor reputation OR how other reason(s) did so, and an additional mark for additional reasons or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks</i></p>	4-5
3	<p>Explains how the League's failure to enforce peace led to poor reputation AND explains how other reason(s) damaged the League's reputation</p> <p><i>Award 6m for an explanation of how failure to enforce peace led to the League's poor reputation AND how another reason(s) did so, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks</i></p> <p><u>Given Factor</u> e.g. The League of Nations' inability to resolve conflicts led to its poor reputation in the 1920s, as it <u>made the League's aims look like empty promise</u>. The League was set up with the key aim of resolving international disputes without going to war. Yet, the League proved to be inconsistent in its ability to prevent member states from warring. For example, in 1920, Poland took control of Vilna, the Lithuanian</p>	6-8

capital. However, the League could not make Poland withdraw, as the League's leaders (Britain and France) saw Poland as a potential ally against a resurgent Germany in the future. **As a result, this was a blow to the reputation of the League, with the League leaders appearing hypocritical.** Additionally, in 1923, Mussolini had attacked the Greek island of Corfu. Greece appealed for help from the League, to no avail. While Britain was willing to stand up to Mussolini, the French were not keen to be in a dispute with Italy as they were preoccupied with the Ruhr occupation. In the end, Mussolini got his way. These two examples illustrated that **the League was not always able to act to enforce peace, with some aggressor countries going unpunished. This contributed to the League's poor reputation amongst many.**

Other Factors

e.g. Another reason for the League's poor reputation was **because of its membership issues** which greatly weakened its credibility. In particular, the US Congress refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles or allow the United States to join the League. Without the US in the League, the League would not have the backing of a major world power. This effectively doomed the League, since it would be difficult to enforce economic or military sanctions as aggressor countries could potentially continue to trade with US, which was the world's largest economy. Additionally, without the powerful US military, the League would likely not be able to take strong action against aggressor countries even if the League chose to take military action as a last resort. **This affected the League's reputation, making it appear as a paper tiger.** Additionally, the absence of other large countries like the communist-USSR or Germany also **affected the League's reputation and claim to be a world organisation for peacekeeping,** since the League was not at all representative and seemed like an "exclusive" club of victors from WWI and their allies. Hence, **the membership of the League cast a shadow on the League, affecting its reputation.**

e.g. Another reason for the poor reputation of the League was **its failure to bring about its goal of disarmament.** In signing the Covenant, members of the League were expected to disarm, but there was too much distrust amongst member countries who feared they could not protect their territories and interests. **For example, the League Commission to prepare for the World Disarmament Conference in 1926 was a failure, with Britain and France refusing to co-operate. Where there were some successes at disarmament in the 1920s, such as the Washington Naval Conference or the Locarno Treaties, these were negotiated outside of the League, with the League appearing irrelevant.** Hence, it appeared that **overall**

	<u>progress on disarmament was limited, with continued distrust amongst many world powers. There was thus scepticism about the League's ability to bring peace.</u>	
	<p>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3+2 bonus marks, i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2.</p> <p>e.g. Overall, I believe that the <u>root cause</u> of League's poor reputation in the 1920s was not its inability to resolve conflicts, but its membership issues. Firstly, the League did experience some successes in terms of resolving conflicts, such as in the Greek-Bulgarian border dispute of 1925 and the Upper Silesia dispute in 1921. These had created some optimism for the League's effectiveness. Hence, its poor reputation was not due to this factor, but rather because of the membership issues. The lack of US participation was a huge blow, since Woodrow Wilson was its biggest backer. <u>Without the US, there was much scepticism that the League would work, and its goals seemed lofty and idealistic. Britain and France themselves were reluctant leaders and ended up lacking the conviction and ability to make it work. They would end up making decisions contrary to the goals of the League, damaging its credibility.</u> Where the League was unable to solve conflicts, it boiled down the Britain and France's unwillingness to act, again showing how the root cause for the League's failures and its poor reputation was really because of its membership.</p>	

4. 'The United States was to blame for the outbreak of World War II in Asia-Pacific.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Marker's Report

- + Many students were able to give examples of why United States was to blame for the outbreak of WWII in Asia-Pacific, citing protectionism as well as US trade embargos and sanctions on Japan from 1937 onwards
- + Many students could give a good alternative factor, mainly focusing on why Japan was also to blame for the outbreak of WW2, giving examples of militarism/ultranationalism and an expansionist foreign policy. Popular examples include the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, the Mukden Incident, and also the bombing of Pearl Harbour.

Areas for Improvement

- Students lack content mastery
 - e.g. for Given Factor, students mixed up tariffs, embargoes, and sanctions.
 - e.g. for explaining Japan's expansionist policy, it is better to use examples from the 1930s as that is closer in time to WWII, compared to examples from Japan's earlier phase of expansionism (e.g. Korea, Taiwan)

Level	Descriptor	Marks
1	<p>Identifies/Describes factors that were to blame for the outbreak of World War II in Asia-Pacific</p> <p><i>Award 1m for identifying one reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing one reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.</i></p> <p>Possible factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United States to blame - poor relationship with Japan (sanctions from 1937/ protectionism in early 1930s) • Japan to blame – expansionist ambitions / militarism • League of Nations to blame – inability to maintain peace • European powers to blame – discriminatory attitudes towards Japan 	1-3
2	<p>Explains why the United States was to blame for the outbreak of WW2 in A-P OR explains why other factor(s) were to blame</p> <p><i>Award 4m for an explanation of why the US was to blame for the outbreak of WW2 in A-P OR how other factor(s) were more to blame, and an additional mark for additional reasons or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks</i></p>	4-5
3	<p>Explains why the United States was to blame for the outbreak of WW2 in A-P AND explains how other factor(s) were to blame</p> <p><i>Award 6m for an explanation of why the United States was to blame for the outbreak of WW2 in A-P AND explains how other factor(s) were more to blame, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks</i></p> <p><u>US was to blame</u></p> <p>e.g. The US was to blame for the outbreak of World War II in Asia-Pacific as it took actions that pushed Japan to take increasingly aggressive actions. One area which illustrated this is the use of protectionism by the Americans in the 1930s after the Great Depression. For example, the US had introduced a range of tariffs on</p>	6-8

Japanese goods, such as light bulbs, canned fish and clothing, making them more expensive to the American consumer. These hurt Japan's export trade and convinced the ultranationalists in Japan that other countries were unreliable and they needed to take more aggressive steps to be self-sufficient. Another example was in the rapidly deteriorating relations from 1937 onwards, when the US government took a hard line on Japan to protest its invasion of China and to keep its expansion in check. The US provided aid to the Chinese and in 1940, also placed an embargo on raw materials like steel and iron after Japan's occupation of French Indochina. An oil embargo was also placed on Japan in 1941 when Japan refused to withdraw from both China and Indochina. Such actions by the US was to blame for the outbreak of WW2, as it appeared to **strangle Japan financially and it also cut off Japan's oil supplies—a huge blow to the Japanese military's ambition of expanding throughout Southeast Asia.** US demands for Japan to withdraw were also seen as unacceptable to Japan as it would mean Japan could be bullied and intimidated. This was directly responsible for WW2 as it was what led Japanese leaders to eventually take the gamble of launching the Pearl Harbour attack as a pre-emptive strike against the US, to ensure that it could conquer new territories uninterrupted. With Pearl Harbour, the outbreak of WWII in Asia-Pacific was triggered, with US declaring war on Japan.

US was not to blame – it was others

e.g. However, the US cannot be completely blamed for the outbreak of WW2, as it was Japan's own expansionist policy that was to blame for creating much tension within the Asia-Pacific. Japanese politics in the 1930s had taken a more militaristic and ultranationalist bent after the Great Depression, with many seeing expansionism as a way to solve Japan's economic problems. Military commanders and officers believed that it was Japan's destiny to remove the Western powers from Asia and to expand its rule over Asia. The Japanese education system had also inculcated a wariness towards foreigners and a strong sense of nationalist pride in the Japanese population. As a result, actions that the Japanese military took in China, such as the conquest of Manchuria in 1931 were met with popular support. Subsequently, the Japanese military government also took advantage of China's civil war to expand its territory, taking places like Inner Mongolia and eventually starting the Second Sino-Japanese War. It was these acts of aggression that drew condemnation from the US and created much tension, causing the two powers to clash. The decision to bomb Pearl Harbour was also due to Japan's own desire for a knockout blow to distract the US and to secure more oil and resources in Southeast Asia. Hence, it

	<p>was <u>Japan's own actions and calculations that prompted the US to declare war after Pearl Harbour.</u></p> <p><i>Other points</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LON to blame – not able to respond to the Manchurian Crisis; Lytton Report seen as a weak response. Not able to impose sanctions as member states could not agree on how to act. Britain and France also did not want to risk their navies or armies to stop Japan (appeasement). Japan thus merely left the League and was emboldened to take a free hand in expanding in Asia, eventually causing the clash with the US. • European powers to blame – history of discrimination against Japan was what fuelled Japanese ambitions to build an empire to rival the West. For e.g., the Washington Naval Treaty seen as discriminatory and unfair; USSR's border with Japan in Manchuria seemed insecure; Britain's criticism of Japan's invasion of Manchuria seemed hypocritical considering that Britain had many colonies throughout Asia. All of these were seen as Western double standards to Japan and were used by ultranationalists as reasons to push for a more aggressive foreign policy that would eventually lead to war. 	
	<p>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</p> <p>The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3+2 bonus marks, i.e. L3/6+2; L3/7+2; L3/8+2.</p> <p>e.g. I believe that blame should largely be on Japan instead of the US, as <u>US was ultimately just responding to stop/curb Japan's acts of aggression, which had repeatedly crossed American lines.</u> Moreover, <u>US actions were progressive and did not immediately endanger Japan.</u> At each stage, US used measures that stopped short of war, focusing its sanctions on war material only, in the hope of bringing Japan to the negotiating table. It was Japan that continued to escalate its activities, prompting the US to take harsher measures leading to the eventual oil embargo. The declaration of war was also a response to the unexpected Pearl Harbour attack. Ultimately, Japan's ambitions was what led it to view US actions as an affront and a threat.</p>	