

Level 5 Exemplar and comments

Paper 1 Question 1

1a). Extract 1 in Source A was more anti-Japanese in tone. From Source A, the usage of words describing Japan in extract 1 was more negative than in extract 2. Extract 1 uses <sup>negative</sup> words like "bullied by Japan", "getting more ambitious". Moreover, the extract foresees that "If our people can work together with an unified heart to refuse to buy and use Japanese goods... Japanese people will immediately fall into poverty, and the Japanese treasury will immediately be empty and void of money." It describes a bad future for Japan which shows a hate attitude and anti-Japanese in tone. Meanwhile, in extract 2, there is no negative words describing Japan and sentences like "This is meant to show our determination to abandon business with the Japanese. Nevertheless, we hope that our patriotic could,..." It shows that the aim of encouraging Chinese to help his nation's rise. To compare, extract 1 mentions bad words <sup>of Japan</sup> and foresees worsen situation in Japan while extract 2 did not use negative word for Japan and its aim is to encourage Chinese to be patriotic. Thus, extract 1 was more anti-Japanese in tone. The tone in extract 1 was more fierce.

1b). From source B, one characteristic was that Hong Kong Chinese abandon Japanese goods. The sentence "The auction sale of the wreck of a Japanese steamship had to be abandoned this morning<sup>, owing to their not being a single bidder present.</sup>... In the ordinary way, at such sales there is a large attendance of Chinese and bidding is usually active" shows that Hong Kong Chinese were no longer active in buying Japanese, there was a boycott of Japanese goods. Another characteristic was that no Japanese material of any description could be used in contracts signed by Chinese. The sentence from source B "... majority of recent contracts signed by Chinese contained a clause that no Japanese material of any description was to be used, and this appears to be typical of all the attitude of the Chinese business houses." This shows that Chinese businessmen in Hong Kong abandoned Japanese materials.

(c). Yes, I agree.

From source A, it shows that Chinese in mainland China boycotted Japanese goods. In extract 1, "Our people can work together with an unified heart to refuse to buy and use Japanese goods, then they will lose their markets" and "all Japanese goods will be taken off the shelf and not be sold any more." in extract 2 shows the mainland Chinese abandoned Japanese goods. People abandoned Japanese goods in extract 1 while sellers and businessmen refused to sell Japanese goods in extract 2.

From source B, it show that Hong Kongers also boycott Japanese goods. "The auction sale of the wreck of a Japanese steamship had to be abandoned this morning, owing to there not being a single bidder present. In the ordinary way, at such sales there is a large attendance of Chinese and bidding is usually active." It means that Chinese in Hong Kong abandoned Japanese goods and no longer attend sale of Japanese goods.

In above two sources, both Chinese in mainland and Hong Kong boycott Japanese goods, refused to buy them. It shows a similar views on anti-Japanese attitude during May fourth Incident.

From my own knowledge, during Cultural Revolution period

(1967-1977), mainlanders followed Mao's mass movement and had class struggles. They aimed to remove capitalist and remain socialist. Meanwhile, Hong Kong was supportive towards this event in China, 1967 Riot in Hong Kong occurred, they set up banners and riot to support Mao. Moreover, during June Fourth Incident (1989), Chinese students in mainland demonstrated and refused to eat. They sit in front of the TianAnMen Square to show discontent towards the Chinese government. Meanwhile, Hong Kong also shared similar views. They were supportive and many young people in Hong Kong demonstrated and to show their support towards the mainland students in Hong Kong.

All in all, I agree to the statement. Hong Kong people were shown supportive towards the major events, e.g. May Fourth Movement from source A and B as well as June Fourth Incident et..

Paper 1 Question 2

2a). From source C, the problem was the weak mentality of Japanese after the WWII. With reference to source C, "In order to begin our next ten years, we cannot merely stick to the mentality of reviving the old Japan." and "Therefore, we who have graduated from 'post-war' should accept the new meaning of small nation, and use it to grasp new ideals for human wellbeing." show that Japanese might look down upon their nations after the defeat in WWII, they were sad and couldn't surpass the bad feeling of being a small nation. And, if Japanese do not have a stronger mentality, Japan's development could not be strengthened. Thus, the weakness of Japanese might make it difficult for the recovery of Japan.

2b). Yes, I think the author of source C would have agreed.  
From source C, "Thus, citizens of Tokyo will enjoy living in a much more attractive and efficient city after the Games" shows that hosting the Olympic Games can bring positive impacts to Japan. Also, "the led bomb-shattered London... even before

the damage was repaired to undertake the 1948 olympics as its first project after the close of the disastrous World War." shows a good example of Britain recovered from the WWI by hosting an Olympic Games.

Meanwhile, in source C, "Therefore, we who have graduated from 'post-war' should accept the new meaning of small nation, and use it to grasp the new ideals for human wellbeing." shows the aim of the author. He wanted Japan to be recovered soon after the defeat in WWII. While, the example of Britain in source D could convince the author to host Olympic Games as it could bring many positive impacts for Japan <sup>after wars.</sup>

2c). To a little extent, the domestic factor was important in bringing about Japan's economic <sup>(1953-73)</sup> miracle.

In source C, it shows that a strong mentality of Japanese was essential in bringing recovery after WWII.

"Therefore, we who have graduated from 'post-war' should accept the new meaning of small nation, and use it to grasp the new ideals for human wellbeing." It shows that Japanese needed to be strong mentally and accept the defeat, look forward

to the future so as to bring positive impacts to Japan.

In source D, it shows a foreign factor which was holding Olympic Games can bring positive impacts and bringing economic miracle. "The program of civic improvements of Municipality for the next ten years has been advanced and huge sums have been spent in the construction of new hotels and other private buildings." With holding Olympics, Japanese could enjoy better living standard; economic <sup>and business</sup> opportunities for foreigners visiting Tokyo during Olympics.

From my own knowledge, the US factor (foreign factor) was more important. After WWII, Japan was under the US's control during SCAP period (1945-52). The U.S. troops were stationed in Japan so Japan had lowered its military cost a lot. This had lessened the burden for Japanese government. US also stabilized Japan's economy by having Nine Principles of Economic Mobilization. US also adopted Podge Plan to having a linking exchange rate between the US and Japan.

Some may say domestic factor like the obedience <sup>of Japanese</sup> and low birth rate had helped economic recovery by lessening burden. However, without US's help, it is difficult to recovery so soon. In 1950, US no longer

asked Japan for reparations. It was very important that with US's aid and help. Japan could focus on recovering its own economy and with no need to burden of paying reparations.

Thus, to a little extent, the domestic factors <sup>was important</sup> in bringing about Japan's economic miracle. US factor was much more important as it laid a stable foundation for the economic miracle.

Paper 1 Question 3

3a). The cartoonist thinks the U.S.A was angry about the Cuba Missile Crisis launched by the USSR. In the left of source E, there were "a soviet base in Cuba" in front of the U.S.A and the U.S. president Kennedy looked frustrated and pointed at Khrushchev (the USSR president) which shows that the U.S.A was discontented about that. While, the caption "Intolerable Having Your Rockets on My Doorstep" shows that the U.S.A thought the USSR's action in Cuba was intolerable. Thus, the cartoonist thought the U.S.A was angry with that.

b). The U.S.A's participation in foreign wars would increase its budget. From source F, during 1953-1975, the average national defence as percentage of expenditure was the highest during 1947-1970, which was 67.1 and had an average expenditure of 48265.7 millions. During that period, the U.S. had a regional conflict with the USSR in Korean War. The U.S.A sent troops to help South Korea to resist communism. and caused an increase of military expenditure. Thus, its budget would be higher.



30). In source E, it shows the confrontation between the U.S.A and the USSR due to the Cuban Missile Crisis. In the left of the cartoon, there were missiles <sup>called</sup> a soviet base in Cuba in front of the U.S.A and the U.S. president Kennedy looked frustrated and angry. He pointed at Khrushchev <sup>(the president in the USSR)</sup> on the right side. And, the cartoon was drawn in 1962 which shows the confrontation between two blocs in 1962.

In source F, with reference to the table, during 1968-1970, the average national defence as percentage of expenditure (44.2) was smaller compare to other data in 1950s and 1960s. It shows that the U.S. might use less military force to fight regional conflict with the USSR. It also shows the factor that there is a trend of reducing arm cost in the U.S. <sup>(a period with less tension between two blocs)</sup>

From my own knowledge, détente took place in the late 1960s and 1970s due to the end of Vietnam War and Korean War. After the end of those wars, the U.S. and the USSR no longer need to fight for regional conflicts so there were less tension between two blocs. Moreover, it was also about the fear

of nuclear war. Both countries knew that having nuclear war would be extremely destructive and cause a lot of casualties so they dare not to fight. Also, it was caused by the willingness of the USSR to remove missiles installed in Cuba, thus the U.S.A had less discontent towards the USSR.

Thus, the above all are the reasons of why détente takes place.

Paper 1 Question 4

4a). The main message was to show that France was treating Germany too harsh after the WWI. The cartoon was drawn in 1921, which was the post WWI period. In the cartoon, the goose (Germany) had given France and Britain an egg (German offer). However, France pointed at Germany with a mean face and show him the model of golden egg desired which was much more bigger than <sup>the one that</sup> Germany gave. It shows that France thought the punishment of Germany was too enough and discontented with Germany's offer shows that France demand too much that Germany could not afford. Meanwhile, the goose which represents Germany was crying which show that France was treating Germany too harshly.

4b). His attitude was condemning and unwelcoming. With reference to the language in source H, he used "guilty of the greatest crime in the history of Europe" to describe Germany. He used negative word "guilty" to show that Germany was unforgivable and bad. Meanwhile, from the argument "Every day will see Germany requesting, demanding, to have its burdens lightened and every day something of the burden

of defeat will be transferred from Germany to France by the good graces of the Treaty's executors." shows that Clemenceau disagreed with the French government regarding its execution of the Treaty of Versailles. He believed that with Treaty's executors, France would be harmed and gain more burden in the future. Thus, he was condemning and discontent with it.

4c). Yes, I agree.

In source G, it shows the factor of the harsh treatment of the Treaties of Versailles. <sup>The cartoon was drawn in 1921.</sup> The goose represents Germany was crying due to France's demand. France wore a mean face and held a model of golden egg desired which was a lot bigger than what Germany has given. It shows that the harsh punishment of Treaty of Versailles made Germany sad and gave hints that Germany felt humiliated and angry with France which causes tension in Europe's international relations in the 1920s.

In source H, it shows that the reduce of reparations that Germany needed to pay for

France. The sentence " In 1921, the French government estimated the damages caused by Germany to persons and property in France at 136 billion of gold marks. In May 1921 it had already dwindled to 68 billion... Up to 1929, it was about 22 billion of gold marks " It shows that, in 1920s, Germany had less and less burden in paying gold marks to France with the execution of the Treaty of Versailles. Thus, soonly, the punishment of the Treaty of Versailles become less. This factor also became less important.

From my own knowledge, there were also other factors. Firstly, the Great Depression. The Great Depression caused huge economic setbacks to France and Britain. Thus, they had to focus on solving their own economic and social problems in their own nations first. Germany was also hugely damaged and face extreme inflation. Thus, in 1920s, relations in Europe was better as they did not have time to fight. Also, the isolationist policy of the U.S.A<sup>was</sup> also a factor, the U.S.A wished to focus on her own rather than issues in Europe. This led to failure of checking the rise of totalitarianism in Italy and Germany. Relations<sup>in Europe</sup> were more intensified.

All in all, due to the punishment of Treaty of Versailles was less harsh to Germany, the factor of the treaty determining Europe's international relations was less and less important. While, the other factors like the Great Depression and the isolationist policy of the U.S.A. <sup>etc.</sup> ~~etc.~~ became more and more important. ~~Great Depression~~ → Peace Treaties and disarmament conference.

Another factor like the League of Nation <sup>(established in 1920)</sup> also became ~~was~~ also an important factor. Its aims to maintain peace but lack of enforcement power. Major powers like the U.S. and the USSR did not join. And it did not have an ~~in~~ independent army. Thus, ~~the~~ the failure of LN became important in resisting aggression and settle disputes. Disarmament conference like Washington Conference and London Naval Conference were also important. They fixed ~~a~~ ratio of capital ships and tension in Europe was lessen. Also, Peace treaties like Locarno Treaty and Kellogg-Briand ~~&~~ Pact also help maintain peace in Europe in 1920s, the former improved relations between Germany and France etc. The latter promised European countries would not fight against each others unless there was a defensive war.

Paper 2 Question 4

4). Yes, I agree to this statement. Aggressions of Germany played a more important role in causing the Second World War than the appeasement <sup>policy</sup>. Nazi aggressions were so many and frequent that no one could tolerate and finally led to the Second World War. It was much more important than the appeasement policy which appeased Germany by different agreements.

In 1930s, due to the rise of Hitler and Nazism, Germany became more and more aggressive. He led Germany by violating the Treaty of Versailles and expanding into Europe. All these will be discussed as follows.

Firstly, due to the Paris Peace Settlement, Germany should be punished. She was disarmed and only be allowed to have 100 000 army. <sup>she should also abolished conscription.</sup> Rhineland was demilitarized and under control of the victorious countries in the First World War. She was also not allowed to have union with Austria. However, in early 1930s, Hitler rose to power and violated all these. Germany rearmed and re-established conscription. He also remilitarized Rhineland and annex Austria. All these German aggressions created and aroused mistrust between countries. Acts of Germany shows that she was getting prepared for a fight, for revenge. This intensified relations in Europe. Other countries like Britain and France could not trust Germany

did them for peaceful means. Germany was narrowing the military gap between her and other European countries. Other countries therefore then knew the purpose of Germany and also strengthening their military power to get ready for war. Thus, it sown seeds for the Second World War.

Secondly, the <sup>aggressive</sup> expansions of Germany also led to the Second World War. Germany first annexed Austria which Germany was supposed not to have any connection with. Then, Germany invaded Sudetenland and demanded a whole of Czechoslovakia. And, Germany would never be satisfied, she kept invading different countries to strengthen her power. In 1939, Germany signed the Non-Aggressive Nazi-Soviet Pact with the USSR. They agreed to share Poland. Germany then sent troops and invaded Poland. Eventually, this act of invading Poland led to the opening of the Second World War. During the period of German expansions, Germany gain power and strong spirit and confidence to revenge successfully. She kept growing power and made countries like Britain and France discontented. German aggressions were on the active side in intensifying European relations. With their acts, other European countries, <sup>especially Britain and France</sup> were worried and frustrated, thinking that Germany's acts could no longer

be tolerated, only wars could end this. Therefore, the invasion of Poland made Britain and France understand that Germany would not stop being aggressive. They then started the Second World War.

However, the appeasement policy also contributed to the Second World War. Britain and France (the leaders of the League of Nations) were struggled by their own economic and social problem due to the Great Depression. They had to first focus on solving local problems and did not have the strength to fight at that time. They had adopted the appeasement policy to satisfy Germany's wants to prevent wars. In 1938, Germany invaded Sudetenland. Then, France and Britain then asked Czechoslovakia to give Sudetenland to Germany. By Munich Agreement, Germany got Sudetenland. The appeasement policy enhance Germany's military strength and territories, which made Germany more dangerous and caused the Second World War.

Although the appeasement policy contributed to the cause of Second World War, it was only a little impact. Nazi aggression was more important. The appeasement policy did strengthen Germany and made her more dangerous. However, the adoption of appeasement policy was due to the aggressions



of Germany. If Germany was not aggressive and <sup>did not</sup> invade other countries, appeasement policy would not exist. Besides, the appeasement policy was only an indirect factor which encouraged German aggressions. However, Nazi aggression on Poland was the direct cause of the outbreak of the Second World War. Germany invaded Poland and made Britain and France know that Germany would never be satisfied. It was the aggression of Germany that made the two countries no longer tolerate and declare war, which started the Second World War. If Germany did not become that aggressive, the Second World War might be prevented.

Therefore, with these examples above, I agree that Nazi aggression was more important than appeasement policy in causing the Second World War.

5). To a large extent, the end of Cold War was due to Mikhail Gorbachev's liberalisation policy. In the last stage of the Cold War (1985-91), Gorbachev was the leader of the VSSR. He was different from the former leaders, he was energetic and willing to cooperate with the West. He introduced liberalisation policy, like "reconstructing" and "openness". The failure of his policy led to the end of the Cold War.

Firstly, Gorbachev introduced "glasnost", which means reconstructing. He introduced democratic reforms, established a market economy and abolished planned economy. People in Soviet Union had more freedom and connected to the world outside. All those aimed with positive impacts but ended with horrible impacts. People in Soviet Union were not benefited from the reforms. With market economy, there were shortage of basic necessities and food, social problems like unemployment and inflation were even intensified. People still lived in a poor lives and faced "soup famine". Besides, with the reforms, people in the Soviet Union were enable to know more about the West. And they found that the lives in the West was much more easier and nice. The technologies in the West was much more advanced than their nations. With

The acknowledgement of Western advances, people were discontented with the Soviet government and lost their faith and trust in Gorbachev. This reform had weakened the USSR and brought disastrous impacts to the USSR, making the USSR harder and harder to battle with the U.S.A.

Secondly, Gorbachev also introduced "openness". The USSR was no longer <sup>having</sup> one party dictatorship. Multi-parties system were established and there were party politics. It slow down the progress of administration. The efficiency of parties were lowered. Schemes could not be passed quickly like before. Moreover, he also couldn't solve the arguments between parties. The conservatives and other government officials who wanted reform and new things often argued for a long time with no conclusion. This had caused political instability of the Soviet Union. There were a lot of weakness of party politics and they had no achievements in socio-economic reforms and lost confidence from the public. Once again, the policy of Gorbachev failed and led to more and more political and social problems. Which could not be solved. The political instability worsen the situation in the USSR and weakened her power. The USSR could not chase after the rapid development of the United States.

Thirdly, Gorbachev had loosened the control of Eastern European countries. He thought the Eastern European countries should be given more freedom to choose their own future and fate. Eventually, many Eastern European countries no longer support the Soviet Union and joined other European Unions. This act had made Soviet Union weakened and lack of support. Soviet Union was even weakened with limited support.

Moreover, the policies launched by Gorbachev aroused discontent of the parties and led to the August Coup. Conservative members captured him and not letting him go anywhere. Although he was released some time later and still the leader of the USSR, his reputation was ruined and the public no longer support him. He no longer had strong leading power.

Furthermore, the failure of Gorbachev directly caused to the dissolve of Warsaw Pact. Warsaw Pact was dissolved and the USSR was also dissolved. Cold War thus eventually ended.

Some may say that other factors also contributed to the end of Cold War, such as the willingness of the U.S.A to build friendship with the USSR. Indeed, the U.S.A was <sup>more and more</sup> friendly towards the USSR and they had signed

treaties and maintaining peace. Also, the local problem in the USSR also a factor causing the end of the Cold War. Before 1985, the Soviet Union had already facing many social problems like unemployment, food shortage. The USSR also faced huge military burden. They could not afford huge arm cost. <sup>so the USSR did not create tension or confront with the US.</sup> All these had also contributed to the end of the Cold War.

However, these factors were not as important as the policies made by Gorbachev. The failure of his policy was a decisive factor. If he could successfully reform the USSR, solving social problems, gaining confidence of the public and established political stability, the USSR would not be hugely weakened and still had a chance to combat with the U.S.A. With his policy, the USSR was weakened in political, social, economic aspects which prevent the USSR from having confrontations or fight with the U.S.A. <sup>(1955-69)</sup> With the previous examples in second and fourth stage of the Cold War, <sup>(1979-85)</sup> the USSR would create tension to the Cold War when she had power, such as the Cuban Missile Crisis, she installed missiles in Cuban and made tensions, as well as suppressing Polish Solidarity which intensified relations with <sup>the</sup> US. The Cold War was less likely to end if Gorbachev did not weaken the USSR by his policy. Therefore, to a large extent, the Cold

had come to an end due to Mikhail Gorbachev's liberalisation policy. His policies had weakened the USSR and finally dissolved the USSR, contributing the end of the Cold War.

#### Comments

The script demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the curriculum content. In Paper 1, the candidate generally managed to answer questions at different levels of difficulty, sometimes performing excellently (such as with Q.1a). In Paper 2, the candidate provided logical answers to the questions, despite occasional weak points in the answer to Q.4.