

ACS INDEPENDENT 2025 Y4 HUMANITIES HISTORY P2 PRELIM Suggested Answers		
(a)	Study Source A. What can you infer from Source A regarding British reason for adopting an appeasement policy? Explain your answer.	5m
L1	Misunderstands/paraphrase with no inference/describes source	1
L2	Inference unsupported The British soldiers were mentally stressed. Many people died in the war.	2
L3	Inference supported and explained. - 3m: evidence only; weak explanation - 4m: 1 inference supported - 5m: 1 inference with contextual explanation From Source A, we can infer that Britain adopted an appeasement policy because of the widespread trauma and fear caused by the horrors of the First World War. The soldier describes the Battle of the Somme as "the dance of hell," with non-stop shelling: "Boom! Boom! Boom!" This vivid imagery suggests extreme psychological distress that left lasting emotional scars: "My God, I shall never get it out of my memory." Such memories reflect how deeply WWI affected British soldiers and the public, leading many to dread the idea of another war. As a result, politicians like Chamberlain promoted appeasement to avoid repeating such devastation. This is supported by contextual knowledge that in the 1930s, Britain was still recovering from WWI and the Great Depression, and the public strongly supported any measure to prevent another conflict, even if it meant making concessions to Hitler when he took over Rhineland, Austria or Sudetenland.	3-5

(b)	Study Source B. How reliable is the source to a historian studying British foreign policy in Europe? Explain your answer.	5m
L1	Fails to analyse the source.	1
L2	Content only explained/no evidence/context/ provenance only	2
L3	Content only explained with evidence The content of Source B is reliable regarding foreign policy in Europe as it states that Chamberlain is afraid of aggression 'armed conflict is a nightmare to me'.	3

L4	Content analysis supported with evidence and cross reference OR Purpose analysis only The content of Source B is reliable to explain that Britain is pursuing an appeasement policy in Europe as it states that Chamberlain is afraid of aggression 'armed conflict is a nightmare to me'. This means that Britain is giving in to aggressive power in order to avoid war. This is supported by Source E which shows the British man caring more about its basket of eggs and saying why 'should they take a stand'. This supports the reliability of Source B as it shows British reluctance to stand up against aggression. Contextual knowledge supports this as the British had horrified memories of WWI and wanted to avoid conflict at all cost; thus Chamberlain, being the Prime Minister of England is pursuing appeasement as a reflection of British domestic concerns. When we examine the origins and purpose of the source, the reliability is questionable. Source B is a radio broadcast by Chamberlain a day before he went to meet Hitler in Munich to discuss about Sudetenland, he needed to convince the British that he was a strong leader who is able to stand up for global crisis in Europe; 'must be resisted' showing a strong and firm Chamberlain was against aggression. However Chamberlain did not resist Hitler and signed the Munich agreement with him. Because of this bias speech to get the British people to support his leadership, Source B's reliability is questionable and thus does not give a reliable view of British foreign policy.	4
L5	Content analysis supported with evidence and cross reference + Purpose analysis (4m only if evidence/impact is lacking) The content of Source B is reliable to explain that Britain is pursuing an appeasement policy in Europe as it states that Chamberlain is afraid of aggression 'armed conflict is a nightmare to me'. This means that Britain is giving in to aggressive power in order to avoid war. This is supported by Source E which shows the British man caring more about its basket of eggs and saying why 'should they take a stand'. This supports the reliability of Source B as it shows British reluctance to stand up against aggression. Contextual knowledge supports this as the British had horrified memories of WWI and wanted to avoid conflict at all cost; thus Chamberlain, being the Prime Minister of England is pursuing appeasement as a reflection of British domestic concerns. When we examine the origins and purpose of the source, the reliability is questionable. Source B is a radio broadcast by Chamberlain a day before he went to meet Hitler in Munich to discuss about Sudetenland, he needed to convince the British that he was a strong leader who is able to stand up for global crisis in Europe; 'must be resisted' showing a strong and firm Chamberlain was against aggression. However, Chamberlain did not resist Hitler and signed the Munich agreement with him. Because of this	4-5

	bias speech to get the British people to support his leadership, Source B's reliability is questionable and thus does not give a reliable view of British foreign policy.	
--	---	--

(c)	Study Source C. How useful is the source as evidence of British responses towards the government's policy of appeasement? Explain your answer.	6m
L1	Does not answer the question. NO evidence.	1
L2	Utility explained using context/ provenance	2
L3	Useful and / or Not useful using content analysis, supported.	3-4
L4	Content analysis supported with evidence and cross reference. OR Purpose only	5
L5	L4+Use of purpose to analyse the answer (award 5m only if evidence /impact is lacking.) The content of Source C is useful to a historian as evidence of some positive British responses to appeasement, particularly within Parliament. It describes a scene of <i>"wild rejoicing in Commons"</i> when Chamberlain announced his meeting with Hitler at Munich, showing MPs and spectators <i>"cheering, waving, clapping, shouting"</i> in support. This suggests that many in Parliament saw appeasement as a successful peacekeeping measure, reflecting relief after years of fear about another war. Cross refer to contextual knowledge, it supports source C as the British were suffering from the Great Depression and many people were still horrified by the consequences of WWI and were determined to keep Britain out of another global conflict thus supporting the widespread jubilant for Chamberlain's achievement. However, Source C is not useful as contextual knowledge refutes it that while many Britons supported appeasement in 1938, others—including Churchill and the Labour opposition—criticised Chamberlain for trusting Hitler. Cross referring to Source D, Chamberlain criticised the policy to betray Czechoslovakia as 'abandoned'. These dissenting views are absent, so the source is limited as it only shows one enthusiastic reaction, not a balanced picture of British responses. The purpose of the source is key limitation to its utility. It was published in the <i>Singapore Straits Times</i> on 6 October 1938, shortly after the signing of the Munich Agreement. Its description of	5-6

	“wild rejoicing in Commons” and “every member... cheering, waving, clapping, shouting” suggests overwhelming approval of Chamberlain’s actions. As it is published in Singapore, which is a British colony then, this conveys the message that the British public and Parliament were united in celebrating Chamberlain’s diplomacy, portraying appeasement as a triumph for peace. As it was a propaganda to reassure British subjects in the colonies that the British is managing crisis well, so that the people in Singapore feels the British govt is a great colonial master, it is not useful as it is one sided with a bias purpose. As the newspaper published a celebratory article on the response of the British parliament, its purpose makes its utility limited. Analysing the tone, words like ‘cheering, clapping, rejoicing; portrayed a sense of relief that every politician in England supported the opportunity to avoid war. However, this purpose was to calm the anxiety of the readers that war was avoided by using hyperbole. The intended outcome to ease the worries of the readers. Because of this hidden agenda, Source E’s utility is limited.	
--	---	--

(d)	Study Source D and E. How far does Source E prove that Source D was right about Hitler’s intentions in Europe? Explain your answer.	6m
L1	Does not answer the question. NO evidence.	1
L2	Prove explained using context. Analyse one source only without referring to purpose at all.	2
L3	Prove and/ or Not prove using content analysis, supported.	3
L4	Content analysis supported with evidence and cross reference.	4-5
L5	Content analysis supported with evidence and cross reference. + Purpose analysis 6m. Purpose only 5m The content of Source D proves that Source E was right about Hitler’s aggressive intentions in Europe as Source D says that ‘Czechoslovakia recedes to darkness’ as it was conquered by Hitler. Similarly, Source E shows a German soldier leaning against Czechoslovakia showing his aggressiveness. Cross referring to contextual knowledge, Hitler was pursuing lebensraum and thus was behaving aggressively towards his neighbouring countries. However, the purpose of Source E failed to prove that Source D was right as it is unreliable. Source E was cartoon by David Low who published many anti-German cartoons to the British newspaper readers. By drawing a German soldier leaning on the other countries, he wanted to	5-6

	exaggerate German aggressiveness in Europe so that the British audience would develop an anti-Hitler perspective towards Hitler's actions. This is especially when Hitler had taken over Austria and seen to be expanding towards Sudetenland. Because of his ulterior motive to create anti-Hitler's sentiments in England, Source E is bias and thus unreliable to explain Source D.	
--	--	--

e.	Study all the sources. "The British were justified in their pursuit of the appeasement policy" How far do you agree with this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.	8m
L1	Inference unsupported or misreading of source	1m
L2	Yes or No, supported by valid source use. Students must explain the evidence provided from each source. Merely quoting evidence will result in the lowest mark in the band.	2-4m
L3	Yes and No, supported by valid source use. Award 5m for 1 yes and no and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source up to a maximum of 7m. Students must explain the evidence provided from each source. Merely quoting evidence will result in the lowest mark in the band. <u>Sources A, B and C support the view that appeasement was justified.</u> Source A is a soldier's account of the Battle of the Somme. He calls it a "dance of hell" and says, "I shall never get it out of my memory." This reflects the horrors of the First World War and helps explain why Britain tried to avoid another war at all costs. Appeasement was seen as a way to preserve peace and prevent another generation from going through such suffering. Source B states that 'war is a fearful thing' and with the many casualties Britain suffered in WWI, the memories of war made it right for Britain to try to avoid war by using appeasement. Source C shows that 'every member of the parliament in the house.. cheering, waving' which justified appeasement as it was what the people in Britain wanted. This was because the British were fearful of another war and Chamberlain's solution to negotiate with Hitler over Sudetenland was well received by the British population. <u>However, Sources D and E suggest that appeasement was not justified and had serious consequences.</u> Source D is Churchill's speech after the Munich Agreement. He describes how Czechoslovakia was "abandoned" and "recedes into the	5-7m

	darkness.” He believes appeasement has destroyed the alliances in Europe and allowed Nazi power to rise. This shows that appeasement betrayed allies and made Hitler stronger. Source E is a cartoon from February 1938 showing Germany crushing Austria while Britain and France look on passively. The caption criticises the British for saying “Why should we take a stand...when it’s all so far away?” This implies that appeasement encouraged Hitler and failed to protect smaller countries, leading to greater conflict.	
	For L2 and L3 award a bonus of 1m for use of contextual knowledge to question a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency, etc. However, Source E is unreliable to prove the statement. It is a cartoon that was meant to criticise Britain by exaggerating the impact of the appeasement policy; blaming Britain and France for their nonchalance which led to WWII. This cartoon exaggerated British selfishness by focusing on their domestic needs ‘eggs’ but <u>contextual knowledge states</u> that the British were wary of war and thus were reluctant to engage in a conflict that did not concern them. Thus because of its intention to shame the British govt, its reliability is limited.	+1

Essay LORMS (Levels of Response Marking Scheme)

Levels	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies/Describes given or other reasons (Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying 2 or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.)	1 – 3 marks
L2	Explains given reason OR other reasons (Award 4 marks for an explanation of given reason OR other reason, and an additional mark for additional reasons/ supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.)	4 – 5 marks
L3	Explains given reason AND other reasons (Award 6 marks for an explanation of given AND other reason, and additional mark(s) for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks (which include given reason).	6 - 8 marks
	Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of <u>the relative importance of different reasons</u>. 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).	
	i.e. for L3 Explains given reason AND other reasons Response can get up to 8 marks through two routes. (a) 2 explained reasons that are well-developed with depth of treatment OR (b) 3 explained reasons - with breadth of coverage but less depth of treatment Valid Evaluation •Award additional 2 marks •Total marks to be awarded: Marks obtained at L3 + 2 bonus marks	

2. The Germans suffered during Hitler's rule. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. (10m)

One key reason why Germans suffered was because the Nuremberg Laws specifically targeted Jewish Germans. These laws stripped Jews of their German citizenship and made it illegal for Jews to marry or have sexual relations with non-Jews. This legalised discrimination isolated Jews socially and economically. For example, Jews were banned from government jobs, schools, and even public parks. The laws laid the foundation for further violence, such as Kristallnacht in 1938, when Jewish homes, businesses, and synagogues were attacked, and over 30,000 Jews were arrested. For Jewish Germans, this was the beginning of systematic persecution which escalated into the Holocaust.

While the Nuremberg Laws mainly targeted Jews, other Germans also suffered in different ways under Hitler's dictatorship.

Possible factors:

Firstly, Nazi rule caused suffering for many German women by restricting their rights and independence. They were pressured to abandon jobs and education to become full-time mothers and wives, in line with the policy of "Kinder, Küche, Kirche" (children, kitchen, church). Women who wanted careers or higher education were often discouraged or banned, particularly from universities and professional roles, leaving them frustrated and disempowered. This loss of freedom and opportunities forced many women into lives they did not choose, reducing their independence and personal fulfilment.

Secondly, Nazi rule inflicted severe suffering on political opponents, especially Communists and Social Democrats, who were seen as threats to Hitler's power. Following the Reichstag Fire in 1933, thousands were arrested by the Gestapo and sent to concentration camps without trial, where many endured harsh conditions and violence. Beyond imprisonment, the Nazi regime silenced opposition by controlling newspapers and radios, leaving no space for alternative views. This created an atmosphere of fear, where speaking out against the regime could result in persecution, imprisonment, or even death.

Thirdly, Nazi rule brought immense suffering to ethnic minorities such as the Roma and people with disabilities, who were targeted as "undesirable" by the regime. Disabled children and adults were killed under the secret T4 Euthanasia Programme, which labelled them as "unfit" to live and denied them their basic right to life. The Roma were also victims of brutal persecution, rounded up and deported to concentration camps purely because of Nazi racist ideology, rather than any legal restrictions like the Nuremberg Laws. These policies highlight how Nazi rule dehumanised minorities, subjecting them to discrimination, violence, and mass murder.

Nazi youth policies caused significant suffering for German children, as they were forced into organisations like the Hitler Youth and League of German Girls that stripped away their freedom. Millions of boys and girls had their education and leisure taken over by strict training, military drills, and indoctrination, leaving little room for individuality or personal choice. Those who resisted, such as the Edelweiss Pirates and Swing Youth, faced harsh consequences including arrest, torture, and even execution. This shows that under Nazi rule, young people were

denied independence and lived under constant pressure to conform, with resistance punished brutally.

However, German workers benefitted under Hitler was through a sharp fall in unemployment. When Hitler came to power in 1933, unemployment was around 6 million, but by 1939 it had dropped to below 1 million. This was achieved through massive public works projects such as the construction of autobahns, and through rearmament, which created jobs in weapon factories and the military. Many young men were also absorbed into the National Labour Service (RAD), which provided compulsory employment, especially in infrastructure projects. These initiatives gave German workers a sense of stability and purpose after the Great Depression.

Hitler's regime also introduced social programs like Strength Through Joy (KdF) and Beauty of Labour (SdA) to improve workers' lives. The KdF scheme offered subsidised leisure activities such as holidays, cheap theatre tickets, and even cruises, which were previously unaffordable for most working-class Germans. Meanwhile, the SdA program focused on improving working conditions by installing better lighting, ventilation, and even building canteens and clean toilets in factories. Although trade unions were banned and workers had no right to strike, these programs were used to gain their support and create the image of a caring state.

In conclusion, while it is true that many German workers benefitted from reduced unemployment and propaganda schemes like KdF, these gains were limited and often came at the cost of freedoms such as trade unions and fair wages. In contrast, suffering under Hitler's rule was widespread and severe, affecting not just Jews but also women, political opponents, ethnic minorities, the disabled, and even German youth. The scale and intensity of persecution, particularly the Holocaust, outweigh the temporary economic improvements. Therefore, it is more accurate to argue that Germans suffered more than they benefitted under Hitler's rule.

3. 'The main reason why communist countries became involved in the Korean War was to support North Korea.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

China helped North Korea during the Korean War was their long-standing political and ideological friendship. Both nations were newly established communist states in the aftermath of World War II, and they shared a common goal of resisting Western imperialism and supporting socialist revolutions in Asia. This friendship was reinforced by their cooperation during the Chinese Civil War, when Korean communists aided Mao Zedong's forces. China viewed North Korea not only as a neighbour but as a "revolutionary brother-in-arms," making it difficult for Mao to allow Kim Il-sung's regime to collapse under American and UN forces. Therefore, China's intervention in 1950 was motivated not only by security concerns but also by a sense of loyalty and solidarity with a fellow communist ally.

However, China also entered the war to defend its national security. When UN forces crossed the 38th parallel and approached the Yalu River—the border between North Korea and China—Beijing feared a potential invasion. China sent hundreds of thousands of troops to push UN forces back and protect its sovereignty and buffer zone. The intervention was framed as support for a fellow communist state, but in truth, China acted out of defensive national interest, fearing encirclement by Western-aligned states.

The Soviet Union became involved in the Korean War by directly helping North Korea prepare and launch its invasion of the South. In 1950, Stalin gave Kim Il-sung permission to attack and provided vital military assistance, including tanks, aircraft, weapons, and Soviet military advisors. Soviet pilots also secretly flew combat missions in support of the North. This backing gave North Korea the resources and confidence to begin the war, showing that the Soviet Union played a crucial role in enabling Kim's regime to challenge South Korea.

However, the Soviet Union's involvement in the Korean War was guided primarily by Cold War rivalry with the United States rather than friendship with North Korea. Stalin approved Kim Il-sung's invasion plan in June 1950 and supplied North Korea with tanks, aircraft, and military advisors. By supporting the invasion, Stalin saw an opportunity to expand communism in Asia and test Western resolve, all while avoiding a direct confrontation that could escalate into world war. This allowed the USSR to weaken the United States by tying down its military and draining its resources.

Confidence from the Sino-Soviet Alliance: Another reason for Soviet involvement was the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship in early 1950, which gave Stalin greater confidence to back Kim's invasion. With China as an ally, Stalin could rely on Mao to commit troops if necessary, reducing the risk of the USSR being drawn into a costly direct conflict. This meant the Soviet Union could exploit the war for strategic advantage while maintaining plausible deniability, since China would bear the burden of fighting on the ground.

In conclusion, while communist countries did intervene partly out of loyalty to North Korea as a fellow communist state, this was not the main reason. For China, defending national security and preventing an American-controlled Korea on its border was far more urgent than ideology as it was a struggle for China's sovereignty and not to maintain North Korean's autonomy. For the Soviet Union,

the war was a chance to weaken the USA and extend Cold War influence in Asia without direct risk. These wider strategic and security concerns shaped communist actions more decisively than solidarity with North Korea. Therefore, although support for North Korea was a factor, communist involvement in the Korean War was driven mainly by their own self-interest.

4. Gorbachev's leadership was a total failure. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Gorbachev's leadership is widely regarded as a failure due to his reforms of *glasnost* and *perestroika*, which exposed the government's weaknesses, destabilised the economy, and contributed to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. However, his leadership did achieve some success in improving relations with the United States through key arms reduction agreements. This essay will evaluate whether those achievements outweigh the long-term damage done to the Soviet system.

One key reason Gorbachev's leadership is seen as a failure was his policy of glasnost (openness), which unintentionally exposed the deep flaws within the Soviet regime. Initially introduced to increase transparency and reduce corruption, glasnost encouraged criticism of the Communist Party and uncovered decades of repression, environmental disasters (such as Chernobyl), and economic mismanagement. Citizens began to openly question the legitimacy of the Soviet system, and nationalist movements grew stronger across the USSR. Rather than strengthening the government, glasnost triggered widespread disillusionment and undermined confidence in the regime.

Gorbachev's economic reform, perestroika, also failed to achieve its goals. Intended to introduce market mechanisms and boost productivity, perestroika instead created chaos. Poor implementation, lack of clear direction, and resistance from hardliners led to supply shortages, inflation, and falling production. By trying to combine elements of capitalism with central planning, Gorbachev created an unmanageable hybrid that made living standards worse. Many Soviet citizens grew increasingly frustrated, seeing their lives worsen under reforms that promised improvement. The economic instability further weakened support for the Communist Party.

Additionally, Gorbachev's foreign policy allowed communism to collapse across Eastern Europe. By abandoning the Brezhnev Doctrine and refusing to use Soviet troops to suppress uprisings in countries like Poland, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia, Gorbachev unintentionally accelerated the fall of communism in the Eastern Bloc. Although his decision prevented violence, it also led to the rapid loss of Soviet influence and prestige. Many in the USSR viewed this as a sign of surrender to the West, further contributing to internal unrest and a growing crisis of legitimacy.

That said, Gorbachev's leadership was not without achievement. He made significant progress in reducing Cold War tensions. His meetings with US President Ronald Reagan led to historic agreements, such as the INF Treaty (1987), which eliminated entire classes of nuclear weapons. These moves improved global security and earned Gorbachev international respect. However,

even this success was controversial within the USSR, where many saw it as a weakening of Soviet power at a time of growing internal crisis.

However, when judged by the survival of the USSR, Gorbachev's leadership must be seen as a failure. His reforms unintentionally destroyed the very system he sought to save. Glasnost exposed the Party's weaknesses, perestroika wrecked the economy, and his foreign policy led to the loss of Eastern Europe. By December 1991, the Soviet Union itself had collapsed, and Gorbachev resigned as its final leader. While his achievements in ending the Cold War were historic, they could not compensate for the disintegration of the USSR. Therefore, Gorbachev's leadership was not a *total* failure internationally, but domestically it was disastrous — and in the context of preserving Soviet power, it was ultimately a failure.