

Zhonghua Secondary School
History Elective 2261/2
Secondary 4 Express
2025 Preliminary Examination
Marking Scheme and Suggested Answers

Section A: Source-Based Case Study (30 marks)

1 (a) Study Source A.
)

Why was this cartoon published in 1950? Explain your answer.
 [5]

Question Focus: Inference (Purpose)

Level	Mark Descriptor	Mark Range
L1	Answer Based On Lifting OR Paraphrasing The Source. Award 1 mark for answers based on lifting OR paraphrasing.	1
L2	Reason Award 2 marks for a supported claim based on Message. E.g. This cartoon was published by the Americans in 1950 to show that North Korea was aggressive in launching an invasion against South Korea (Message).	2
L3	L2 plus Answers Based On Target Audience and Desired Outcome. Award 3 marks for Message, with valid Target Audience or Desired Outcome. Award 4 marks for Message, with valid Target Audience and Desired Outcome. Note: Answers on purpose, unsupported will be awarded L2/2 marks. E.g. This cartoon was published by the Americans in 1950 to convince (Intent) the Americans (Audience) that North Korea was aggressive in launching an invasion against South Korea (Message) so that the Americans would support the US government's involvement in the Korean War (Intended Outcome). Source A depicts a communist leader explaining how North Korea was being invaded by South Korea. However, the map that he was holding is turned upside down. This suggests that North Korea was trying to misrepresent the fact that it started the Korean War because by inverting the map, it would appear as if South Korea was the aggressor.	3-4
L4	L3 plus Context to Explain Purpose E.g. L3 + Since the Korean War has started on 25 June 1950 and rapid advancements were made by the North Korean forces in occupying most of South Korea, there was an urgency for the US to provide immediate reinforcements for South Korea in order to prevent a communist takeover of South Korea. As such, the US government needed to justify their upcoming involvement in the war so that they would not face criticisms from its people and to influence public opinion against North Korea / the Communists for starting the Korean War which requires US intervention.	5

1 (b Study Source B.
)

How useful is Source B as evidence that the US entered the Korean War to preserve peace?
Explain your answer. [5]

Question Target: Utility

Level	Mark Descriptor	Mark Range
L1	Paraphrasing / lifting / description from source	1
L2	Useful or not useful, based on content E.g. Source B is useful as it claims that the US entered the Korean War to preserve peace. Source B states that “Win it and Europe most probably would avoid war and yet preserve freedom.” This suggests that the US intervention was necessary to contain the spread of communism and ensure stability.	2
L3	Useful or not useful, based on cross-reference <i>Award 4m for a cross-reference, well-explained.</i> E.g. Source B is useful as it is supported by Source A. Source A shows a communist leader explaining how North Korea was being invaded by South Korea. However, the map that he was holding is turned upside down. This suggests that North Korea was trying to misrepresent the fact that it started the Korean War because by inverting the map, it would appear as if South Korea was the aggressor. Therefore, to counter North Korea’s aggression and to preserve peace in the Korean peninsula, the US entered the Korean War. Since Source A supports Source B, Source B is reliable therefore useful . E.g. Source B is not useful as it is challenged by my contextual knowledge. Based on my contextual knowledge, I know that the US entered the Korean War as part of its plan to contain the spread of communism. Initially, the US sought to minimise its involvement in the Korean War, aiming to avoid a direct military confrontation with the USSR while focusing on rebuilding Japan after WWII. However, the communist victory in the Chinese Civil War alarmed the US as inaction would enable the communist takeover of North Korea hence triggering the falling domino effect. Hence, the US changed its stance with the release of the NSC-68 report emphasizing that more aggressive US action in the Korean peninsula was crucial to its containment policy. Since my contextual knowledge challenges Source B, Source B is unreliable therefore not useful . <u>Sources that challenge Source B:</u> • D and F	3-4
L4	Useful or not useful, based on critical analysis of provenance E.g. Upon critical analysis of provenance, Source B is unreliable therefore not useful in claiming that US entered the Korean War to preserve peace. Source B is from a private letter written by General Douglas MacArthur to the leader of the Republican party which was the opposition in the US Congress on 20 March 1951. General MacArthur had wanted to convince (Intent) the leader of the Republican party (Audience) that the US needed to take more aggressive actions to preserve peace (Message) so that the leader of the opposition party would understand and support General MacArthur’s actions of expanding the scale of the war (Intended Outcome). (4m) As General MacArthur had recently just defied direct orders from Truman and the UN to limit operations north of the 38 th parallel, and the leader of the opposition	5

	was critical towards some of Truman's administration decisions, it is of General MacArthur's interest to gain the support of the leader in order to continue with his pursuit of a more aggressive military campaign in the Korean War. (5m)	
--	---	--

1 (c) Study Source C.

How surprised are you by this source? Explain your answer.

[6]

Question Focus: Surprise

Level	Descriptors	Mark Range
L1	Paraphrasing / lifting / description from source	1
L2	Surprised or not surprised, based on content <u>OR</u> superficial analysis of provenance E.g. I am surprised by Source C as it claims that the USSR played a significant role in the outbreak of the Korean War. This is evident in "The decision would not have been made without Soviet sanctions or direction." This suggests that China was only involved in the Korean War because it has gotten the approval of the USSR.	2
L3	Surprised or not surprised, based on cross-reference <i>Award 4 marks for more developed cross-references.</i> E.g. I am surprised by Source C as it is challenged by Source E. Unlike Source C, Source E claims that North Korea was the country that played a significant role in the outbreak of the Korean War. This is evident in "Therefore, we turn to you, comrade Stalin to render us assistance in this regard". This means that the North Korean leader was the one actively persuading the USSR to intervene through the provision of military training for the Soviet troops. Or E.g. I am not surprised by Source C as it is supported by my contextual knowledge. Based on my contextual knowledge, following the delivery of the defensive perimeter speech by US Secretary of State Dean Acheson and the communist victory in the Chinese Civil War, the USSR became keener and more willing to interfere in the Korean conflict. With a new communist ally and the assurance that the US would not interfere in the region, the USSR believed that the chances of solidifying the communist bloc in the region would increase. As a result, more support was provided for North Korea by the USSR. Therefore, the USSR played a significant role in the Korean War.	3-4
L4	Surprised or not surprised, based on critical analysis of provenance <i>Award 5m for a valid analysis of provenance, supported.</i> <i>Award 6m for a valid analysis of provenance, supported, with an analysis of the context of Source C.</i> E.g. I am not surprised by Source C as I expect the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to convince the US government that the USSR was the main actor responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War so that the US government could discuss and implement the necessary policies to counter the threat posed by the USSR during the Korean War. As the CIA is responsible for gathering and analysing information that could affect the national security of the US and considering that this source was taken from a secret CIA report, it is expected that the CIA would emphasize the role of the USSR in the conflict to help the US government formulate policies to contain Soviet influence. (5m) Furthermore, by November 1950, Chinese troops had joined the North	5-6

	Koreans in the war, making it crucial for the US government to reassess their strategy. (6m)	
--	--	--

1 (d Study Sources D and E.
)

How far does Kim Il Sung's telegram in Source D prove that the poster in Source E is right?
Explain your answer.
[6]

Question Target: Hybrid (Comparison & Reliability)

Level	Mark Descriptor	Mark Range
L1	Answers Based on Source Detail(s) But No Valid Matching / Lifting / Paraphrasing / Answers based on underdeveloped provenance	1
L2	Answers Based on Source Content <i>Award 2m for comparison, unsupported.</i> <i>Award 3m for comparison, supported.</i> E.g. Kim Il Sung's telegram in Source D proves that the poster in Source E is right as both sources are similar in showing that the US was aggressive towards Korea. Source D states that "For a successful struggle against a strong enemy armed with the latest achievements of military science and technology we will have to train pilots, tankists, radio operators, and engineering officers urgently." This suggests that the US was well-prepared in entering the Korean War which then prompted North Korea to strengthen its own military capabilities. Similarly, Source E depicts General MacArthur stabbing the Koreans and a plane dropping a bomb labelled with "US" on China. The caption also reads, "The Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate the invasion of other countries and cannot allow imperialists to invade its own neighbours without taking any action." This suggests that the US was being aggressive in trying to achieve its aim of expanding its influence.	2-3
L3	Answer Based on Analysis of the Reliability of Sources <i>Award 5 marks for more developed cross-references.</i> E.g. Kim Il Sung's telegram in Source D proves that the poster in Source E is right as Source D is supported by Source F, hence making it reliable. Source F states that "It instigated and manipulated the Security Council of the United Nations to adopt a resolution on dispatching a UN Force with US troops as the principal force in the absence of the Soviet representative to expand the war in Korea." This suggests that the US had escalated tensions during the Korean War by enlisting the support of the UN. As Source F also highlights the aggressive nature of USA's involvement like Source D, Source D is reliable . E.g. Kim Il Sung's telegram in Source D does not prove that the poster in Source E is right as Source D is challenged by Source B, hence making it unreliable. Source B states that "Win it and Europe most probably would avoid war and yet preserve freedom." This suggests that the US was not aggressive in its involvement in the Korean War as its objective was to prevent the spread of communism and to preserve peace. Since Source D is different from Source B, Source D is unreliable .	4-5
L4	L3 + Critical Analysis of Provenance / Purpose / Context E.g. Kim Il Sung's telegram in Source D does not prove that the poster in Source D is right as Source E is unreliable upon critical analysis of provenance. Source D was from a telegram message from Kim to Stalin, published 9 October 1950. Kim had wanted to convince (Intent) Stalin (Audience) that North Korea was ill-prepared to fight against South Korea and the US (Message) so that Stalin would provide more military	5-6

	reinforcement for North Korea (Intended Outcome). (5m) Given that the UN forces had landed at Incheon in September 1950, Kim had an ulterior motive of seeking sufficient support from the USSR to counter the strength of the UN and to eventually unify Korea. (Explanation of Ulterior Motive) Since Source E is biased, it is unreliable. (6m) E.g. Kim Il Sung's telegram in Source D does not prove that the poster in Source E is right as Source E is unreliable upon critical analysis of provenance. Source E was a poster published by the Chinese Communist Party in 1950. The Chinese Communist Party had wanted to convince (Intent) the Chinese (Audience) that the US were aggressors and China as the defender of sovereignty (Message). Hence, the Chinese would be more likely to support China's involvement in the Korean War (Intended Outcome). (5m) Given that the UN troops had advanced towards the Yalu River by October 1950, China had an ulterior motive to interfere in the Korean War to protect its national security while at the same time, strengthen the communist bloc in the region. (Explanation of Ulterior Motive). Since Source D is biased, it is unreliable. (6m)	
--	--	--

1 (e Study all the sources.
)

'The Communists were the aggressors in the Korean War.' How far do the sources support this statement? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Question Target: Testing Assertion

Level	Mark Descriptor	Mark Range
L1	Writes About The Hypothesis, But No Valid Source Use <i>Award up to 2 marks for answers with further elaboration.</i>	1-2
L2	Yes OR No, Supported By Valid Source Use <i>Award 3 marks for one Yes OR No, supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent Yes OR No, supported by valid source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.</i>	3-4
L3	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 8 marks.</i> <u>Supporting Statement</u> The Communists were the aggressors in the Korean War. <u>Sources That Support The Statement: A, B, C and D</u> E.g. Source A supports the statement as it claims that the communists started the Korean War. Source A depicts a communist leader explaining how North Korea was being invaded by South Korea. However, the map that he was holding is turned upside down. This suggests that North Korea was trying to misrepresent the fact that it started the Korean War because by inverting the map, it would appear as if South Korea was the aggressor. - (Evaluation) <i>However, it may be unreliable as it is an American cartoon which may have been intended to convince the Americans on the aggression of North Korea so that the Americans would support the involvement of the country in the Korean War.</i> E.g. Source B supports the statement as it claims that the communists sought to use	5-8

the Korean conflict to expand their influence. Source B states that “It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest.” This suggests that the communists aimed to consolidate their influence the ongoing Korean conflict as part of their broader plan to expand their sphere of influence worldwide.

- (Evaluation)

However, it may be unreliable as it is a letter by General MacArthur to the leader of the opposition party in Congress to convince the leader that more aggressive action was needed to push the communist forces beyond just the 38th parallel so that the leader would take the side of MacArthur and apply pressure on the Congress to agree.

E.g. **Source C** supports the statement as it claims that the USSR had influenced China’s decision to send troops during the Korean War. Source C states that “China’s decision to commit troops in North Korea entails a serious risk of widening the Korean conflict. The decision would not have been made without Soviet sanctions or direction.” This suggests that China’s decision was made with the approval of the USSR.

- (Evaluation)

However, it may be reliable/unreliable as it is a secret report published by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to convince the US government that there was greater involvement of the communist powers in the Korean conflict so that the US government would reassess its strategy and involvement in the Korean peninsula.

E.g. **Source D** supports the statement as it claims that North Korea was eager to gain the USSR’s support during the war. Source D states that “For a successful struggle against a strong enemy armed with the latest achievements of military science and technology we will have to train pilots, tankists, radio operators, and engineering officers urgently. It is very difficult to train them inside our country. Therefore, we turn to you, comrade Stalin to render us assistance in this regard.” This suggests that North Korea was driven by a fierce determination to win the war despite the risk of escalating the conflict.

- (Evaluation)

However, it may be unreliable as Kim’s telegram message was meant to persuade Stalin of the urgent need to provide military reinforcements for North Korea so that Stalin would decide to do so.

Challenging Statement

The non-communists were the aggressors in the Korean War.

Sources That Challenge The Statement: E and F

E.g. **Source F** challenges the statement as it claims that the US aggression escalated the Korean War. Source F states that “It instigated and manipulated the Security Council of the United Nations to adopt a resolution on dispatching a UN Force with US troops as the principal force in the absence of the Soviet representative to expand the war in Korea.” This suggests that the US has intensified the conflict by securing the support of the UN in sending a larger military force into Korea.

E.g. **Source E** challenges the statement as it claims that the US was aggressive in infringing on the sovereignty of Korea and eventually China. Source E depicts General MacArthur stabbing the Koreans and a plane dropping a bomb labelled with

“US” on China. The caption also reads, “The Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate the invasion of other countries and cannot allow imperialists to invade its own neighbours without taking any action.” This suggests that to achieve its aim of expanding its influence, the US would go all out by using violence and force in the Korean War. - (Evaluation) However, Source E may be unreliable as it is a poster published by the Chinese Communist Party in 1950 aimed to rally support for China’s involvement in the war by portraying the US as aggressors and China as the defender of sovereignty. *Note To Marker: For L2 and L3, award a bonus mark of up to two marks (i.e. +1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc. The total mark for the response must not exceed 8 marks.	
--	--

Section B: Essays (20 marks)

- 2 ‘The purpose of the Treaty of Versailles was to prevent future war.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Question Target: Making Judgment

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes the intention(s) of the Treaty of Versailles (Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.)	1-3
L2	Explains how prevention of a future war OR Explains how other reason(s) were the purposes of the Treaty of Versailles (Award 4 marks for an explanation of how the prevention of a future war OR how other reason(s) were the purposes of the Treaty of Versailles, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.) E.g. Yes, the purpose of the Treaty of Versailles was to prevent a future war. According to the treaty, German forces had to be reduced to well below pre-war levels. The army was limited to 100,000 men and conscription was banned. In addition, no armoured vehicles, submarines or aircraft were allowed. The navy could have only six battleships. The Rhineland was also demilitarised. <u>As a result, Germany’s military capability was severely weakened, and its reduced strength posed less of a threat to other countries. With weakened armed forces, the likelihood of securing victory in future conflicts was greatly reduced, thereby deterring the start of another war.</u> Other reasons: • To punish Germany • To end WWI officially	4-5
L3	Explains how prevention of a future war AND Explains how other reason(s) were the purposes of the Treaty of Versailles (Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the prevention of a future war AND how other reason(s) were the purposes of the Treaty of Versailles, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.)	6-8

	E.g. [As L2 plus] No, the purpose of the Treaty of Versailles was to punish Germany. According to the treaty, Germany had to give up territories to various neighbouring countries. It lost 10% of its land, 12.5% of its population and was forbidden to make alliances with Austria to form an Anschluss. In addition, Germany had to give up its overseas empire. <u>As a result, this dealt a major blow to German pride and its economy as thousands of Germans had to live under the rule of other governments. The loss of territories also meant that Germany no longer had access to the valuable resources and manpower found in these areas, thereby hindering post-war recovery. The loss of its empire also reinforced Germany's image as a defeated power as its influence over other countries was greatly diminished. Hence, the treaty was intended to punish Germany.</u> (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 factors. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6 +2; L3/7 +2; L3/8 +2). E.g. [As L3 plus] In conclusion, the main purpose of the Treaty of Versailles was to prevent a future war. While the Treaty of Versailles did consist of harsh terms meant to punish Germany in the short term, its broader purpose was to prevent a future war. This is evident as in the immediate years following the end of World War I, many countries were war-weary and sought to avoid involvement in international conflicts. Therefore, the primary aim of the Treaty of Versailles can be seen as preventing future war through the reduction of German power.	
--	---	--

- 3 'World War II broke out in the Asia-Pacific due to Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers.'
 How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Question Target: Making Judgment

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers or other reasons that contributed to the outbreak of WWII in the Asia-Pacific (Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.)	1-3
L2	Explains how Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers OR Explains how other reason(s) contributed to the outbreak of WWII in the Asia-Pacific (Award 4 marks for an explanation of how Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers OR how other reason(s) contributed to the outbreak of WWII in the Asia-Pacific, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.) E.g. Yes, a reason why World War in the Asia-Pacific broke out was because of Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers . In October 1940, following Japan's invasion in China and French Indochina, the US placed an embargo on raw materials such as steel and iron on Japan. Later in Aug 1941, an oil embargo was also imposed on Japan. Furthermore, US president Roosevelt also resurrected a law from WWI, Trading with the Enemy Act to seize Japanese assets in the US, making it unable to buy essential goods. <u>As a result, Japan's</u>	4-5

	<u>war efforts in China and Indochina were undermined. Japan was forced to seek alternative avenues, such as Southeast Asia, to obtain resources. Hence, Japan continued to adopt its expansionistic foreign policy in Southeast Asia, heightening tensions in the region. Japan also realized that other countries could not be trusted and many military leaders believed that a war between Japan and the US was inevitable. As such, Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers like the US contributed to the outbreak of World War II in the Asia-Pacific.</u> Other reasons: • Instability in China • Japan's expansionistic foreign policy • Great Depression	
L3	Explains how Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers AND Explains how other reason(s) contributed to the outbreak of WWII in the Asia-Pacific (Award 6 marks for an explanation of how Japan's worsening relations with foreign powers AND how other reason(s) contributed to outbreak of WWII in the Asia-Pacific, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.) E.g. [As L2 plus] No, another reason why World War II broke out in the Asia-Pacific was because of the weaknesses of the League of Nations (LON). On 19 September 1931, the Japanese army made use of the Mukden incident as a pretext for invading Manchuria. After seizing Manchuria, Japan renamed it Manchukuo and controlled it as a puppet state. The following month, China appealed to the LON for support. Following an investigation, the Lytton Report was written, stating that Japan had acted unlawfully and Manchuria must be returned to China. In February 1933, Japan announced plans to occupy more parts of China and later rejected the Lytton Report altogether and withdrew from the LON. <u>As a result, it undermined the confidence of the LON to tackle future crises. Japan was also encouraged to further expand into Asia. Furthermore, the invasion of Manchuria allowed Japan access to the raw materials and resources available in Manchuria. Japan could make use of these resources to continue with its aggressive expansionistic actions, heightening tensions in the region, thereby contributing to the outbreak of World War II in the Asia-Pacific.</u> (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 factors. The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6 +2; L3/7 +2; L3/8 +2). E.g. [As L3 plus] In conclusion, I disagree with the statement, as the weakness of the League of Nations (LON) was the main reason for the outbreak of World War II in Europe. The involvement of the US in response to Japan's aggression in China and French Indochina depended on the effectiveness of the LON. Since the LON proved to be ineffective in handling the Manchurian Crisis, the US had to intervene and impose sanctions on its own to condemn Japan's continued expansion, resulting in the worsening of US-Japan relations thereby increasing the likelihood of an outbreak of World War II in the Asia-Pacific.	6-8

- 4 'The Second Vietnam War broke out due to USA's involvement.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Question Target: Making Judgment

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes US' involvement or other reasons that contributed to outbreak of the second Vietnam war (Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.)	1-3
L2	Explains how USA's involvement OR Explains how other reason(s) contributed to outbreak of the second Vietnam war (Award 4 marks for an explanation of how USA's involvement OR how other reason(s) contributed to the outbreak of the second Vietnam War, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.) E.g. Yes, USA's involvement was one reason for the outbreak of the Second Vietnam War. Following the 1954 Geneva Accords, the US provided large amounts of economic aid and military supplies to keep the Diem government in power. Even though Diem was corrupt and harsh in his rule, he received significant support from the US due to his anti-communist stance. Between 1955 and 1960, President Eisenhower's government provided aid worth US\$7 billion to South Vietnam. In 1964, when the US reported that two of its destroyers were attacked by North Vietnamese patrol boats, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was passed, giving the US president wide-ranging powers to wage war without an official declaration. <u>As a result, the US Air Force began bombing North Vietnam to demoralise its people and diminish its manufacturing and transportation capabilities. US support for Diem's government earlier on had also led to growing dissatisfaction among the South Vietnamese population, allowing the Viet Cong to gain more recruits and expand their guerrilla activities. With direct US military intervention, the conflict escalated further, marking the full outbreak of the Second Vietnam War.</u> Other factors: • North Vietnam/Viet Cong's involvement • China's involvement	4-5
L3	Explains how USA's involvement AND Explains how other reason(s) contributed to outbreak of the second Vietnam war (Award 6 marks for an explanation of how USA's involvement AND how other reason(s) contributed to the outbreak of the second Vietnam War, and an additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.) E.g. [As L2 plus] No, North Vietnam's involvement was another reason for the outbreak of the Second Vietnam War. Due to an inferiority in military equipment, the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese used guerilla warfare, involving ambushes, hit-and-run tactics and booby traps. They also made use of the Ho Chi Minh trail for supplies and for launching surprise attacks before disappearing back into the jungles and villages. This was done to greatly hurt American morale and helped them gain a psychological advantage. <u>As a result, the increasing casualties and damages sustained by the US led the US to perceive a greater need to take stronger military action to prevent Vietnam from falling to communism. Hence, the guerilla war tactics employed by North Vietnam forced the US to increase its involvement in Vietnam, transforming its original support role into a full-</u>	6-8

blown conflict thereby contributing to the outbreak of the Second Vietnam War.

(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 factors.

The total marks to be awarded for the response will be based on marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks: i.e. L3/6 +2; L3/7 +2; L3/8 +2).

E.g. [As L3 plus]

In conclusion, the **USA's involvement** was the main reason for the outbreak of the Second Vietnam War. Its initial support for Diem's government contributed to the rise of the Viet Cong and increased instability in South Vietnam. The guerrilla tactics employed by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese were in response to this support and later to the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Ultimately, it was the USA's involvement that escalated a local conflict into a full-scale war.