FOR EXAMINER'S	USE
SECTION A	/ 30
SECTION B	/ 20
TOTAL	/ 50

Class:

R'S USE	My target grade/mark:
/ 30	
/ 20	

Parent's Signature

[Turn over

This document consists of 6 printed pages.

Candidate Name:

AUGUST 2024

Source-based Case Study

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

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

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

1(a) Study Source A.

How useful is this source as evidence of the USA's motivations for intervening in the Korean War? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Source B.

Why do you think Mao made this speech? Explain your answer. [5]

(c) Study Source C.

Are you surprised by the reasons given for Chinese intervention in the Korean War? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Sources D and E.

How far does Source E prove that Source D was wrong about the communist powers? Explain your answer.

[6]

(e) Study all the sources.

"The Korean War was a regional conflict rather than a Cold War conflict." How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Was the Korean War a regional conflict rather than a Cold War conflict?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

The Korean War began when North Korean forces crossed the 38th parallel and invaded South Korea on 25 June 1950. This invasion led to a swift response from the United Nations, with the USA leading a coalition to repel the North Korean forces. Traditionally, the war is seen as part of the broader Cold War struggle between the USA and the Soviet Union. However, regional issues and security concerns also played significant roles. Both China and the Soviet Union had strategic interests in supporting North Korea to maintain a buffer state and preventing a US-aligned Korea on their borders. The conflict ended in a stalemate with the signing of the Korean Armistice Agreement on 27 July 1953, which established the Korean Demilitarised Zone (DMZ) but did not lead to a formal peace treaty. Was the Korean War a regional conflict led by local interests and security concerns, rather than a Cold War conflict between superpowers?

Source A: A statement by American President Harry Truman, 27 June 1950.

The Security Council of the United Nations called upon the invading troops to cease hostilities and to withdraw to the 38th parallel. This they have not done, but on the contrary have pressed the attack. The Security Council called upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution. In these circumstances I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that Communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war. It has defied the orders of the Security Council of the United Nations issued to preserve international peace and security.

Source B: Excerpt from a speech by China's Chairman, Mao Zedong, October 1950.

To leading comrades of the Chinese People's Volunteers at all levels:

In order to support the Korean people's war of liberation and to resist the attacks of U.S. imperialism and its running dogs, thereby safeguarding the interests of the people of Korea, China and all the other countries in the East, I herewith order the Chinese People's Volunteers to march speedily to Korea and join the Korean comrades in fighting the aggressors and winning a glorious victory.

Source C: Adapted from a *CIA National Intelligence Estimate report on Chinese intervention in the Korean War, November 1950.

Communist China's decision to send troops to North Korea, risking a wider conflict, likely had Soviet approval or direction. Both parties must have deemed the expected benefits worth the risk of a general war involving the USSR. This risk included a possible US reaction to address the broader issue with the USSR rather than engage in an expensive, uncertain war with China.

The immediate reason for Chinese assistance was the crossing of the 38th Parallel by US forces and the swift collapse of North Korean resistance. Without Chinese intervention, UN forces would have soon secured the Yalu River line, leaving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as a government-in-exile and guerrilla movement. Faced with this, the Chinese decided to prevent an early UN military victory and maintain a Communist regime on Korean soil.

*CIA (Central Intelligence Agency): a US government agency responsible for gathering, analysing, and reporting on national security information from around the world to assist in making informed decisions on foreign policy and security issues

Source D: An American leaflet dropped on North Korea during the Korean War. The leaflet is accompanied by the following text on its reverse: "The communist aggressor is enslaving your country like a giant octopus."



EFSS/PRELIM2024/HUMANITIES(HIST)/2261_02/4E/NSR

Source E: A telegram from Stalin to Mao Zedong, 26 October 1949.

We agree with your opinion that the Korean People's Army ought not to pursue an attack at the present time. At one time we also pointed out to the Korean friends that the attack on the south by the Korean People's Army should not be undertaken since this attack had not been prepared from either a military or a political standpoint.

In our opinion at the present time the Korean comrades ought to concentrate their efforts in the struggle for the unification of Korea on developing a partisan movement, creating liberated areas in South Korea, and a comprehensive strengthening of the People's Army of Korea.

Source F: An extract from an article published by two Chinese historians in London in 1990.

It is clear the reasons why China entered the Korean War were primarily security concerns. Fearing a growing military threat from the US and believing that Sino-American military confrontation was inevitable, CCP leaders maintained that it might be wise for them to select the time and place. When American troops, despite Chinese warnings, crossed the 38th parallel and marched towards the Yalu River, the People's Republic of China entered the conflict in support of North Korea's forces. Over a brief period, the Korean War turned into a United States-China military conflict. Looking back, if the CCP and the Truman Administration had better understood each other's intentions, this tragedy could have certainly have been avoided."

Acknowledgements:

|--|

- Source B https://china.usc.edu/mao-zedongs-order-chinese-peoples-volunteers-1950
- Source C https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/DOC_0001095911.pdf
- Source D https://digitalhorizonsonline.org/digital/collection/ndsu-korea
- Source E <u>https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114899</u>
- Source F Chinese historians; The China Quarterly, No. 121 (Mar, 1990); Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of the School of Oriental and African Studies.

Section B: Essays

Answer two questions.

- 2. "The weaknesses of Japan's democratic government were decisive in the establishment of an authoritarian regime in Japan." How far do you agree with this statement? [10]
- **3.** "The Viet Cong together with the North Vietnamese were the primary cause of the Vietnam War." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your [10] answer.
- 4. "The Cold War ended because of the failure of the Soviet command economy." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

END OF PAPER

2024 HUMANITIES (HISTORY) 2261/02 4E PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION LEVEL OF RESPONSE MARKING SCHEME (LORMS)

Section A

1a)	Study Source A. How useful is this source as evidence of the USA's motivations for intervening in the Korean War? Explain your answer.	5m
L1	Address the assertion based on provenance only	1
	E.g. Source A is useful because it is from a speech by President Truman so as an American president, he should know what USA's motivations were for intervening in Korea.	
L2	Address the assertion based on source content only Award 3 marks for more developed answers.	2-3
	E.g. Source A is useful as evidence of the USA's motivations for intervening in the Korean War because it highlights the USA's intent to support the United Nations and counter Communist aggression. Source A states, "The Security Council of the United Nations called upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations," and, "The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that Communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations." This suggests that the USA's intervention was driven by a desire to uphold international peace and security and to counter the spread of communism. However, it does not address other potential motivations, such as geopolitical interests in Asia.	
L3	L2+ Addresses the assertion based on cross-reference to another source/CK	4
	E.g. L2+ However, this is refuted by Source F, which suggests that China's entry into the war was driven by security concerns and fear of US aggression. Source F states, "It is fairly clear the reasons why China entered the Korean War were primarily security concerns. Fearing a growing military threat from the US, and believing that Sino-American military confrontation was inevitable" This indicates that the USA's motivations might have also included strategic concerns about maintaining influence in Asia, not solely ideological reasons. This contradiction suggests that Source A may not provide a complete picture, thus affecting its overall credibility and utility as evidence of the USA's motivations.	
L4	L2/L3 + Not entirely useful based on source origin and purpose	5
	E.g. L2/L3 + However/Additionally, considering the origin and purpose of Source A, its credibility may be affected. As a public statement by President Truman following North Korea's invasion of the South, its purpose was likely to justify the USA's intervention to both the American public and the international community. This means it could be biased, emphasising the ideological battle against communism while downplaying other motives, such as American strategic interests in Asia. For instance, Truman's statement that "I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean	

	Government troops cover and support" shows a clear intent to demonstrate decisive action against communism, which would appeal to both domestic and international audiences wary of communist expansion. During this period, the USA was also focused on containing Soviet influence and protecting its allies in Asia, particularly Japan. This context suggests that Truman's speech was partly designed to garner support for a broader strategic agenda, making the source somewhat biased. This affects the credibility of Source A and its utility as evidence of USA's motivations. Despite this potential bias, Source A is still useful because it reflects the official stance and reasoning given by the USA at the time. It provides insight into the public justification for the intervention, showing how the USA presented its actions to the world.	
1b)	Study Source B. Why do you think Mao made this speech? Explain your answer.	5m
L1	Lifts from the source.	1
	E.g. Mao made this speech to support the Korean people's war of liberation and to resist the attacks of U.S. imperialism.	
L2	Answers based on context only – because of what was going on at the time	2
	E.g. Mao made this speech because UN forces had penetrated deep into North Korea and were closing in on the border with China.	
L3	Answers based the source's message only.	3
	E.g. I think that Mao made this speech to suggest that intervening in the Korean War was necessary to resist American imperialism and support North Korea. This is evident in Source B where Mao says, "In order to support the Korean people's war of liberation and to resist the attacks of U.S. imperialism and its running dogs." This means that Mao was framing the intervention as a just and essential act of defense against American aggression.	
L4	Purpose explained with intended outcome Award 5 marks for more developed answers.	4-5
	E.g. I think that Mao made this speech to convince the Chinese people that intervening in the Korean War was necessary to resist American imperialism and support North Korea. This is evident in Source B where Mao says, "In order to support the Korean people's war of liberation and to resist the attacks of U.S. imperialism and its running dogs." This means that Mao was framing the intervention as a just and essential act of defense against American aggression. At the time, China was consolidating its power post-revolution and faced the threat of American troops approaching the Yalu River, the	

1c)	border with North Korea. It was wary of American influence in Asia, particularly after the US involvement in Japan and Taiwan as well as the broader Cold War tensions. Thus, Mao likely intended to legitimise the intervention, boost morale among Chinese troops, and unify public opinion against the USA, reinforcing the ideological struggle between communism and capitalism. Study Source C. Are you surprised by the reasons given for Chinese	6m
	intervention in Korea? Explain your answer.	
L1	Addresses assertion based on general comments on provenance only. E.g. I am not surprised by the reasons Source C gives because its from the CIA.	1
L2	 Addresses the assertion based on source content only Award 3 marks for more developed answers. E.g. I am not surprised by the reasons given in Source C for China's intervention in the Korean War. Source C claims that China's decision to intervene was influenced by Soviet approval and direction, stating, "Communist China's decision to send troops to North Korea, risking a wider conflict, likely had Soviet approval or direction." This suggests that China's actions were heavily influenced by Soviet strategy. Since China and the Soviet Union were communist allies, it is not surprising that they worked together to support North Korea and oppose the USA and its allies. 	2-3
L3	 L2+ Addresses the assertion based on cross-reference to another source/CK Award 5 marks for more developed answers. E.g. I am surprised by the reasons given in Source C for China's intervention in the Korean War. Source C claims that China's decision to intervene was influenced by Soviet approval and direction, stating, "Communist China's decision to send troops to North Korea, risking a wider conflict, likely had Soviet approval or direction." This suggests that China's actions were heavily influenced by Soviet strategy. This is surprising because it is refuted by Source F, which emphasises that China's intervention was mainly driven by its own security concerns and fear of US aggression. Source F states, "The reasons why China entered the Korean War were primarily security concerns When American troops, despite Chinese warnings, crossed the 38th parallel and marched towards the Yalu River, the People's Republic of China entered the conflict." This means that China's decision was more independent and focused on its national security rather than being directed by the Soviet Union. This contradiction between the sources provides a reason to be surprised by the claims made in Source C. 	4-5

L4	L2/L3 + Addresses the assertion based on an analysis of source origin and purpose Award 6 marks for more developed answers. E.g. L2/L3 + Ultimately, I am not surprised by the reasons given in Source C for China's intervention in the Korean War. Source C comes from the CIA National Intelligence Estimate report, which was likely meant to analyse and interpret international events from a American perspective during the Cold War. The report states, "Communist China's decision to send troops to North Korea, risking a wider conflict, likely had Soviet approval or direction." Given the heightened tension between the USA and the Communist bloc, it is expected that the CIA would emphasise Soviet influence to highlight the coordinated threat posed by communist countries. Source C's seeks to inform US policymakers about the perceived dangers of Soviet and Chinese collaboration, so it would be natural to assume the worst in order for policymakers to safeguard American geopolitical interests. So, it is not surprising for Source C to claim that China was acting on Soviet direction, given the source's origin and purpose.	5-6
1 d)	How far does Source E prove that Source D was wrong about the communist powers? Explain your answer.	6m
L1 L2	 Addresses the assertion based on general comments on provenance or context / an analysis of Source D or E only. E.g. Source D suggests that communists were aggressive and controlling. Addresses the assertion based on content comparison of Sources D and E, supported Award 3 marks for more developed answers. E.g. Source E proves that Source D was wrong about the role of communist powers because it provides a different perspective on communist actions and 	1 2-3
	intentions than Source D. Source D suggests that communist powers were aggressive and controlling, as shown by the octopus bearing the communist symbol, manipulating North Korea. The image depicts the octopus's tentacles extending over North Korea, squeezing its civilians and soldiers. This symbolises aggressive and manipulative control by the communist powers, Soviet Union and China, over North Korean actions. On the other hand, Source E suggests that the Soviet Union was cautious and advising restraint. Source E states, "The attack on the south by the Korean People's Army should not be undertaken since this attack had not been prepared from either a military or a political standpoint." This suggests that the Soviet Union was not pushing for immediate aggressive action but was focused on careful planning and stability instead. Thus, Source E shows a more cautious approach by the Soviet Union, proving that Source D's portrayal of aggressive communist control is not entirely accurate.	
L3	L2 + Addresses the assertion based on cross reference to other sources / contextual knowledge Award 5 marks for more developed answers.	4-5

	E.g. L2+ when I cross refer to Source C, it highlights China's strategic concerns and need for careful intervention, supporting Source E's portrayal of a more measured approach by communist powers. Source C states, "The immediate reason for Chinese assistance was the crossing of the 38th Parallel by US forces and the swift collapse of North Korean resistance." This shows that China's intervention was strategic and reactive rather than purely aggressive, emphasising the need to prevent a UN victory and maintain a communist regime on Korean soil. Since, Source C supports Source E, Source E is reliable and proves that Source D was wrong about the communists.	
L4	L2/L3 + Addresses the assertion based on a critical examination of	6
	source origin and purpose.	
	E.g. L2/L3 + A critical examination of Source E's origin and purpose enhances its credibility and ability to prove that Source D was wrong. As a private communication from Stalin to Mao, the telegram's purpose was to provide strategic advice rather than public propaganda. For example, Stalin says, "The attack on the south by the Korean People's Army should not be undertaken since this attack had not been prepared from either a military or a political standpoint." This shows realistic concerns and careful planning, not meant for public persuasion. Therefore, Source E can be considered a reliable reflection of Soviet strategy, showing caution and restraint rather than the aggressive manipulation depicted in Source D. Stalin's message was meant for a trusted ally and focused on practical military considerations rather than influencing public opinion. Thus, Source E is reliable and proves that Source D was wrong about the communist powers.	
1 e)	Study all the sources. "The Korean War was a regional conflict rather than a Cold War conflict." How far do these sources support this view?	8m
14	Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.	4
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, with no valid source use	1
	E.g. Yes the Korean War was a regional conflict because more sources say so.	
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source useAward 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.SupportSource C,E, F	2-4
	E.g. Source C supports the view that the war was driven by regional issues. It describes how China's intervention was crucial in preventing a UN victory and maintaining a stable North Korea, indicating China's actions were focused on supporting its neighbouring ally and ensuring regional security. The source states, "The immediate reason for Chinese armed assistance	

appears to have been the crossing of the 38th Parallel by US forces and the swift collapse of North Korean resistance." This suggests that China's involvement was motivated by regional stability and preventing the fall of North Korea rather than purely Cold War dynamics.

E.g. **Source E** supports the view that the war was driven by regional issues because Stalin advised against immediate aggressive action, indicating the Soviet Union's strategic considerations and cautious involvement. The source states, "The attack on the south by the Korean People's Army should not be undertaken since this attack had not been prepared from either a military or a political standpoint." Stalin's advice for a more measured approach suggests a focus on regional stability rather than immediate Cold War aggression.

E.g. Source F supports the view that the war was driven by regional issues. The source states, "The reasons why China entered the Korean War were primarily security concerns... When American troops, despite Chinese warnings, crossed the 38th parallel and marched towards the Yalu River." This indicates that China's involvement was motivated by regional security concerns. The source highlights China's efforts to protect its borders and maintain local stability in response to US actions, showing that the conflict was more regional.

OR

Do Not Support

Sources A, B, D

E.g. Source A does not support the view that the Korean War was a regional conflict and instead suggests it was part of the larger Cold War rivalry. President Truman's statement emphasises the USA's commitment to counter Communist aggression and support South Korea, highlighting the ideological struggle between the USA and Communist forces, mainly China. Truman states, "The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that Communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war." This shows that the USA viewed the conflict through the lens of the global struggle against communism.

E.g. Source B does not support the view that the war was a regional conflict and instead emphasises the Cold War dynamics. In Mao's speech, he says, "In order to support the Korean people's war of liberation and to resist the attacks of U.S. imperialism." This indicates China's motivation to support North Korea and oppose the USA, reflecting the global superpower rivalry typical of the Cold War. Mao's framing of the war as a fight against US imperialism underscores the ideological battle between superpowers.

E.g. Source D does not support the view that the Korean War was a regional conflict and instead portrays it as a Cold War conflict. The political cartoon depicts North Korea as being manipulated by communist powers suggesting aggressive intervention by these communists against US-backed South Korea. The cartoon illustrates the broader Cold War context of superpowers

	using Korea as a battleground for their ideologies. However the reliability of Source D can be questioned, as it is a piece of propaganda likely created to influence public opinion. Political cartoons are often exaggerated and intended to promote a particular perspective, in this case, highlighting the idea of communist aggression and manipulation to rally support for US involvement in the war. This means the cartoon may overstate the influence of China and the Soviet Union, making it less reliable as evidence of the true nature of the conflict. (+1)	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use Award 5 marks for one Yes <u>AND</u> No supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks. Award 8 marks for use of contextual knowledge / motive to question a source in relation to its reliability or sufficiency – "evaluate the source" E.g. Both elements of L2	5-8
	 *For L2/L3 award a bonus of up to 2 marks (+1/+1) for the use of contextual knowledge / motive to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total marks for the question must not exceed 8 marks. Notes: To score in L2/L3 there must be source use (source details) i.e., direct reference to source content. Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues is not enough. Higher marks in L2/L3 to be awarded based on the numbers of sources 	

2024 HUMANITIES (HISTORY) 2261/02 4E PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION LEVEL OF RESPONSE MARKING SCHEME (LORMS)

Section **B**

2	"The weaknesses of Japan's democratic government were	10m
	decisive in the establishment of an authoritarian regime in Japan." How far do you agree with this statement?	
L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasonsAward 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 ormore. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks fordescribing 2 or more.E.g. An authoritarian regime was established in Japan because of the	1-3
	weak democratic government but also because of the appeal of the ultranationalists in Japan.	
L2	Explains the given reason <u>OR</u> other reason(s) Award 4 marks for an explanation of the given reason OR other reason(s), and additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks. E.g. I agree that the weaknesses of Japan's democratic government were crucial in the rise of authoritarianism in Japan because they led to a loss of public confidence and created a power vacuum that militarist factions could exploit. The Taisho Democracy period saw the establishment of democratic institutions, but these were plagued by corruption, inefficiency, and political infighting. The government was not united due to party politics and rivalry, which weakened the authority of the Prime Minister. Emperor Yoshihito was sickly and unable to provide strong leadership, further undermining the effectiveness of the government. The government's inability to implement effective policies to mitigate the economic crisis and maintain political stability undermined public trust in democratic institutions. For example, the government's failure to handle the aftermath of the 1923 Great Kanto Earthquake, which devastated Tokyo and Yokohama, further diminished public confidence. The earthquake killed over 100,000 people and left millions homeless, and the government's slow and inadequate response to the disaster led to widespread disillusionment. Additionally, political assassinations and coup attempts by ultranationalist groups highlighted the government's weakness and inability to maintain order. Notably, the assassination of Prime Minister Inukai Tsuyoshi in 1932 by ultranationalist elements showcased the growing influence of militarists and the government's inability to curb their power. This series of governmental failures created a perception of incompetence and inability to lead, making authoritarian solutions more attractive and contributing significantly to the militarists' rise to power. Therefore, political weaknesses were pivotal in establishing an authoritarian regime in Jap	4-5
L3	Japan. Explains the given reason AND other reason(s)	6-8

Award 6 marks for an explanation of of the given reason AND other reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).

E.g. L2 + However, the economic challenges of the 1920s and 1930s also brought about the establishment of an authoritarian regime in Japan because they created widespread dissatisfaction with the democratic government. Japan faced severe economic turmoil during this period, including inflation, unemployment, and landlord-tenant disputes, which were exacerbated by the Great Depression. For instance, the Great Depression caused a sharp decline in Japan's exports such as silk, which were vital for its economy, leading to factory closures and mass unemployment. Businesses collapsed causing almost 15 to 20 per cent of Japan's workforce to lose their jobs. Additionally, the 1927 banking crisis, which saw the collapse of numerous banks and led to financial panic, further destabilised the economy and eroded public trust in the government. Inconsistent economic growth during this period also exacerbated social unrest, as rapid industrialization did not evenly benefit all segments of society. Rural areas, particularly affected by economic instability, experienced significant landlord-tenant disputes, often resulting in violent confrontations. For example, in the 1930s, tenant farmers organised protests and strikes against landlords, which sometimes led to violent clashes. The economic hardships eroded public confidence in the democratic government's ability to address these issues effectively. They also made the promises of economic revitalisation and stability under an authoritarian regime appealing to many Japanese, thereby increasing support for militarist leaders who ultimately seized power. Thus, the economic challenges were a crucial factor in driving Japan towards an authoritarian regime.

E.g. L2 + Additionally, the appeal of the ultranationalist faction played a crucial role in the establishment of an authoritarian regime in Japan because their ideology resonated with a population disillusioned by economic and political instability. Ultranationalist factions capitalised on the economic distress and political disunity by promoting a vision of a strong, unified Japan under military leadership. They advocated for the restoration of traditional values, territorial expansion, and the establishment of a strong military government. For instance, the ultranationalists gained significant support by blaming the democratic government for Japan's economic woes and promoting aggressive foreign policies as a solution. The Manchurian Incident of 1931, where Japanese military officers orchestrated a crisis to justify the invasion of Manchuria, exemplified the ultranationalists' strategic use of military actions to gain popular support. Their success in Manchuria bolstered their credibility and demonstrated their ability to achieve tangible results, unlike the troubled democratic government. This appeal to national pride and economic recovery through

L3+	 expansionism resonated with the Japanese who were desperate for change, leading to increased support for ultranationalist leaders and the eventual establishment of an authoritarian regime. Therefore, the appeal of ultranationalist factions was a significant factor in the rise of authoritarianism in Japan too. Valid Evaluation Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of the relative importance of 	(L3)+2
	<i>different reasons.</i> E.g. In conclusion, I ultimately agree that the weaknesses of the democratic government were decisive in bringing about the establishment of an authoritarian regime in Japan. The economic difficulties created widespread dissatisfaction, but it was the democratic government's inability to address these issues that ultimately facilitated the rise of militarism. It created a power vacuum and an environment of political instability that ultranationalists could exploit. The government's failure to provide effective leadership and maintain public confidence was more immediately influential in enabling the rise of authoritarianism than the underlying economic issues. Therefore, while economic challenges were important, the decisive factor in the establishment of an authoritarian regime in Japan was the political instability and ineffective governance of the democratic period.	
3	"The Viet Cong together with the North Vietnamese were the primary cause of the Vietnam War." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	10
L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.	1-3
	E.g. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese caused the outbreak of the Vietnam War because their actions directly challenged the South Vietnamese government.	
L2	Explains the given reason <u>OR</u> other reason(s) Award 4 marks for an explanation of the given reason OR other reason(s), and additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.	4-5
	E.g. I agree that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese caused the outbreak of the Vietnam War because <u>their actions directly</u> <u>challenged the South Vietnamese government</u> . The Viet Cong formally organised themselves and stepped up a guerilla war against the South Vietnamese government in the early 1960s. The Viet Cong's guerrilla tactics, which included ambushes, sabotage, and hit-and-run attacks, made it difficult for Diem's conventional forces to combat them	

	Vietnamese military outposts, government buildings, and infrastructure,	
	causing significant disruption and instability. North Vietnam, under the	
	leadership of Ho Chi Minh, stepped in by providing substantial support	
	to the Viet Cong insurgency in the South, including training, supplies,	
	and reinforcements. This external support was crucial in sustaining the	
	insurgency and escalating the conflict. For instance, the Ho Chi Minh	
	Trail was a vital supply route that enabled North Vietnam to transport	
	troops and materials to support the Viet Cong. This well-organised and	
	covert route allowed North Vietnamese forces to infiltrate South Vietnam	
	and support guerrilla operations against the South Vietnamese	
	government. 40,000 North Vietnamese troops were also sent the Viet	
	Cong between 1961 and 1963. The determination of the North	
	Vietnamese leadership to reunify the country under communist	
	rule and their strategic use of guerrilla warfare with the Viet Cong	
	intensified the conflict. This constant harassment and the ability to	
	blend in with the civilian population made the Viet Cong a	
	formidable enemy. The insurgency was effective in destabilising	
	the South Vietnamese government and gaining popular support in	
	rural areas. Therefore, the actions of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong	
	were also critical in the outbreak and escalation of the Vietnam War, as	
	they directly challenged the stability and authority of the South	
	Vietnamese government.	
L3	Explains the given reason <u>AND</u> other reason(s)	6-8
	Award 6 marks for an explanation of of the given reason AND other	•••
	reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to	
	a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).	
1		
	$F \neq 1.2 + However I cannot fully agree with the statement because Ngo$	
	E.g. L2 + However, I cannot fully agree with the statement because Ngo Diph Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they created widespread discontent and instability in South	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism,	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese society. Diem's nepotism worsened the situation, as he placed his family members in powerful positions. This concentration of power within	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese society. Diem's nepotism worsened the situation, as he placed his family members in powerful positions. This concentration of power within Diem's family led to widespread corruption and abuse of power, causing	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese society. Diem's nepotism worsened the situation, as he placed his family members in powerful positions. This concentration of power within Diem's family led to widespread corruption and abuse of power, causing even more resentment among the population. Diem's oppressive	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese society. Diem's nepotism worsened the situation, as he placed his family members in powerful positions. This concentration of power within Diem's family led to widespread corruption and abuse of power, causing even more resentment among the population. Diem's oppressive policies against Buddhists, such as the violent crackdown on Buddhist	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese society. Diem's nepotism worsened the situation, as he placed his family members in powerful positions. This concentration of power within Diem's family led to widespread corruption and abuse of power, causing even more resentment among the population. Diem's oppressive policies against Buddhists, such as the violent crackdown on Buddhist protests in 1963, made many people angry and more likely to support	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese society. Diem's nepotism worsened the situation, as he placed his family members in powerful positions. This concentration of power within Diem's family led to widespread corruption and abuse of power, causing even more resentment among the population. Diem's oppressive policies against Buddhists, such as the violent crackdown on Buddhist protests in 1963, made many people angry and more likely to support the Viet Cong insurgency. The Buddhists, who made up a significant	
	Dinh Diem's actions and policies also brought about the Vietnam War as they <u>created widespread discontent and instability in South</u> <u>Vietnam</u> . Diem's regime was marked by authoritarianism, nepotism, and a disregard for democratic processes, which alienated large segments of the population. For example, Diem refused to hold the national elections promised by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which made people question his legitimacy and fueled opposition. Additionally, he showed favoritism towards Catholics, appointing many of them to key government positions and providing them with economic benefits, while the majority Buddhist population felt neglected and discriminated against. This favoritism created deep divisions within South Vietnamese society. Diem's nepotism worsened the situation, as he placed his family members in powerful positions. This concentration of power within Diem's family led to widespread corruption and abuse of power, causing even more resentment among the population. Diem's oppressive policies against Buddhists, such as the violent crackdown on Buddhist protests in 1963, made many people angry and more likely to support	

	policies destabilised South Vietnam, creating an environment where the Viet Cong could gain support and strength. The Viet Cong capitalised on the discontent by presenting themselves as liberators from Diem's oppressive rule, thereby attracting more recruits and increasing their influence. Thus, Diem's actions and policies played a crucial role in causing the Vietnam war by undermining the stability and legitimacy of the South Vietnamese government. E.g. L2 + Additionally, the involvement of the USA was crucial in the outbreak of the Vietnam War because it significantly influenced the internal dynamics of South Vietnam. The U.S. provided substantial military and economic support to Ngo Dinh Diem's government, which kept him in power but also made him overly reliant on America. This reliance made Diem look like a puppet of the Americans, and many people in South Vietnam did not trust him because of this. For example, the USA sent military advisors and money to help Diem fight the Viet Cong, but this made it seem like Diem's government could not stand on its own without American help. Moreover, American strategic interests in containing communism led to increased involvement in Vietnam's internal affairs. The support from the USA emboldened Diem to continue his unpopular and repressive policies, which exacerbated internal discontent and opposition. American strategic interests in containing communism eventually led to increased military involvement, culminating in direct military intervention following the Gulf of Tonkin incident in 1964. The incident, where North Vietnamese forces allegedly attacked American naval vessels, provided the USA with a pretext to escalate its military presence in Vietnam. This escalation included bombing campaigns and the deployment of combat troops, which further intensified the conflict. The heavy American involvement made it difficult for the South Vietnamese government to be seen as an independent and legitimate authority, increasing internal resistance and bolstering the Viet Con	
L3+	 conflict from its inception. Valid Evaluation Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. E.g. In conclusion, I ultimately agree with the statement that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese were the primary cause of the Vietnam	(L3)+2
	War. While Diem's oppressive policies and authoritarian rule created significant internal discontent, it was the determined efforts of the communist insurgency, that ultimately led to the outbreak of the war. The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong's sustained military and ideological campaign to unify Vietnam posed a direct and continuous	

	threat to the stability of South Vietnam, driving the conflict towards full- scale war. Therefore, while Diem's actions were significant, the insurgency's effectiveness was more decisive in the escalation of the conflict in Vietnam.	
4	"The Cold War ended because of the failure of the Soviet command economy." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer	10
L1	 Identifies/Describes given or other reasons Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more. E.g. The failure of the Soviet command economy brought about the end of the Cold War because it made the USSR economically weak and unstable. 	1-3
L2	Explains the given reason <u>OR</u> other reason(s) Award 4 marks for an explanation of the given reason OR other reason(s), and additional mark for additional reasons/supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks. E.g. I agree that the failure of the Soviet command economy was a major factor in the end of the Cold War because it <u>led to significant</u> <u>economic decline and instability within the USSR</u> . The rigid centralised planning system was inefficient and unable to meet the needs of the people. By the 1980s, the USSR faced severe shortages of consumer goods, declining industrial productivity, and a stagnating economy. For example, the focus on heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods created widespread dissatisfaction among the Soviet people, who struggled with poor living conditions and limited access to basic necessities. Additionally, the agricultural sector was particularly inefficient, leading to frequent food shortages. For instance, grain production fell dramatically, and the USSR had to import large quantities of grain from the West to prevent starvation. This economic decline weakened the USSR's ability to compete with the West, both militarily and technologically. The USSR struggled to keep up with the technological advancements and economic prosperity seen in Western countries, particularly the USA. The financial strain also limited its capacity to support its satellite states and maintain Soviet influence over Eastern Europe. Countries like Poland and Hungary began to experience economic crises and were less willing to follow Soviet directives, leading to political instability and resistance against communist rule. Consequently, economic struggles led to widespread unrest and calls for reform, contributing significantly to the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War. Thus, the failure of the command economy played a pivotal role in weakening the Soviet state from within, directly contributing to the end of the Cold War.	4-5

L3	Explains the given reason <u>AND</u> other reason(s) Award 6 marks for an explanation of of the given reason AND other reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to
	a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).
	E.g. L2+ However, the political and social reforms introduced by
	Mikhail Gorbachev also played a crucial role in the end of the Cold War
	because they undermined the USSR's traditional authoritarian
	control. Gorbachev's policies of Glasnost (openness) and Perestroika
	(restructuring) aimed to modernise the Soviet system but instead
	exposed the deep flaws and corruption within the government.
	Glasnost allowed for greater freedom of expression, leading to public
	criticism of the government and the Communist Party, as well as
	revelations of historical atrocities committed under Stalin, such as the
	Great Purge and the Gulag system. This newfound transparency fueled
	widespread discontent and nationalist movements within Soviet
	republics which began pushing for independence. For instance, the
	publication of previously banned works by dissidents revealed the
	extent of government repression and corruption, eroding public trust in
	the regime. Perestroika aimed to reform the stagnant economy by
	introducing market-like elements, such as allowing state-owned
	enterprises more autonomy and encouraging small-scale private
	businesses. However, these changes disrupted the already fragile
	economic system, leading to further decline. The agricultural sector, for
	example, remained inefficient, resulting in frequent food shortages and
	forcing the USSR to import grain from the West. The industrial sector
	also struggled with outdated technology and low productivity, unable to
	compete with Western advancements. The economic turmoil created by
	Perestroika led to strikes and protests, further destabilising the USSR.
	These reforms weakened the Communist Party's control and
	diminished the USSR's ability to maintain its influence over
	Eastern Europe. The increased openness under Glasnost
	emboldened Eastern European countries to demand greater
	freedoms and independence, culminating in events like the fall of
	the Berlin Wall in 1989. Internally, the reforms exposed the
	inefficiencies and corruption within the Soviet system, leading to
	a loss of legitimacy for the government. The combination of
	economic decline, political unrest, and loss of control over satellite
	states ultimately accelerated the collapse of the USSR, bringing an
	end to the Cold War. Thus, while the economic issues were severe,
	Gorbachev's political and social reforms accelerated the decline of
	Soviet control and hastened the end of the Cold War.

6-8

L3+	 Valid Evaluation Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons. E.g. In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. While the failure of the 	(L3)+2
	Soviet command economy was undoubtedly a major factor in the end of the Cold War, Gorbachev's reforms of Glasnost and Perestroika played a more decisive role in accelerating the collapse of the USSR. The economic decline highlighted the system's inefficiencies and created widespread dissatisfaction, but it was Gorbachev's policies that directly undermined the Communist Party's control and exposed the deep flaws within the Soviet system. Glasnost allowed for greater freedom of expression and political criticism, leading to increased public unrest and nationalist movements, while Perestroika's economic reforms disrupted the fragile economy further, leading to strikes and protests. By weakening the central authority and diminishing the USSR's influence over Eastern Europe, Gorbachev's reforms were pivotal in hastening the end of the Cold War. Thus, while the economic failures set the stage, it was Gorbachev's policies that ultimately triggered the Soviet Union's collapse and the conclusion of the Cold War.	