



**SINGAPORE CHINESE GIRLS' SCHOOL
PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2023
SECONDARY FOUR
O-LEVEL PROGRAMME**

CANDIDATE NAME	<input type="text"/>											
CLASS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	REGISTER NUMBER	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>						
CENTRE NUMBER	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	INDEX NUMBER	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>			

HISTORY

2174/01

Paper 1 European Dominance and Challenges (1870s-1945)

Tuesday

22 August 2023

1 hour 40 minutes

Additional Materials: Cover Page
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 **one** question.

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

At the end of the examination, fasten the Cover Page to all your answers and submit ALTOGETHER.

This question paper consists of 7 printed pages.

[Turn over

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

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

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

You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those which 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.
How surprised are you by this source? Explain your answer, using source details and your contextual knowledge. [5]
- (b) Study Source B.
Why do you think Stalin delivered the speech at that time? Explain your answer. [5]
- (c) Study Sources C and D.
How far does Source C prove that the historian is wrong in Source D? Explain your answer. [6]
- (d) Study Sources E and F.
Is one source more useful than the other as evidence on Stalin? Explain your answer. [6]
- (e) Study **all** the sources.
'Stalin emerged the winner of the power struggle because he was a political genius.' How far do the sources support this statement? Explain your answer. [8]

[Turn over

Why was Stalin able to win the power struggle?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

In 1917 the Bolsheviks under Lenin seized power during the November Revolution and set up a communist system of government in Russia. This did not bring about peace as the country plunged into a civil war with the Bolsheviks emerging victorious against the whites. When Lenin died, it was not clear who would take over as leader of Communist Russia but by 1928 Stalin had clearly emerged as the new leader. Why was Stalin able to emerge as the leader of USSR?

Source A: *A cartoon of a Soviet session in 'Russia Illustrated', a magazine published in Paris, 1926. The cartoon shows Trotsky standing on the right and Stalin in the centre.*



[Turn over

Source B: *Adapted from Stalin's speech to the Central Committee in Moscow in January 1925. The speech was entitled 'On the Opposition: Trotskyism'.*

The discussion was started by Trotsky. The discussion was forced on the Party. The Party replied to Trotsky's action by making two main charges. Firstly, that Trotsky is trying to revise Leninism; secondly, that Trotsky is trying to bring about a radical change in the Party leadership. Trotsky has not said anything in his own defence about these charges made by the Party. It is hard to say why he has not said anything in his own defence. The usual explanation is that he has fallen ill and has not been able to say anything in his own defence. But that is not the Party's fault, of course. It is not the Party's fault if Trotsky begins to get a high temperature after every attack he makes upon the Party. The first thing that must be observed and taken note of is Trotsky's statement that he is willing to take any post to which the Party appoints him, that he is willing to submit to any kind of control as far as future actions on his part are concerned, and that he thinks it absolutely necessary in the interests of our work that he should be removed from the post of Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council as speedily as possible.

Source C: *An extract from a speech by Stalin to the Fifteenth Party Congress, December 1927.*

How did it happen that the entire party as a whole, following it the working class too, so thoroughly isolated the opposition? After all, the opposition is headed by well-known people with well-known names, people who know how to advertise themselves. It happened because the leading groups can blow their own trumpets. It happened because the opposition happened to be a group of petty-bourgeois intellectuals divorced from life, divorced from the revolution, divorced from the Party, from the working class... Why did the party expel Trotsky and Zinoviev? Because they are the organisers of the entire anti-party opposition, because they set themselves the aim of breaking the laws of the Party. They thought that nobody would dare to touch them, because they wanted to make themselves the privileged position of the nobles in the Party.

[Turn over

Source D: *Adapted from a historian's view on Trotsky.*

Many people expected Trotsky to succeed Lenin, but his glittery fame counted against him. While Lenin recovered from his stroke, Russia was ruled by the Triumvirate* which had emerged as an anti-Trotsky bloc, especially after Lenin's death. The three met before party meetings to agree on their strategy and instruct their followers on how to vote. In December 1923, Trotsky called for more debate in the Communist Party concerning the way the country was being governed. He argued that members should exercise its right to criticism "without fear and without favour" and anyone who "dares to terrorise the party" should be expelled. Zinoviev was furious with Trotsky for making these comments and proposed that he should be immediately arrested. Stalin, aware of Trotsky's immense popularity, opposed the move as being too dangerous.

**a group of three people who work together*

Source E: *A historian's account on Stalin, published in 2003.*

The foundation of Stalin's power in the Party was not fear: it was charm. While incapable of true empathy on one hand, he was a master of friendships on the other. He constantly lost his temper, but when he set his mind to charming a man, he was irresistible. He did not just socialise with the important officials: he supported junior officials too, constantly searching for tougher, more loyal, and more diligent assistants. He was always within reach: "I'm ready to help you and receive you," he often replied to requests.

[Turn over

Source F: *Adapted from an article written by Trotsky in 1939. This article was published in an American magazine.*

In 1917 when Stalin became a member of the government, not only the popular masses but even the outer circles of the Party knew nothing about him. Even among colleagues in his own Commissariat*, Stalin had small influence and in all important questions, he found himself in the minority. He did not possess the capacity of convincing his young opponents by debate. He had neither theoretical imagination, nor historical knowledge, nor the gift to grasp future events. His intellectual capacities, compared to Lenin's, measure only ten percent or twenty percent. He is the most outstanding mediocrity of the Soviet bureaucracy.

**a department of the Soviet government before 1946*

[Turn over

Section B: Structured-Essay Questions

Answer **one** question.

2 This question is on British colonial rule in Malaya.

- (a) Explain why Hugh Low was more successful than James Birch in their role as Resident. [8]
- (b) 'The political impact of British colonial rule on Malaya outweighs its economic impact.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

3 This question is on peacekeeping after WWI.

- (a) Explain why it was difficult to enforce collective security in the 1930s. [8]
- (b) 'The political impact of the Treaty of Versailles on Germany outweighs its economic impact.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

End of Paper

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Source A: Laver, J, The Impact of Stalin's Leadership in the USSR, 1924-1941, Nelson Thornes, 2008.

Source B: E.H. Carr, Socialism in One Country, Volume 2, Pelican Books, 1970.

Source C: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1937/xx/kamzinov.htm>

Source D: https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1927/12/02.htm#Political_Report_of_the_Central_Committee_

Source E: Montefiore, S. The Court of the Red Tsar, 2003.

Source F: Trotsky, Leon, Joseph Stalin: Hitler's New Friend Sized Up by An Old Foe, Life Magazine, 2 Oct 1939

Singapore Chinese Girls' School
Secondary 4 OLP Full History (Paper 1) Preliminary Examination 2023
Suggested Mark Scheme

Section A: Source-Based Case Study [30 marks]

1(a) Study Source A.

How surprised are you by this source?

Explain your answer, using source details and your contextual knowledge. [5]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	Undeveloped provenance	1
2	<p>Yes/ No, based on source content <i>Award 3 marks for answers supported with valid source details.</i></p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised that Source A shows the disunity of the Communist Party/ Politburo. This is seen from the source that shows members of the party/ Politburo having cat fights during a session. Stalin was trying to hit another member and the chairman of the session could not call the members to order/ could not control the members and get them to behave in a civilized manner.</p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised that Trotsky was not interested in party politics.</p>	2-3
3	<p>Yes/ No based on cross reference</p> <p>e.g. I am not surprised that Source A shows the disunity of the Communist Party/ Politburo because it can be supported by my contextual knowledge. This is seen from the source that shows members of the party/ Politburo having cat fights during a session. Stalin was trying to hit another member and the chairman of the session could not call the members to order/ could not control the members and get them to behave in a civilized manner. Based on my contextual knowledge, there was a bitter power struggle following Lenin's death and there was ideological division among the Party members. Some were moderates who believed in Lenin's approach while the radicals wanted changes to the system. This lack of unity provided an opportunity for Stalin to exploit to gain influence in the party.</p>	4
4	<p>Yes/No, based on critical analysis of the provenance (Context/purpose)</p> <p>L3 plus e.g. I am not surprised that Source A shows the disunity of the Communist Party/ Politburo because it is a cartoon published in Paris. France was non-communist and was expected to poke fun at the communist regime in Russia by portraying the state of chaos and political disarray. Such a negative portrayal is expected to sway the French from supporting the communist party.</p>	5

- (b) Study Source B.
Why do you think Stalin delivered the speech at that time? Explain your answer. [5]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	Infers on sub-message	1
2	<p>Infers on message/ answers based on context <i>Award 3 marks for answers supported with valid source details.</i></p> <p>e.g. Stalin delivered this speech to convince the members of the Central Committee that Trotsky was untrustworthy and unsuitable to hold positions of power. This can be seen in Source B that states “The usual explanation is that he has fallen ill and has not been able to say anything in his own defence ... It is not the Party's fault if Trotsky begins to get a high temperature after every attack he makes upon the Party”. This implies that Trotsky was bringing harm to the party and had the habit of making excuses to cover up for his flaws. These are qualities unbecoming of a leader.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. Stalin delivered this speech in January 1925, one year after Lenin’s death which led to a power struggle among members of the Politburo to succeed Lenin as the next leader. Trotsky was Stalin’s key political opponent and his position as Commissar of War gave him a lot of support in the army. Thus, Stalin had to find ways to get rid of Trotsky’s power base so that he would be less of a threat to Stalin in the power struggle.</p>	2-3
3	Both aspects of L2	4
4	<p>L3 plus Explains intended outcome of target audience and context</p> <p>e.g. Stalin likely delivered this speech to convince the members of the Central Committee to distrust Trotsky and to support his proposal to remove Trotsky as the Head of the Red Army/ his position as Commissar of War.</p>	5

- (c) Study Sources C and D.
How far does Source C prove that the historian is wrong in Source D?
Explain your answer. [6]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	Answers based on uncritical acceptance of provenance/undeveloped provenance	1
2	Yes/No, based on source content <i>Award 3 marks for a well-developed answer.</i> e.g. Source C proves Source D is wrong because both differ in terms of whether Trotsky and Zinoviev were allies. Source C suggests that they were allies working against the party but Source D says otherwise. This is evident in Source C that says "Because they are the organisers of the entire anti-party opposition, because they set themselves the aim of breaking the laws of the Party". This implies that both Trotsky and Zinoviev were in cahoots. But Source D states "Zinoviev was furious with Trotsky for making these comments and proposed that he should be immediately arrested". This implies that Trotsky and Zinoviev were at loggerheads and Zinoviev even wanted Trotsky to be arrested.	2–3
3	L2 plus Yes/No, based on cross reference to other sources/contextual knowledge e.g. Source C proves Source D is wrong because Source C can be supported by my contextual knowledge. Source C suggests that they were allies working against the party but Source D states otherwise. This is evident in Source C that says "Because they are the organisers of the entire anti-party opposition, because they set themselves the aim of breaking the laws of the Party". This implies that both Trotsky and Zinoviev were in cahoots and were working together. Based on what I have learned, Trotsky did enter into an alliance with Zinoviev and Kamenev to form a United Opposition in 1926. Stalin even presented this alliance as a "plot" to overthrow the government and cause dissension in the party. But Source D states "Zinoviev was furious with Trotsky for making these comments and proposed that he should be immediately arrested". This implies that Trotsky and Zinoviev were at loggerheads and Zinoviev even wanted Trotsky to be arrested. Since my ck agrees with Source C, Source C is reliable and does prove Source D wrong.	4
4	Level 2 plus Difference in context/purpose <i>Award 6 marks for answers that explain both contexts.</i> e.g.: Though both sources may say different things about the relationship between Trotsky and Zinoviev, Source C does not prove Source D wrong because of their differing contexts. Source D was about the situation in the Politburo at the end of 1923 and in 1924 when Stalin formed the Troika with Zinoviev and Kamenev against Trotsky, their common target. All three joined forces as they saw the need to eliminate Trotsky, their biggest political opponent to succeed Lenin's position. Hence, relations between Trotsky and Zinoviev were not cordial.	5-6

	<p>However, Source C was about the situation in 1927. By then Trotsky was removed from his position as Commissar of War and expelled from the Politburo. In early 1926, Trotsky allied with Zinoviev and Kamenev and formed a United Opposition. Zinoviev and Kamenev were also sacked from the Politburo on grounds of their plot with Trotsky to overthrow the communist government and expelled from the Party in 1927. Thus Zinoviev and Trotsky were in the same camp. Moreover, Source C was made to justify the expulsion of Kamenev and Zinoviev and seek Congress support for Stalin's decision to expel them and hence unreliable.</p>	
--	--	--

- (d) Study Sources E and F.
Is one source more useful than the other as evidence on Stalin?
Explain your answer.

[6]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	Yes/No, based on uncritical acceptance of source/ provenance/invalid matching	1
2	<p>Yes/No, based on source content <i>Award 3 marks for a supported answer.</i></p> <p>e.g.: Source E is more useful as evidence that Stalin was very strategic in building his support base in the party. This is evident in “He did not just socialize with the important officials: he supported junior officials too, constantly searching for tougher, more loyal, and more diligent assistants”. This suggests that Stalin was constantly trying to connect with people and win them over to his side.</p> <p>Source F is less useful as evidence that Stalin was not outstanding and did not have the necessary qualities to be a leader. This is seen in “His intellectual capacities, compared to Lenin’s, measure only ten percent or twenty percent. He is the most outstanding mediocrity of the Soviet bureaucracy”. This portrays Stalin in a negative light as someone unworthy of any mention, let alone be a leader.</p>	2–3
3	<p>L2 plus Yes/No, based on cross reference (CR), supported by source details</p> <p>e.g.: Source E is more useful as evidence that Stalin was very strategic in building his support base in the party because it corroborates with what I have learned. Source E states “He did not just socialise with the important officials: he supported junior officials too, constantly searching for tougher, more loyal, and more diligent assistants”. This suggests that Stalin was constantly trying to connect with people and win them over to his side. Based on what I have learned, Stalin was strategic in tapping on the ideological divisions within the party and formed alliances with different groups of people at different time to gain the best out of them. For example, he knew that Trotsky was seen as the biggest threat by many and formed a Troika with the moderates, Zinoviev and Kamenev, to oust him. Next he moved against Zinoviev and Kamenev after he made use of them to eliminate Trotsky. Since Source E is supported by my ck, it is reliable and more useful that Stalin was scheming and strategic in manoeuvring his way to gain influence. OR</p>	4

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
	<p>OR</p> <p>Source E is more useful as evidence that Stalin was very strategic because it can be supported by Source C. Source E states “He did not just socialise with the important officials: he supported junior officials too, constantly searching for tougher, more loyal, and more diligent assistants”. This suggests that Stalin was constantly trying to connect with people and win them over to his side. Source C states “Why did the party expel Trotsky and Zinoviev? Because they are the organisers of the entire anti-party opposition, because they set themselves the aim of breaking the laws of the Party”. This shows that Stalin was very clever in rallying people against Trotsky and Zinoviev, his political opponents by portraying them as being disloyal to the party. In this way he hoped to sway support from Trotsky and Zinoviev to himself. Since Source C agrees with Source E and thus discredits/refutes what Source F says about Stalin’s lack of abilities, this shows that Source E is reliable and thus more useful. On the contrary, Source F is unreliable and less useful.</p>	
4	<p>L3 plus No, based on critical analysis of provenance (CAP)/ purpose/ context <i>Award 6 marks for answers that deal with both sources.</i></p> <p>e.g.: Source F is less useful because it is biased. Though it may shed truth on Stalin’s lack of intellect, its unfavourable portrayal of Stalin by Trotsky is expected and unsurprising. In 1925 Trotsky was removed from his position as Commissar of War and expelled from the Politburo. In 1927 he was expelled from the Communist Party and sent into exile in 1929. It was natural for Trotsky to harbour resentment toward Stalin as he continued with his attacks on Stalin’s leadership through publications, etc even when he was living outside of USSR. Moreover, Trotsky still enjoyed support from Trotskyites living in countries like the USA. Such comments were published to win more support to discredit Stalin and his leadership of the USSR. Thus this source lacks objectivity and is less useful compared to Source E.</p>	5-6

- (e) Study **all** the sources.
 ‘Stalin emerged the winner of the power struggle because he was a political genius.’
 How far do the sources support this statement? Explain your answer. [8]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	Writes about the hypothesis; no valid source use.	1
2	<p>Yes OR No, supported by valid source use <i>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.</i></p> <p>e.g. Source B supports the statement as it shows Stalin’s skill in manoeuvring his way and how he tried to sway the Congress from supporting Trotsky by portraying the latter as someone unreliable. This is seen “The usual explanation is that he has fallen ill and has not been able to say anything in his own defence”. This implies that Trotsky had the habit of making excuses and should not be entrusted with huge responsibility. From here, one can see that Stalin was a political genius as he knew Trotsky was his biggest stumbling block and systematically worked his way to narrow Trotsky’s power base, starting with his position as Commissar of War. This position yielded Trotsky great support from the army since the days of the civil war. Thus, Stalin was clever to hit at the right weak spot of his enemy by depriving him of his support base.</p> <p>e.g. Source C supports the statement as it states “Because they are the organisers of the entire anti-party opposition, because they set themselves the aim of breaking the laws of the Party”. It is evident that Stalin was clever in manipulating public opinion and painting a negative picture of Trotsky and Zinoviev as trying to harm the party. By doing so, he was trying to justify the need to expel Zinoviev and Kamenev so that the Party would support his decision. This would help him eliminate his potential threats after making use of them to oust Trotsky. The way he was able to play one against another to extend his influence shows that he was a political genius.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. Source A does not support the statement as it shows Stalin resorting to violence to eliminate his opponent in the power struggle. Stalin can be seen using an object and trying to beat up a member of the Politburo during its session. A political genius would not need to personally use violence to achieve his aims. Instead Source A shows that Stalin could emerge the winner because of division and disunity in the Politburo which Stalin to exploit to gain an upper hand in the power struggle/ Trotsky’s disinterest in party politics which put him at a disadvantage compared to Stalin who seized every opportunity to expand his power base.</p>	2-4*

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
	<p>e.g. Source F does not support the statement as it states “His intellectual capacities, compared to Lenin’s, measure only ten percent or twenty percent. He is the most outstanding mediocrity of the Soviet bureaucracy”. This clearly suggests that Stalin lacked the capability and competence needed to earn the respect of the Party members and lead the party as he was not outstanding at all. Thus he was definitely not a political genius. This led to his political opponents underestimating him and hence failed to forestall his manipulative moves, allowing Stalin to rise to power.</p>	
3	<p>Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <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>Both aspects of L2.</p> <p><i>*For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to 2 marks (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in terms of its reliability, sufficiency, etc.</i></p>	5-8*

Section B: Structured-Essay Questions [20 marks]

- 2a) Explain why Hugh Low was more successful than James Birch in their role as Resident. [8]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	Writes about Hugh Low/James Birch as resident but without answering the question <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i>	1-2
2	Identifies or describes factors <i>Award 3 marks for identification without description.</i> <i>Award 4 marks for a detailed description.</i> e.g. Hugh Low was more successful than James Birch because his background helped him to connect better with the local Malays. He spoke fluent Malay and could communicate directly with the locals without the need for an interpreter.	3-4
3	Explains factors <i>Award 5-6 marks for one explained factor. Award 7-8 marks for two explained factors.</i> e.g. Hugh Low was more successful than James Birch because his background helped him to connect better with the local Malays. He spoke fluent Malay and could communicate directly with the locals without the need for an interpreter. He was the Colonial Secretary of Borneo for 30 years prior his appointment in Perak and <i>his wealth of knowledge of Malay culture put him in good stead as his understanding of the culture allowed him to approach the Malays in a sensitive manner. His appreciation for Malay culture helped him to treat the locals with respect. Thus his background helped him to reach out to the Malays, win them over and be willing to cooperate with him when reforms were rolled out, contributing to the success of reforms.</i> On the other hand, Birch could not speak Malay and had to rely on a Malay interpreter. <i>This prevented him from communicating effectively with Sultan Abdullah and the Malay chiefs.</i> He was also unfamiliar with the Malay customs and traditions and unwilling to understand them better. <i>He considered the local customs and way of life not worthy of his attention and understanding. His ignorance led to his insensitivity in dealing with the locals and earned him local resentment. Thus he was unable to gain their support and cooperation when he introduced new reforms and therefore reforms yielded limited success.</i> e.g. Hugh Low was more successful than James Birch because he was willing to consider the plight of the local Malays when he introduced reforms/his approach in introducing tax reform. Traditionally, the Sultan and the Malay chiefs had the right to collect revenue in his state. Birch ignored the fact that Sultan Abdullah had farmed the right to collect revenue in Perak to his friend, Lee Cheng Teng, for	5-8

	<p>\$26,000 a year. He declared this illegal and acted too quickly to relieve the Sultan and Malay chiefs of their power to collect revenue. <i>This upset the Sultan and Malay chiefs as it undermined their authority and deprived them of their sources of revenue. This made Birch unpopular as he incurred the wrath of the Malays and made the latter unwilling to cooperate with Birch. Low, on the other hand, introduced a centralized system for taxation and unlike Birch, he made sure that the Malay chiefs who lost their privileges to collect revenue were compensated. These Malay chiefs became paid employees of the colonial government. The consideration that he showed and his willingness to understand their needs helped him to win over the cooperation of the locals which in turn allowed him to roll out changes successfully with less resistance and their support.</i></p>	
--	---	--

- 2b) 'The political impact of British colonial rule on Malaya outweighs its economic impact'. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [12]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	<p>Writes about British colonial rule without answering the question <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i></p>	1-2
2	<p>Explains Yes OR No <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</i></p> <p>e.g. Yes, I agree because British colonial rule brought about political stability and greater administrative efficiency in the Malay states. Before the advent of British rule, Malay states like Perak and Selangor were politically unstable as they were plagued with secret societies' fights, succession disputes, etc. The Malay states developed at different pace under their sultans who ruled their states independently and with absolute power. With the introduction of the British Residential System, a structured system of administration was set up in the Malay states. In 1896, the Federated Malay States (FMS) was formed, bringing Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang together under a federal government. Public administration departments in charge of areas like the police, public works, telegraph and railways now came under the central authority of the FMS. <i>Thus, the introduction of British rule through the Residential System and the FMS ushered in peace and political stability. Chaos created by succession dispute and tin mining secret society wars became a thing of the past. Thus, British rule benefitted Malaya as it promoted stability as the locals were less likely to challenge a government that was backed by the British. Political stability also helped to create a safe environment for trade and economic development. British rule also brought about greater centralisation and uniformity as all four states were governed by a central authority with coordination of policies at the Federal level. There was also greater standardisation of the laws and judicial system and this helped to reduce confusion and make it easier for trade to be carried out.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. No, I disagree because British colonial rule transformed Malayan economy and generated more revenue. Before British rule, Malayan's economy was mainly subsistence-based. Though Malaya had rich mineral resources like tin, output levels remained low due to the use of traditional unsophisticated methods of extraction. The advent of British rule encouraged the growth of the tin and rubber industries and stimulated economic growth. The discovery of tin attracted rich European investors who brought in modern equipment like tin</p>	3-6

	<p>dredge that could extract large amounts of tin. By 1898, European capital and Chinese labour had transformed the FMS into the world's largest producer of tin, with an output of 40,000 tons (compared to 6,500 tons in 1851). British rule also spurred the growth of the rubber industry in Malaya. The rubber industry was also funded by European capital and rubber plantations managed by European planters. By the early 20th century, rubber surpassed tin as Malaya's most profitable export. <i>Thus, British colonial rule helped to boost economic growth and diversified the Malayan economy. The stable environment created by the British made it attractive for investors to invest in the tin and rubber industries. This helped to develop them as the twin pillars of Malayan economy, bringing in revenue and boosting the development of the country. Increased economic prosperity and revenue earned allowed for the improvement in the people's standard of living, as well as created jobs for them to earn more income, thus benefitting them economically and financially.</i></p> <p>British colonial rule also led to improved infrastructure. To support the tin and rubber industries, the British built roads, bridges, railways, harbours to connect tin mines and rubber plantations. The first railway line opened in Malaya in 1885 to link Larut in Perak to Port Weld. By the time FMS was formed, 4 railway lines were in operation. The formation of the FMS facilitated better coordination of these railway lines. <i>The development of infrastructure not only improved the accessibility within the country but also created jobs in industries such as transportation. Improved transportation links made exploitation of raw materials for economic gain even more efficient.</i></p>	
3	<p>Explains Yes AND No <i>Award 7 marks for an explanation of Yes and an explanation of No, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks.</i></p> <p><i>Both aspects of L2.</i></p>	7-10
4	<p>L3 plus reaches a balanced conclusion based on explicit considerations of the 2 perspectives <i>Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p>e.g.: I think that the political impact of British colonial rule in Malaya definitely outweighs the economic impact because it created the foundation for a more stable and conducive environment which was essential for economic growth and to attract investors. When law and order ensued, foreign investors came and brought with them the expertise, funding and machinery that the locals lacked. This in turn helped to propel economic growth and necessitated the improvement of the infrastructure to support the economic activities.</p>	11-12

3a) Explain why it was difficult to enforce collective security in the 1930s. [8]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	Writes about collective security but without answering the question <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i>	1-2
2	Identifies or describes factors <i>Award 3 marks for identification without description.</i> <i>Award 4 marks for a detailed description.</i> e.g. It was difficult to enforce collective security in the 1930s because the effects of the Great Depression on world economy forced countries to prioritise their national interests. The Wall Street Crash started the Great Depression in 1929 which crippled the economies of countries worldwide well into the 1930s. As countries such as Britain and France struggled to keep afloat amidst the economic crisis, they prioritised their own national interests above that of the League of Nations. For example, when Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935, Britain and France, the owners of the Suez Canal, refused to close the waterway to Italy out of fear that it would further damage their economies. e.g. It was difficult to enforce collective security in the 1930s because of the emergence of authoritarian regimes like Nazi Germany threatened peace. The rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party in Germany led to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship. Hitler used his new-found power to set into motion his ambitious and aggressive foreign policy, aiming to create lebensraum and unite German-speaking people under a Greater Germany. His rearmament gave him the military capabilities to wage wars. His violation of the Treaty of Versailles in remilitarising the Rhineland and bringing about Anschluss threatened peace and security in Europe. The Sudetenland Crisis is another example of his expansionist foreign policy that undermined the sovereignty of countries like Czechoslovakia.	3-4
3	Explains factors <i>Award 5-6 marks for one explained factor. Award 7-8 marks for two explained factors.</i> e.g. It was difficult to enforce collective security in the 1930s because the effects of the Great Depression on world economy forced countries to prioritise their own national interests. The Wall Street Crash started the Great Depression in 1929 which crippled the economies of countries worldwide well into the 1930s. As countries such as Britain and France struggled to keep afloat amidst the economic crisis, they prioritized their own national interests above that of the League of Nations. As a result, countries were less willing to stand up against aggression to avoid war and generally avoided taking actions that might jeopardise their countries' economies. For example, when Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935, Britain and France, the owners of the Suez Canal, refused to close the waterway to Italy out of fear that it would further damage their economies. <i>This refusal allowed Italy to use it to transport troops and supplies to sustain its war efforts in Abyssinia, thus losing an opportunity to use it as a deterrent to check aggression. This self-preservation mindset among its members made them</i>	5-8

neglect their role in helping the League enforce collective security to protect the sovereignty of countries.

e.g.: It was difficult to enforce collective security in the 1930s because of the emergence of authoritarian regimes like Nazi Germany threatened peace. The rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party in Germany led to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship. Hitler used his new-found power to set into motion his ambitious and aggressive foreign policy, aiming to create lebensraum and unite German-speaking people under a Greater Germany. His rearmament gave him the military capabilities to wage wars. His violation of the Treaty of Versailles in remilitarizing the Rhineland and bringing about Anschluss threatened peace and security in Europe. The Sudetenland Crisis is another example of his expansionist foreign policy that undermined the sovereignty of countries like Czechoslovakia. *Thus, the rise of dictators such as Mussolini and Hitler and their aggressive foreign policies challenged the authority of the league of Nations and made it difficult for the League to enforce its decisions to protect the independence of countries threatened. Their aggressive actions also exposed the weaknesses of the League in upholding collective security which in turn made countries lose faith in it and less willing to support the League in checking aggression.*

- 3b) 'The political impact of the Treaty of Versailles on Germany outweighs its economic impact.' How far do you agree with this statement?
Explain your answer.

[12]

Level	Level Descriptor	Marks
1	<p>Writes about the Treaty of Versailles without answering the question <i>Award 1 mark for each detail, to a maximum of 2 marks.</i></p>	1-2
2	<p>Explains Yes OR No <i>Award 3 marks for an explanation, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</i></p> <p>e.g. Yes, I agree because the Treaty of Versailles affected the international standing of Germany due to territorial reduction. The Treaty made Germany give up territories to various countries and its overseas empire. Former German colonies became mandates controlled by the League of Nations. Germany was forbidden to form Anschluss with Austria and German land was also taken to create the Polish Corridor to give Poland access to the sea. <i>As a result, Germany lost about 10% of its land and 12.5% of its population. These territorial losses dealt a severe blow to German pride and national prestige as the size of a country's empire determined its political standing in the world. The Treaty also prevented future German expansion through merger with other territories, especially with Austria. Before WWI, Germany was a rising power to be reckon with in Europe but the Treaty undermined its status as one of the leading powers. The Treaty also affected Germany politically because it made the new Weimar government unpopular as it represented Germany in signing the harsh Treaty. The Germans associated the hated Treaty with the Weimar politicians. Many believed that the government had "stabbed them in the back" by signing the armistice and accepting the Treaty. They blamed the government for the problems faced after the war and this led to attempts to overthrow the government in the early 1920s. This affected the political stability of the country and posed challenges to the infant government.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>e.g. No, I disagree because the economic impact of the Treaty was more damaging to Germany due to the need to pay war reparations. According to the Treaty Germany had to pay 6.6 billion pounds as reparations to the Allies for war damage. <i>This put tremendous additional strain on the depleted German economy. Germany had suffered damages and economic losses during the war and had incurred huge debts from the war effort. After the end of WWI, it was also struggling with post-war reconstruction. Moreover, the loss of resource-rich regions (e.g. its overseas colonies in Asia Pacific and Africa) further crippled German economy and hampered its post-war reconstruction as it meant a loss of resources, population and potential sources of income. Thus, the need to pay reparations further drained German treasury and crippled the German economy.</i></p>	3-6

	<p><i>Its ability to keep up with the payment of reparations in 1923 led to French and Belgian troops occupying the Ruhr valley (an important industrial region in Germany). The government's order of a sit-down strike resulted in an economic standstill which further aggravated its economic woes and led to hyperinflation. This saw the rapid increase in the prices of daily goods as value of the currency nosedived due to overprinting of money. People lost their savings overnight and poverty was widespread. Thus, the economic impact of the Treaty was more damaging and outweighs the political impact.</i></p>	
3	<p>Explains Yes AND No <i>Award 7 marks for an explanation of Yes and an explanation of No, and further marks for additional reasons or supporting detail for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks.</i></p> <p><i>Both aspects of L2.</i></p>	7-10
4	<p>L3 plus reaches a balanced conclusion based on explicit considerations of the 2 perspectives <i>Award the higher mark in the level for more fully developed answers.</i></p> <p>e.g.: In conclusion, the political impact outweighs the economic impact because the latter was contingent on the political impact. For example, colonies were seen as a viable source of resources, income and cheap labour. The loss of resource-rich colonies meant less resources and less revenue for the German government. Territorial terms that bear political impact in turn lead to economic impact as the territorial losses meant economic losses and hamper Germany's ability to revive its post-war economy.</p>	11-12