

Proposed J2 H2 Paper 1 History Prelim Exams Answer Key 2021

Section A

You **must** answer Question 1.

**CAUSES OF THE KOREAN WAR, 1950 – 1953**

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence regarding the involvement of the United States in the Korean War. [10]

L1 (1-3m)	<i>Answer compares sources through paraphrasing; comparison is superficial, partial or confusing.</i>
L2 (4-6m)	<i>Comparison between sources is made through correct interpretation and deduction from the content only.</i>  For example, the sources agree that the United States has intervened militarily in the war; on the other hand, Source A implied that American military intervention was defensive in nature, while Source B accused America for being the aggressor in the war.
L3 (7-8m)	<i>Answer is uneven, meaning insights are shown only in the discussion of one source or the comparison and contrast are not attempted equally well, but the response as a whole contains valid contextualisation.</i>
L4 (9-10m)	<i>Analysis of both sources, demonstration of compare and contrast skills, are performed well with valid contextualisation.</i>  The answer can mention how, on surface, both sources are similar in showing how American intervention in the Korean War has been through its military, as they were describing American role in the war during the same period. Given their purpose however, the nature of American involvement has been explained differently. Source A sought to justify the reason for USA support of the United Nations' collective security action to be undertaken against the incursion of North Korean troops across the 38 <sup>th</sup> parallel. It is a message made by President Truman 2 days after the Pyongyang crossed the line. Source B on the other hand was a North Korean propaganda narrating the military actions already executed by the American forces against North Korean targets, by 30 <sup>th</sup> June 1950. It was produced as an accusation against supposed American invasion of the north.

**(b)** To what extent do Sources A – F show that the Soviet Union should bear the primary responsibility for starting the Korean War? [30]

L1 (1-4m)	<i>Sources are not used sufficiently or correctly; overall response has been uneven and underdeveloped.</i>
L2 (5-10m)	<i>Only relevant information from content of the sources is extracted but the overall response is not contextualised. Answers use sources in isolation belong to this level.</i>
L3 (11-15m)	<i>Sources are studied in sets with attempts to triangulate them to answer the question based on deduction from the content only. There will be no contextualisation.</i>
L4 (16-20m)	<i>Sources are discussed in sets but only some of these materials are assessed with contextualisation. Quality of challenge and support sets will not be equally good.</i>
L5 (21-25m)	<p>Support set – Sources A, D and F. Source D, a South Korean propaganda cartoon distributed at the height of the Korean War in 1952, claimed that Soviet Union was the mastermind of the invading Korean troops, illustrated the insinuation made in Source A, a proclamation made by President Truman to justify US intervention in the war, three days after the invasion from the north, that “communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war.” Soviet leadership at initiating the Korean War has been validated from hindsight by Source F, published long after the truce in 2010, that Stalin’s calculation was key to the battle plans of DPRK.</p> <p>Challenge set – Sources B, C and E instead believe that the USA should be held primarily responsible for starting the Korean War. Sources B and E exhibit the continuation of DPRK perspective from the beginning to the truce of the war between 1950 and 1953, that it was the Americans who were responsible for invading the Korean peninsula in order to assert their imperialistic rule. Both sources corroborate with Source C, a letter from Stalin in 1950, which exonerated the USSR from starting the war and putting the blame squarely on the shoulders of the Americans instead, as evident in “(few) honest people can doubt that America is now acting as an aggressor in Korea”.</p> <p>Evaluation – The set that supports the statement in question is a more valid. While Sources B and E place the blame on the USA for starting the war, they were merely propaganda made to justify DPRK invasion. This perspective was challenged by Source A, where Truman vowed American support for the collective security action by the United Nations to repel DPRK invasion, which is validated by my contextual knowledge, that the DPRK did in fact invaded ROK on 25 June 1950. Sources B and E have therefore distorted facts to serve their political purpose. Source C on the other hand is a less objective source, as Stalin spoke in politically self-righteous terms blaming Americans for the war, yet betrayed Soviet to his reader as he mentioned “(the) reason we eventually allowed the war in Korea is because: let us suppose that the U.S. continues to be tied down in the Far East and also pulls China into the struggle.” This has</p>

## Jurong Pioneer Junior College

	indirectly confirmed Source F assertion that the war could not have happened without the endorsement of Stalin.
L6 (26-30m)	<p><i>In addition to L5, answers at this level may elaborate upon source details with relevant contextual knowledge to enrich their discussion on the thesis statement. Relations between both sets of sources will be explored and if necessary, the statement in question is to be modified.</i></p> <p>If choose to modify the thesis statement, students can argue that all the sources seem to bring about the broader narrative that even though the supporting set has been stronger, it is not entirely reliable. Source A was made before the clouds of war were cleared, while Source D too, like Sources B and E, was propaganda with exaggerated view. It was from Source F that one can tell that the Soviets were merely the endorser of Kim Il-Sung's decision to invade the south. Stalin might be key to starting the war, but he should not bear the primary responsibility as invading the south was an idea persistently pushed by, and with its brunt also bore by DPRK.</p>

## Section B

Band	Marks	Quality of the Answers
0	0	No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.
1	1-8	The essay will be characterised by significant irrelevance or argument that does not begin to make significant points. The essay may mention historical concepts but these will not be understood. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent.
2	9-12	The essay will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The essay may include references to historical concepts but these may not be fully understood. Where appropriate, the essay may mention the existence of other historical interpretations but this may not be explained. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
3	13-15	The essay will offer some appropriate factual material but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis. The essay will include some references to historical concepts but these may not be used to develop the analysis. Where appropriate, the essay may mention the existence of other historical interpretations, though this may be implicit. The quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the essay will be unbalanced. The writing may show some accuracy but there will also be frequent errors.

**Jurong Pioneer Junior College**

4	16-18	The essay will indicate attempts to argue relevantly, although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. The essay will show evidence of knowledge of historical concepts and attempts may be made to use historical concepts to aid analysis. Where appropriate, the essay may mention the existence of other historical interpretations but the nature of these interpretations may not be fully understood. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing will usually be accurate.
5	19-21	The essay will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The essay will show evidence of understanding of relevant historical concepts, and some use of historical concepts will be made in analysis. Where appropriate, the essay mentions the existence of other historical interpretations and offers some relevant knowledge of, or evidence for, these interpretations. The essay will be largely relevant. Most of the argument will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The essay will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. The writing will be generally accurate.
6	22-25	The essay will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative, demonstrating secure understanding of historical concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic. Where appropriate, the essay will discuss competing historical interpretations and offers good knowledge of or evidence for these interpretations. The essay will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The writing will be mostly accurate.
7	26-30	The overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative, demonstrating clear and accurate understanding of historical concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic. The essay will be fully relevant. It will be supported by carefully selected factual material and ideas closely focused on the topic and argument made. Where appropriate, the essay will effectively assess the strengths and limitations of competing historical interpretations. The argument will be structured coherently. The writing will be accurate.

- 2 'The 1973 Oil Shock rather than reckless borrowing by the Latin American governments was responsible for the 1980s Debt Crises.' How far do you agree with this statement? [30]

**B3 and above:** Answer must explain how the outcomes of 1973 Oil Shock, such as the proliferation of petrodollars and extreme optimism over the performance of the Latin American economies, were likely causes for the 1980s Debt Crisis. The essay might even venture forth to discuss generally the causes for the disaster, like reckless borrowing from the Latin American governments as well as the indiscriminate lending by western banks. However, at **B3**, the causal link made between the two crises would be tenuous at best. The paper could even discuss other reasons for the Debt Crisis, even though the explanation would be incomplete or not directly addressing the question. Factors are descriptively listed rather than discussed in relation with each other.

**B4 and above:** Essay must show clearly how consequences of the 1973 Oil Crisis were far reaching causes of the 1980s Debt Crisis. Similarly, strong causal link is made between reckless borrowing of Latin American governments and the Debt Crisis. Comparison made between these two sets of causes could however be weak or superficial. However, essays which are able to weigh these factors with clear criteria and tight causal links deserve **B5 and above**.

**B6 and above:** This band should be awarded to essays that are able to discuss the relationship between consequences of the 1973 Oil Crisis and reckless borrowing by the Latin American governments. It was the prospect that energy prices would remain high, that petrodollars were enticing low-interests funds for loan; lenders, and borrowers soon became reckless. Essays that argue for the latter being the stronger cause for Debt Crisis should build on the criteria governments were to be blamed because they were catalysts and triggering reason for the fiasco. Alternatively, consequences of the Oil Shock ought to be understood as the fundamental or long-term reasons for the Debt Crisis. Any essay that is able to discuss the dualistic aspects of this debate deserve **B7**.

- 3 Assess the impact of Cold War on South Korea's economic transformation between 1970 and 1990. [30]

**B3 and above:** Essay should explain in brief but accurately how the development of Cold War affected the economic development of South Korea in the same period. There will also be attempts to include the discussion of other causes like government's role (in planning, rallying, supporting and troubleshooting), private businesses and cultural influences on the economic transformation of South Korea, from an import-substitution emphasis, to an export-oriented and then a high tech advanced economy.

**B4 and above:** There are strong attempts to show how various stages of the Cold War between 1970 and 1990 propelled the progressive stages of South Korea economic transformation. Changing American interests were key to the international climate that South Korea economy operated under. The essay should also be making connections between the development of Cold War with the initiatives of government as well as how private enterprises strengthened by cultural resilience and innovative ness were able to chart new directions for the robust economy. Stronger answers with strong stated causal links and

some efforts made, at least implicitly, to examine how governmental policies together with the drive of Chaebols were key to exploiting opportunities and overcoming challenges of Cold War, deserve **B5 and above**.

**B6 and above:** Essay is able to assign a valid criteria to define the importance of changing circumstances during Cold War, without overstating its importance, coupled with the emphasis on governmental role being the more decisive factor, supported by a resilient and innovative private sector, belong to this band. Stronger answers, which might attain **B7**, would bring out the broad idea that changing American interests were not the only manifestation of Cold War influence. Other global impact on the South Korea economy like rising protectionism of the other major economies and even the opening up of China could be included as peripheral features of the changing Cold War circumstances.

- 4 'Influence of the United Nations General Assembly has been enhanced by the superpower rivalry during the Cold War.' Discuss. [30]

**B3 and above:** Answer must identify clearly the main ideas and instances of how superpower rivalry during the Cold War affected the influence of the United Nations General Assembly. Any discussion that traces the transformation of the membership of UNGA in the evolving phases of Cold War, hence superpower rivalry, even with few details, could be awarded grades in **B3 and B4**, if it is able to explain how their power fluctuated accurately and clearly.

**B4 and above:** Essay needs to explain with evidential backing on how because of superpower rivalry, the UNGA was empowered to make important decisions at the maintenance of global peace and order. The mentioning of the passing of Uniting for Peace resolutions at the junctures of UN history where superpower rivalry has resulted in deadlock in the United Nations Security Council because of veto cast is necessary. At the same time, superpower rivalry during the Cold War can also diminish the authority and influence of UNGA as either of the two hegemons could withdraw from contributing support and resources to any program and peacekeeping mission of the United Nations, thus rendering any concern raised by the UNGA futile. In addition to the above, those answers that are able to discern how UNGA on its own has continued to operate with high degree of efficaciousness in the fulfilment of the secondary aims of the UN, such as the promotion of socio-economic agendas around the world, even with superpower rivalry, deserve **B5 and above**.

**B6 and above:** The paper is able to assign and discuss at length an evaluative criterion to the impact of superpower rivalry on the efficacy and influence of UNGA. For example, superpower rivalry was critical only at affecting areas of UNGA's responsibilities where the achievement of the United Nations' primary objective at maintaining global peace and stability was at stake. Subsequently, with or without superpower rivalry, so long as the United States, the more powerful of the two hegemons, was intent to lend support to any of UNGA's initiatives, UNGA's influence would still be considerable. Answers that are able to discuss all multifaceted perspectives of this question thoroughly should hit **B7**.

- 5 'American participation was key to the success of any UN Peacekeeping Operations.'  
How valid is this statement at describing peacekeeping missions after the Cold War?  
[30]

**B3 and above:** Essay must be able to explain the crucial role played by the Americans in the undertaking of UNPKO in the aftermath of Cold War. Causal link between American participation and the outcome of these missions must be clear. On the other hand, also other UNPKOs have no American participation. These must be mentioned at least briefly.

**B4 and above:** Not only were the points on how American participation was key to many UNPKOs after the Cold War are made, the essay also displays the other side of the debate that the United States could also be the liability or contribute nothing of positive value to some UNPKOs. At this stage, the student may raise the point that there are other factors for the failure of other UNPKOs, such as lack of local consent and poor management, which could diminish the role played by the USA. American participation was crucial but not necessarily key to the success of any UNPKOs. Essays that are able to evaluate in detail the causality between American commitment and the outcomes of the post-Cold War UNPKOs deserve **B5 and above**.

**B6 and above:** In addition to the above, the essay should transcend the technicalities of UNPKO case studies and analyse the macro trend. There are several types of UNPKOs. American participation was not present in most. Some PKOs like UNTAC succeeded spectacularly even without USA presence. Some like UNOSOM failed even with the USA around. Essays that are more circumspective and conclude that the fulfilment of the classical success formula of UNPKOs, that cooperation of the local belligerents must be secured first, regardless of whether American commitment was given, might attain **B7**.

---THE END---