

Name: _____

Register Number: _____

Class: _____



南橋中學

NAN CHIAU HIGH SCHOOL
PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2024
SECONDARY FOUR

For Marker's Use

HUMANITIES (HISTORY)

2261/02

Paper 2

15 August 2024, Thursday

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 for all candidates.

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

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

1 (a) Study Source A.

Why was this source published in 1936? Explain your answer. [5]

(b) Study Source B.

How useful is this source in showing Hitler as a leader? Explain your answer. [5]

(c) Study Sources C and D.

Does Joseph Goebbels prove Emil Kirdorf to be right? Explain your answer. [6]

(d) Study Sources E and F.

After reading Source E, are you surprised by Source F regarding Hitler's popularity? Explain your answer. [6]

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

'The popularity of the Nazi Party was due primarily to Adolf Hitler.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

The Nazi Party's Popularity

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

Adolf Hitler joined the National Socialist German Workers Party (NSDAP or Nazi Party) and became its leader in 1921. He was imprisoned in 1923 after the failed Munich coup. While in prison, he wrote his memoir, *Mein Kampf* (or 'My Struggle') which outlined his political beliefs. After his release, Hitler progressively gained popularity and support among the Germans through his leadership, personal abilities as well as his promises of recovery for the economy and national pride.

To what extent was the popularity of the Nazi Party due primarily to Adolf Hitler?

Source A: *A Nazi poster which reads, 'All Germany listens to the Führer on the radio', published in 1936.*



Source B: *An American journalist in Germany writes about his experiences in Berlin in 1934.*

I remember being in a big Berlin café when it was announced that Hitler was to speak on the radio. The loudspeaker was turned on. Next to me was a group of German businessmen. They went on talking in low voices. At another table was a woman writing a letter. She went on writing. The only man who stood up was a small man with his tie creeping over his collar at the back of his neck. No one else in the crowded café listened to Adolf Hitler.

Source C: *An extract from an article written by Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's Minister of Propaganda, published before the German elections in 1932.*

Adolf Hitler, the born mass leader, has as his goal to unify the German people and forge from them tremendous strength. Millions and millions have joined together under the idea of '*gemeinschaft*'*. They have found in National Socialism new meaning and purpose for their lives. They thank Adolf Hitler and his saving idea that they have not fallen into hopelessness and anarchy.

The Weimar Republic's policies have divided the people into two classes. The economy is in anarchy, the finances are in a desperate state. Many Germans felt a deep sense of despair and have, in fact, fallen into hopelessness. The masses see in Adolf Hitler their last hope. For millions, his name has become the bright symbol of the German will for freedom.

*a community where the mindsets, sentiments, tastes, & attitudes of the people are common

Source D: *An extract from an interview with Emil Kirdorf, a German industrialist who sponsored the Nazi Party, published in 1937.*

In 1927 I first met the Führer personally. The undisputed logic and clear conciseness of his train of thought filled me with such enthusiasm with what he said. I asked the Führer to write a pamphlet on the topics he had discussed with me. I then distributed the pamphlet in business and industrial circles. Shortly after, leading industrial personalities were keen and arranged several meetings with the Führer as a result of what was written on the pamphlets.

Source E: *An article written by Bruno Heilig, an Austrian journalist in 1938.*

In 1931 the crisis was in full swing. Seven million men and women (one-third of the wage-earning people) unemployed, the middle class swept away. Depression rapidly produced the most dreadful poverty. In the first year of the crisis, the number of Nazi deputies to the Reichstag rose from 8 to 107. A year later this figure was doubled. In January 1933 Hitler was appointed Chancellor. He attained power, as I said before, quite legally.

I do not believe that the Germans would have followed Hitler in his hates and revenges if the people had been living under reasonably good social conditions instead of being under the lash of so much unemployment.

Source F: *A historian's account of Hitler's economic policy.*

In 1935, Hitler reintroduced conscription for the German army. Conscription reduced unemployment. The need for weapons, equipment and uniforms created jobs in the coal mines, steel and textile mills. While bringing economic recovery, these measures boosted the Hitler's popularity because they boosted national pride. Germans began to feel that their country was finally emerging from the humiliation of the Great War and the Treaty of Versailles, and putting itself on an equal footing with the other great powers.

Section B: Essays

Answer **two** questions.

- 2 'The rise of militarist Japan was primarily due to the weakness of the civilian government.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 3 'The main reason why the US intervened directly in Vietnam in 1965 was out of concern for the weak South Vietnam government.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]
- 4 'Gorbachev's reforms was the main reason that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

End of Paper

Copyright Acknowledgements:

- Source A: Cited in Ben Walsh, Modern World History, 2018, p. 166.
Source B: <https://www.hodderplus.co.uk/accesstohistory2/ocr-units/unit2-Dictatorship-Democracy-Germany/sources.htm>
Source C: <https://research.calvin.edu/german-propaganda-archive/angrif12.htm>
Source D: <https://alphahistory.com/weimarrepublic/heilig-how-hitler-came-to-power-1938/>
Source E: Ben Walsh, Modern World History, 2018, p. 173.
Source F: <https://spartacus-educational.com/GERkirdorf.htm>

Suggested LORMS

Section A: SBQ

1 (a) Study Source A.

Why was this source published in 1936? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Lift details from source The photo shows a large radio surrounded by a large crowd of people	1
2	Message <i>Award 2-3m for developed answers, supported with evidence</i> The message of the source is to show that Hitler's speeches were important and popular among the German masses. The evidence is the large crowd of people surrounding the radio and the words on the poster which says "All Germany listens to the Fuhrer on the radio" This shows that many people were listening and the speeches were regarded as an important part of the Germans' lives.	2-3
3	L2 + Purpose & Intended Outcome <i>Award 4m for only explaining Purpose</i> <i>Award 5m for explaining both Purpose & Context.</i> The poster was published to influence the Germans that Hitler's speeches were important to many people in Germany. The evidence is the large crowd of people surrounding the radio and the words on the poster which says "All Germany listens to the Fuhrer on the radio" The intention is to get more Germans to tune in to the radio to listen to the Fuhrer so as not to miss out what their fellow countrymen have heard from the Fuhrer. This was especially so in 1936 when Hitler was the leader of Germany and was making massive policy changes to create a greater Germany.	4-5

(b) Study Source B.

How useful is this source in showing Hitler as a leader? Explain your answer.

[5]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Yes/No, based on uncritical analysis of Provenance Source B is not useful in showing Hitler as a leader because it was from an American journalist writing about his experiences in Berlin in 1934.	1
2	Yes/No based on Source Content Source B is useful in showing that Hitler was not a very popular or effective leader as it highlighted that the Germans were not interested in Hitler's speeches. From Source B, it is stated that when Hitler was speaking on the radio, German businessmen "went on talking in low voices", "woman writing a letter" and that "no one else in the crowded café listened". This shows that the Germans were not keen to listen to what Hitler had to share and, therefore, did not think very highly of Hitler as a leader.	2
3	Yes/No, with cross reference to another source / contextual knowledge <i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i> Source B is not useful in showing Hitler was a popular leader as my contextual knowledge suggests that Hitler was indeed quite a popular leader who not only rebuilt the Nazi Party but was also a very charismatic and confident leader who was able to capture not just the attention of the German population but their votes as well as can be seen in his party success in the elections and increase in party membership. OR Source B is useful in showing Hitler as an ineffective leader as it is supported by Source D when the Austrian journalist concluded that Hitler's rise to power was not because of him being an effective leader but rather more because of the severe economic depression that the population was undergoing at that point in time. From the source, the Austrian journalist commented that the Germans would not have supported Hitler "if the people had been living under reasonably good social conditions instead of being under the lash of so much unemployment".	3-4
4	Yes AND No, with cross-reference to another source / contextual knowledge OR No due to the limitations of the source. Source B is not useful in showing Hitler as an ineffective leader the source only shed light on one aspect of Hitler's leadership, his speeches. The source does not explain any other aspects of Hitler's leadership such as his ability to secure funding and sponsorship from rich businessmen and industrialists for the Nazi Party, his ability to resolve the massive unemployment problems, his capability in reorganizing the Nazi Party into a	5-6

	formidable force etc. As the source is limited in its scope with regard to Hitler's overall capabilities as a leader, it is, therefore not reliable nor useful in showing Hitler to be an ineffective leader.	
--	---	--

(c) Study Sources C and D.

Does Joseph Goebbels prove Emil Kirdorf to be right? Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	<p>Prove / Doesn't prove based on uncritical response</p> <p>Goebbels doesn't prove Kirdorf to be right/wrong because Goebbels was the Minister of Propaganda in the Nazi government.</p>	1
2	<p>Yes/No based on Source Content</p> <p>Goebbels does prove Kirdorf to be right as both sources agree that Hitler was an effective leader. Source C states that Hitler was "the born mass leader" and "millions and millions have joined together under the idea of <i>'gemeinschaft'</i>". This shows that Hitler was the primary reason for the rise of the Nazi Party. Kirdorf in Source D, likewise, also explained how the brilliance of Hitler, especially his "undisputed logic and clear conciseness of his train of thought filled me with such enthusiasm" and how because of Hitler's persuasion, "several meetings took place between the Fuhrer and leading industrial personalities". As both sources agree that Hitler played a significant role in the popularity and rise of the Nazi Party, Goebbels in Source C does prove Kirdorf in Source F to be right.</p>	2-3
3	<p>Yes/No, with cross reference to another source / contextual knowledge <i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p>Goebbels does prove Kirdorf to be right in highlighting that Hitler was an effective leader as it is supported by Source F. Source F explains how Hitler managed to resolve the massive unemployment problem facing Germany when he "reintroduced conscription for the German army" as the "need for weapons, equipment and uniforms created jobs in the coal mines, steel and textile mills". As Source F supports Source C in showing Hitler to be an effective leader, Goebbels in Source C, therefore, can prove Kirdorf in Source D right when Kirdorf also highlighted Hitler's ability to secure funds and sponsorship from rich businessmen and industrialists.</p> <p>OR</p>	4-5

	<p>Goebbels does not prove Kirdoft to be right in highlighting that Hitler was an effective leader as it is challenged by Source E which explained that the underlining reason for the rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party was the severe economic situation prevailing at that time. In Source D, it is stated that “seven million men and women unemployed, the middle class swept away” and “depression rapidly produced the most dreadful poverty”. It then concluded that it was this dire economic conditions that led the German masses to believe in Hitler as “if the people had been living under reasonably good social conditions”, they would not “follow Hitler in his hates and revenges”. As Source E challenges Source C, Source C is, therefore, not reliable in its characterization of Hitler as an effective leader and, as such, Goebbels in Source C cannot prove that Kirdoft in Source F is true.</p>	
4	<p>No, developed evaluation of the Provenance & Purpose <i>Award the higher mark for more fully developed answers.</i> Goebbels in Source C does not prove Kirdoft in Source D to be right as it is unreliable due to its provenance and purpose. Goebbel was Hitler’s Minister of Propaganda and it is expected that he will present Hitler in a most positive manner so that the German population will then support Hitler and the Nazi Party. Goebbels’ bias can also be seen from his exaggerated accolades for Hitler when he wrote “The masses see in Adolf Hitler their last hope” and that “for millions, his name has become the bright symbol of the German will for freedom”. As Goebbels in Source C is very likely biased and one-sided in his characterization of Hitler, Source C is, therefore, unreliable and, as such, does not prove that Kirdoft in Source F to be right.</p>	6

(d) Sources E and F.

After reading Source E, are you surprised by Source F regarding Hitler's popularity?
 Explain your answer.
 [6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	<p>Valid comparison of the sources, but no statement of surprised/not surprised OR Identifies what is/is not surprising</p> <p>Source E and Source F as both talk about the popularity of Hitler.</p>	1
L2	<p>Surprised / Not surprised based on valid comparison of content</p> <p>I am surprised by Source F after reading Source E as both sources <u>differ on the popularity of Hitler</u>. Source E contends that Hitler's popularity was not due to his capabilities but the severe economic conditions that had plagued the country such as "seven million men and women unemployed, the middle class swept away" as well as "depression rapidly produced the most dreadful poverty". The journalist concluded that <u>Hitler would not have become a popular alternative</u> "if the people had been living under reasonably good social conditions instead of being under the lash of so much unemployment". This shows that <u>it was the dire economic conditions that provided Hitler to be a more popular option</u> than the Weimar government. Source F, however, contradicts Source E by highlighting that <u>Hitler was popular</u> as he "reintroduced conscription for the German army", unemployment was reduced. The economic recovery "boosted the Hitler's popularity because it boosted national pride". This shows Hitler's popularity due to his ability to reduce unemployment and increasing national pride. As both sources contradict each other in its explanation of Hitler's popularity, I am, therefore, surprised.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>I am not surprised by Source F after reading source E, as the <u>economic issues in Source E explains the reasons for Hitler's popularity in Source F</u>. Source E shows that it was the poor</p>	2-3

	<p>economic conditions that pushed Germans to pin their hopes on the Nazi Party. Hence, since the economy was in such terrible shape, it is unsurprising that Hitler would then put in place policies like conscription and rearmament as seen in F. Moreover, it would also make F unsurprising when it says that Hitler's economic policies imbued a sense of pride and made him/the Nazis so popular since he could tackle the dire conditions in E.</p>	
L3	<p>L2 + Surprised / Not surprised based on cross-reference <i>Award the higher mark in the level for appropriate evidence to support inference</i></p> <p>Although Sources E and F contradict each other in <u>on the popularity of Hitler</u>, I am not surprised by F as it is supported by Source D which shows <u>Hitler's popularity amongst businesses due to his abilities to secure sponsorship from leading business and industrial circles for his Nazi Party</u>. Source D states that owing to Hitler's "inexorable logic and clear conciseness of his train of thought", "several meetings took place between the Fuhrer and leading industrial personalities". This suggests that it was Hitler's competency as a leader that drew the rich businessmen to support him, rather than the dire economic situation as suggested in Source E. As such, even though Sources E and F differs, I am not surprised by Source E as it is supported by Source D.</p>	4-5
L5	<p>Critical analysis of the contexts/timing of Sources D & E</p> <p>Although Sources E and F differ in <u>explaining the reasons for the popularity of Hitler</u>, I am, however, not surprised as both sources were written during different contexts. Source E was describing Germany in 1931 when it was experiencing the full force of the Great Depression which saw millions of German unemployed and business went bankrupt. The Austrian journalist, therefore, concluded that it was the severe economic situation that afforded Hitler the opportunity as a popular alternative. Source F, on the other hand, was describing Germany, 4 years later, in 1935 where Hitler has undertaken some initiatives to resolve the problem of unemployment through conscription of the German army which, in turn, created jobs in the coal mines, steel and textile mills, thereby making him a popular choice as he had resolved the severe economic downturn. Therefore, although both sources differ in explaining the reasons that contributed to the popularity of Hitler, I am not surprised as due to the difference in the time period, Hitler was able to implement his economic initiatives in 1935 which were not possible 4 years earlier in 1931.</p>	6

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

‘The popularity of the Nazi Party was due primarily to Adolf Hitler’. How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.
[8]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use	1
L2	<p>Yes <u>OR</u> No, supported by valid source use Award 2 marks for one Yes or No supported by valid source use and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks</p> <p>Source A does not support the view that the popularity of the Nazi Party was due to Hitler because the source is an example of the many propaganda tools that the Nazi-controlled media churn out ever so regularly.</p> <p>Source B does not support that the popularity of the Nazi Party was due primarily to Hitler as it pointed out that Germans paid very little attention to Hitler’s speeches. It is shown that while Hitler’s speeches were being broadcasted over the radio in a Berlin café, all the customers in the café paid no attention to it and merely carried on “talking in low voices”, “writing a letter” and “no one else in the crowded café listened”. This shows that there was actually not much support shown for Hitler by the Germans and, therefore, Hitler could not have been the primary reason for the popularity of the Nazi Party.</p> <p>Source E does not support that the popularity of the Nazi Party was due primarily to Hitler but more the economic crisis that was prevailing during the 1930s. It highlighted that “seven million men and women unemployed, the middle class swept away”. The Great Depression also led to “the most dreadful poverty”. The source also concluded that “if the people had been living under reasonably good social conditions</p>	2-4

	<p>instead of being under the lash of so much unemployment”, the German population would not have supported Hitler.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Source C supports that Hitler was the primary reason for the popularity of the Nazi Party. It mentions that Hitler was “the born mass leader” who had saved the German population from falling “into hopelessness and anarchy”. The masses, in fact, saw Hitler as “their last hope” and his name “became the bright symbol of the German will for freedom”. This shows that the rise of the Nazis was only possible because of the strong support shown to him Hitler by the German population—his charisma.</p> <p>Source D supports that the popularity of the Nazi Party was due primarily to Hitler as it showed how Hitler was very skillful and competent in securing large funding and sponsorship from big businesses and industrialists. After Hitler’s thoughts and initiatives were shared with the business and industrial circles, “leading industrial personalities were keen and arranged several meetings with the Fuhrer as a result of what was written on the pamphlets”. This shows that Hitler was able to entice the rich sectors of the German community to support and sponsor him which was instrumental in growing his Nazi Party and Nazi Germany thereafter.</p> <p>Source F supports that Hitler was the primary reason for the popularity of the Nazi Party as he was the one who resolve the massive unemployment issue and revived the economy which, in turn, “boosted Hitler’s popularity”. It is shown that because of Hitler’s reintroduction of conscription for the Germany army, unemployment was reduced as “the need for weapons, equipment and uniforms created jobs in the coal mines, steel and textile mills” and all these brought about “economic recovery”. The revival of the economy also “boosted national pride”, even putting Germany “on an equal footing with the other great powers”. This suggests that the continued support/popularity of the Nazis were premised on Hitler’s economic policies.</p>	
L3	<p>Yes <u>AND</u> No, supported by valid source use</p> <p><i>Award 5 marks for one Yes and No supported by valid source use and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks</i></p> <p><i>For L2 & L3, award a bonus of up to two marks (ie. +1;+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability & sufficiency.</i></p>	5-8

Section B: Essay

2. 'The rise of militarist Japan was due to the weakness of the civilian government'.
How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Identifies / Describes the weakness of the civilian government or other reason for the rise of militarist Japan	1-3
2	<p>Explains how the weakness of the civilian government led to the rise of militarist Japan</p> <p>I agree that the weakness of the civilian government was an important factor that led to the rise of the militarist Japan. The structure and system of the civilian government was inherently weak and lent itself to ineffectiveness and inefficiency. For example, in order to get new laws passed by the Diet, the PM had to gain the majority support from the Diet. However, divisions among the different parties within the Diet made it challenging for the Prime Minister to gain the support of the majority. As a result, laws which were needed to resolve issues faced by the country were unable to be passed and the issues faced by the population persisted. Even in the event that laws were passed by the PM with consensus from the Diet, these can also be bypassed and even overturned by the Privy Council which reported directly to the Emperor. In addition, the military faction within the government also quite independent and held much power as they were appointed directly by the Emperor and, therefore, had immunity from the instructions from the PM. The PM, in fact, also had no authority to remove these military leaders. Because of all the inherent bureaucratic inefficiencies, the civilian government presented itself as a very weak organization to the population and many of the problems and issues faced by the population were not resolved. This led the population</p>	4-5

	losing hope in the civilian and they were, hence, well placed to shift their support to the military leaders.	
3	<p>Explains how the weakness of the civilian government AND other reason(s) led to the rise of militarist Japan</p> <p>The prevailing economic crisis that plagued Japan in the 1920s and 1930s was also an important factor that led to the rise of militarist Japan. As early as the 1920s, Japan was already experiencing economic difficulties brought about by severe inflation which resulted in the sharp increase of process of goods. The population also experienced high level of unemployment due to decline in overseas demand for Japanese goods. The severe economic downturn eventually led to the Banking Crisis in 1927 and the Great Depression in 1929 which saw the banks being unable to collect the loans they lent to the various industries that were hard hit by it. As a result of this, the Japanese masses who had deposited their money in the banks rushed to withdraw their money and this, in turn, led to the closing down of more than 20 banks. Many Japanese lost all their savings overnight and this significantly intensified the suffering of the Japanese further. The civilian government was not able to resolve the massive economic crisis and this led the Japanese to be disillusioned with them, losing their faith in their ability to govern effectively. As a result of this, the Japanese became more open to the idea of a new government to replace the civilian one such as the military.</p> <p>The appeal of the military as an alternative government to replace the civilian government was also another important factor. Due to the military's unhappiness with the ineffectiveness of the civilian government, they, especially the ultranationalists, began to carry out various activities which they deemed necessary to help resolve the country's problems. For example, the Kwangtung Army saw Manchuria as a solution to the country's many problems such as shortage of land and resources including iron and coal. In order to completely secure the land, the Kwangtung Army assassinated the Manchuria's warlord, Zhang Zuolin in 1928 in order to replace him with a more cooperative leader who will make it easier for them to occupy the land. When the civilian government failed to take any follow-up against the Kwangtung Army's insubordination, the unit grew bolder by bombing of the railway tracks at Mukden and attributing it to the Chinese government. The Kwangtung Army then used that as an excuse to seize control over Manchuria. The actions of the Kwangtung Army greatly supported by the Japanese population who saw that as a solution to the many economic problems Japan was facing. The occupation of Manchuria was, in fact, celebrated through songs, plays, newsreels and radio broadcasts.</p>	6-8
	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	10

	While the rise of militarist Japan was brought about by various factors, the inherent weaknesses of the civilian government was probably the most underlining of all. The failure of the civilian government in resolving the many problems, particularly the economic problems, that plagued Japan and caused hardship and suffering to the masses left the vast majority of the population disillusioned. As such when the military carried out its aggressive overtures towards Manchuria, occupying its land and accessing its resources, the Japanese population saw it as a viable and more effective alternative to the weak civilian government.	
--	--	--

3. 'The main reason why the US intervened directly in Vietnam in 1965 was out of concern for the weak South Vietnam government.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Identifies / Describes the fear of Communism or other reason for the USA's decision to intervene directly in Vietnam in 1965	1-3
2	<p>Explains how the concern for the weak South Vietnam government led the USA to intervene directly in Vietnam in 1965</p> <p>I agree with the statement as the USA's decision to intervene was motivated primarily by the weakness of the South Vietnamese government. Diem, who was the US-endorsed President, was an intensely unpopular leader due to his authoritarian approach as well as his practices of corruption and nepotism. By 1959, the Communist government in the North had begun to support the armed struggle against Diem's regime leading to the establishment of the National Liberation Front in the south. The military arm of the NLF, the People Liberation Armed Forces was formed in 1961 to coordinate the insurgency against the Diem regime and were further supported by reinforcements and supplies from the North and started to attack government bases and US military installations in South Vietnam and they were able to make the countryside unsafe for government forces. The NLF also sought to win the hearts and minds of villagers in the South and further undermined Diem's government. Whilst the USA continued to pour aid and advisors to help the South, the incompetence and corruption in the Diem regime meant that it was ineffective and brought South Vietnam to the brink of collapse. The subsequent US sponsored coup removed Diem but the South</p>	4-5

	Vietnamese government continued to be ineffective, hence leading the USA to take direct action to intervene in Vietnam in order to prop up its ally in South Vietnam to prevent it falling to the NLF.	
3	<p>Explains how the concern for the weak South Vietnam government AND fear of Communism or other reason(s) led to the USA's decision to intervene directly in Vietnam in 1965.</p> <p>I disagree that the concern for the weak South Vietnam government was the reason that led the USA to intervene directly in Vietnam as the fear of Communism was also a very significant factor. China and the USSR recognized the DRV as the legitimate government of Vietnam and had provided assistance to the Communists during the first Indochina War. After 1954, they continued to support North Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh in their efforts to achieve reunification and independence. The support provided helped North Vietnam to sustain the insurgency in the South. Successive US governments feared that if South Vietnam fell to communism, then many Southeast Asian Countries would fall to Communism in what is termed as the 'Domino Theory'. As South Vietnam continued to weaken with the mismanagement of Diem's government along with the power vacuum that came about as a result of Diem's removal and assassination meant that the USA became increasingly fearful of a Communist takeover and its potential impact on the region. Hence, the USA decided to intervene directly after the Gulf of Tonkin incident by sending US combat troops to directly fight the Communists and ensure that Vietnam remained a non-Communist state and to prevent the further spread of Communism.</p>	6-8
	<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>While the hugely unpopular Diem government on the brink of being overtaken by the Northern insurgents was a significant reason for the US to intervene directly in Vietnam in 1965, the latter decision was, fundamentally, brought about by the wider concern of a communist takeover of the South by the North. Had the Diem government, with the support and resources from USA, been able to govern in a more effective manner in order to fend off the northern threats and advances, the US government probably would not see the need to intervene directly.</p>	10

4. 'Gorbachev's reforms led to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
1	Identifies / Describes Gorbachev's reforms that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.	1-3
2	<p>Explains how Gorbachev's reforms led to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.</p> <p>I agree that Gorbachev's policies led to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. He did not foresee the consequences of his policy of glasnost (openness) and perestroika (economic restructuring), though forward-looking, would backfire greatly and resulted in the disintegration of USSR. When Gorbachev introduced glasnost, he had intended it to be a platform for all Soviets to freely share their ideas and proposals for reforms to revive and improve the economy. Unfortunately, this initiative backfired as the disillusioned Soviet masses took this opportunity to unleash their decades of unhappiness and resentment against the Soviet government, many even calling for the government to step down. The sudden surge of freedom also led the greater awareness of the progress that their western counterparts have made, contrary to the image that the Soviet government had painted erroneously to them for years. This led to even greater anger and protests. Where perestroika was concerned, it was meant to be a form of greater decentralization from the command economy system to greater decision-making power at the ground level of managers in the companies. These managers were encouraged to develop a collaborative relationship with their workers for the growth of the companies. Unfortunately, due to the decades of corruption, the</p>	4-5

	<p>infrastructural requirements such as roads and storage facilities for economic growth was almost non-existent. In addition to this, the means of production such as equipment and transportation vehicles were all still owned by the government and small businesses encouraged by the perestroika initiative soon became disillusioned again when they realised they still had to continue to deal with corrupted officials when trying to set up their businesses. The political reforms under perestroika also encouraged more diverse political parties to be set up and many of these openly challenged the government. These very negative sentiments and oppositional overtures against the government, in time to come, severely weakened it and eventually led to its collapse.</p>	
3	<p>Explains how Gorbachev's reforms AND other reason(s) led to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.</p> <p>L2 + I disagree with the statement. It wasn't Gorbachev's policies that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union but the declining economy due to excessive spending that prevented them from keeping control of their sphere of influence and control over the satellite states. By the late 80s the Red Army was already a spent force. The losses in Afghanistan, huge casualties mounted on the Red Army caused the troops to be demoralized. The lack of revenue to fund the Red Army added to their uncertainty that the government cares for their welfare. Aided by a weakened Red Army, the republics began to assert for independence from Moscow. This worried the conservatives and senior leaders of the military who launched a coup against Gorbachev in August 1991. The coup weakened Gorbachev. The military officers and pro-democracy protestors sided with a new leader, Boris Yeltsin; with their support, he suspended Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Yeltsin rallied the main Soviet republics (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus) to dissolve the USSR on 21 Dec 1991. Four days later, Gorbachev resigned as president of the USSR led to the collapse of the Soviet Union</p> <p>OR</p> <p>I disagree with the statement. It wasn't Gorbachev's policies that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union but rather it was the huge cost of running the Soviet Union with declining revenues that led to its collapse, One reason for the huge cost incurred by the Soviet Union was in supporting the Eastern Europe militarily and selling them oil at highly subsidised prices as well as fighting the war in Afghanistan. Soviet Union supported poorer communist economies through economic bartering; USSR's annual subsidy to Warsaw Pact allies through discounting oil prices reached US\$3billion. This caused a serious loss of revenue to the Soviet Union that can be used to improve living conditions at home. Also, as a leader of the Warsaw pact, it had a duty to lead the defence of Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union also has to station troops and military equipment in Eastern Europe and this caused the Soviet state to be bankrupted as it was</p>	6-8

	<p>spending more than it was earning. With less revenue it was not able to provide for social welfare programs for its people and this resulted in public discontentment over increases in cost of food and the shortage of consumer goods. Neither Perestroika nor Glasnost helped to alleviate the living conditions for the Russian people.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>I disagree with the statement as it wasn't Gorbachev's policies that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union per se but rather the accumulative impact created by the ageing leadership within the Soviet government. As the Soviet Politburo was made up of ageing politicians, averaging 65 years old, there was a systemic lack of initiatives and ideas to help develop and grow the country. Due to old age, many of the top leaders helmed the positions only for relatively short period of time and this contributed to the stagnation of not just the economy but the entire country as a whole.</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>In the final conclusion, while Gorbachev's reforms were indeed very forward-looking and progressive and probably what could have improved the USSR predicament in the long run, he erred in not understanding the very deep-rooted discontentment and disillusionment of the vast majority of Soviets had against the government. Gorbachev had not anticipated that the vast majority will make use of platforms and latitude afforded by his reforms to protest and demonstrate for the disintegration of the prevailing government and the USSR. Ultimately, it still remains true that Gorbachev's reforms opened up the decades of unhappiness of the millions of citizens and allowed them to demonstrate these emotions on the streets which eventually led to the collapse of the USSR.</p>	10