

1a) The first characteristic is foreigner dominating the political system. According to Source (A), the governor, most of the official members and most of the unofficial members are not ethnic Chinese. Only 1 out of 9 official members and 4 out of 9 unofficial members are Chinese, This shows that most legislative Councillors are foreigners, which is one of the characteristics.

The second characteristic is not democratic. According to Source (A), all of the 18 official and unofficial members of legislative Council in 1951 is appointed by the Governor. This indicates that the political system is not democratic as members of legislative Council are not elected but appointed by governor, which is another characteristic.

b) Communication barrier is the administrative problem faced by Hong Kong Government. From Source (B), 'the government is pressured to appoint a bilingual Chinese Crown Counsel to facilitate better understand and working relationship.' This shows that Hong Kong government faced communication barrier as foreign members cannot understand Chinese, thus they need bilingual Counsel member. This indicates that colonial government faced communication and language barrier.

c) I agree.

Firstly, Hong Kong was not democratic in 1951. From Source (A), all of the unofficial members and official members of the legislative Council were appointed by governor in 1951. Shows that the political system in Hong Kong is not democratic as members are not elected by local people but appointed by governor, thus lacked representativeness and democracy.

However, Hong Kong had become better regarding democracy. According to my own knowledge, Hong Kong was more democratic. For instance, in Legislative Council, the first indirect election was held in 1985. In 1995, all of the 60 Legislative Councillors were elected. Also, the governor stopped acting as chairperson but to be elected. This shows that Hong Kong political system turned better.

Secondly, regarding racial equality, Hong Kong was not good in 1951. According to Source (B), the Chinese Crown Counsel Patrick Yu claims that he was not granted expatriate terms and are paid minimum flat salary without living quarters, housing allowance and long leave with pay. This shows that as he is Chinese, he is not granted any expatriate terms and minimum salary as those foreign members have. Thus, racial equality is not granted in Hong Kong 1951.

However, it turned better afterwards. According to my own knowledge, racial discrimination gradually decrease. For instance, Chinese was

added as one of the official languages of Hong Kong in 1974. Also, more and more Chinese are absorbed into political system, such as over 60% of Administrative Officers are Chinese in 1970s. This shows that racial equality improved greatly.

Thirdly, democracy is not granted in 1951. According to my own knowledge, in 1951, Hong Kong the Urban Council and District Board is not democratic, while the members are mostly appointed by the governor and most of them are British merchants. Local Chinese can only take up few and primary seats.

However, the situation turned better. From my own knowledge, after Sino-British Joint Declaration was signed in 1984, the government promoted democratization. For instance, all appointed seats in Urban Council are abolished in 1985. Also, direct elections are held in Urban Council and District Board. This shows that Hong Kong become more democratic than before,

Paper 1 Question 2

2a) Students lacking of law of politics knowledge may hinder modernisation efforts in China. From source (C), head of Japan's University said: 'Chinese students sent to Japan rarely study law and politics, which are essential subjects for China's reform'. This shows that, as Chinese students lacked modern law and politics knowledge, modernisation efforts in China, namely carrying out reform, may be limited in effectiveness, thus hindering modernisation efforts in China.

2b) The overthrow of Qing government is successful but with limitations. From source (D), from ~~to~~ Extract A, 'provinces flying the revolutionary army's new flag, and people are happy'. This shows the overthrowing Qing government is successful and people are happy. Also, 'We have recently formed a new government of Republic of China'. As republic is formed, the revolution is successful.

But there are a few limitations. From source (D), from Extract A, the new republic government

'earnestly request for financial help from Japan'. Also, China have to pay bank loan by Paye Iron Mine and at high annual interest rate (7%) from Extract B. This indicates that the new republic government is bearing financial difficulties and have to pay large amount of loan to Japan, therefore there are limitations.

Paper 1 Question 3

3a) The cartoon showed Germany has higher status than France ^(and strong military power) thus provoking fear towards Germany. From Source (E), in the cartoon, the man representing West Germany is sitting on the goose representing France, showing that West Germany enjoyed higher status than France in the ECSC. Moreover, the goose representing France is forced to eat 'coal or steel' and produce 'Schutzstaffel' for elite military unit in Nazi Germany. The cartoon provokes fear towards Germany as Germany enjoying higher status than France, and Germany have elite military unit that indicates strong military power.

3b) Source (F) is to support Britain's entry into EC.

Firstly, the extract states that Britain would not lose its sovereignty. From Source (F), it states that 'entry into EC would not of course affect the position of Monarchy' and 'it will be a community of sovereign states'. This shows that she thinks that British sovereignty will not be affected

after joining EC, thus it supports joining EC.

Secondly, it states that joining EC would not act contrary to British national interest. From Source (F), it claims that 'it is not possible to force another member state to act contrary to its vital national interests.' Therefore it shows that the extract is convincing that Britain's national interest cannot be harmed upon joining EC, thus it supports joining EC.

3c) I agree.

Firstly, integration has more benefits but little harms, ~~joined EC~~ showing that it was 'irresistible'. According to Source (F), Britain is preparing document to join the EC, while some agreed to joined the EEC by saying 'sovereignty can be maintained' and 'national interests will not be harmed.', showing that British think that there are no harms for Britain to join EC but to ~~to~~ have economic interest. Therefore economic integrations are irresistible.

Secondly, Britain as a world strong power wanted to join economic integration. From source (P), the document reckon that Britain should join the EEC. While from my own knowledge, Britain is one of the leading powers of Europe, while it always emphasize national interest and national glory. Even this strong power planed to join EEC, showing economic integration irresistible.

Thirdly, economic integration is irresistible as there are interests for countries. According to source (E), both France and Germany can gain 'Coal and Steel' and elite military unit as interests respectively. Therefore economic integration is irresistible.

Fourthly, economic integration is irresistible as its large economic interest for member states. According to my own knowledge, economic integrations were effective for economic development. For instance, the total industrial output for EEC increased by 60% for its member states. Also, after economic integration in 1950s,

Europe entered 'golden economy' and their total industrial output of Western Europe occupied $\frac{1}{4}$ of whole world. Thus it is irresistible.

lastly, number of countries joining integration is expanding. From my own knowledge, after 1991, more Eastern European powers joined economic integration. European Union is even established with over 60 countries joining, including strong powers, therefore economic integration is irresistible.

Paper 1 Question 4

4a) Firstly, disarmament conferences were held to maintain peace. From Source (G), there are three Nobel Peace Prize winners who have joined actively in Hague Conferences, which is a disarmament conference. The three winners are Institute of International Law, Louis Renault and Auguste Beernaert from three different countries, Switzerland, France and Belgium. This shows that countries made effort on disarmament conferences for maintaining peace.

Secondly, international peace organisations are established. From Source (G), there are 5 Nobel Peace Prize winners who actively participated in PIPB, which is an international peace organisation. The winners are from four countries, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, Denmark and Belgium. This shows that countries made effort in peace organisation to maintain world peace.

4b) The cartoonist's view towards prospect of peace is grim and hard to achieve. From Source (H), the prince charming representing Britain is coming

to the Sleeping Beauty representing peace. But the prince didn't kiss her but said 'Wake up, Miss, if you please' in the language of diplomacy. This shows that the cartoonist think that as sleeping beauty will not wake up without the kiss, peace cannot be maintained only with the pleading of Britain and Britain is incapable of calling peace to wake up. Thus the author thinks that prospect of peace is grim and hard to achieve.

4(c) I do not agree.

Firstly, military rivalry is a strong trend due to armament race. According to my own knowledge, in 1900-14, Britain and Germany is participating in armament race of building dreadnoughts. Britain claimed to build 2:1 ratio to German dreadnought. This is one of the military rivalries and increase tension between powers.

Peacekeeping was also a strong trend. From Source (H), in the cartoon, Britain was pleading the sleeping beauty representing peace to wake up in the language of diplomacy, showing peacekeeping was a strong trend.

However, in comparison, military rivalry is a stronger trend. As peacekeeping is only ~~done by a few countries, and they are not~~ on the surface, powers paid little efforts to maintain peace. For instance, Britain claimed to hope to maintain peace, but she is in armament race with Germany, which is a threat to peace. This shows that military rivalry is a stronger trend.

Secondly, peacekeeping was a strong trend. From my own knowledge, many countries compared military strength by competing territorial expansions, such as Germany and France both wanted to expand to Morocco in Moroccan Crisis in 1907. This shows that military rivalry is a strong trend.

While peacekeeping was also a strong trend. According to Source (K), powers joined the PIPB and HC, which are both contributing to peace maintaining. Over 6 countries have Nobel Peace Prize winners due to actively participating in peacekeeping. Therefore peacekeeping was a strong trend.

However, in comparison, military rivalry is a stronger trend than peacekeeping. As military rivalry is joined by strong powers in Europe, such as Germany, Britain, France and Russia. However, peacekeeping is mainly participated by small countries like Belgium, Switzerland. But there are no Nobel Peace Prize winners for Russia and Germany. This shows that military rivalry is a stronger trend.

To conclude, ~~military~~ rivalry.

Paper 2 Question 4

To a large extent, Second-World-War is a consequence of the Paris Peace Settlement as the Paris Peace Settlement, including Paris Peace Conference (1919) and establishment of League of Nations are the main cause of WW II.

Firstly, the Paris Peace Settlement encouraged the aggression of Germany. In Paris Peace Conference, as Germany is the losing power of WW I, she is forced to sign the Treaty of Versailles. The treaty forces Germany to give to territories like Danzig city, to pay reparation £6600 pounds to winning powers, which is a very large number at the time. Moreover, Germany is virtually disarmed. The treaty aimed to weaken Germany, in order to maintain peace. However, it aroused German's discontent as they see it as a 'dictatorial treaty'. Under the discontent of Germans, the Weimar Republic government signing the treaty was overthrown and Hitler rose to power. Hitler utilized German's discontent to propose his totalitarianism expansion and won widespread support. The Treaty of

Versaille of Paris Peace Settlement directly caused the rise of Nazi Hitler, which then caused the outbreak of WWI due to Hitler's expansion. Therefore, WWI is a consequence of the Paris Peace Settlement.

Secondly, Paris Peace Settlement caused the discontent of another totalitarianist power - Italy. Before the WWI, Italy was promised to be given ~~Dalmatia and Tyrol~~ as lands after the war. However, in the Paris Peace Settlement, Italy failed to get Dalmatia and Tyrol as promised. This caused the discontent of Italy and they wanted to take back the land they wanted. Under the leadership of Fascist Mussolini, Italy started territorial expansion to Abyssinia and Albania, and eventually triggered the Second World War. Therefore, Paris Peace Settlement encouraged the aggression of Fascist Italy, and thus triggered the outbreak of WWI. Thus the WWI is a consequence of Paris Peace Settlement.

Thirdly, the League of Nations established in Paris Peace Settlement encouraged the totalitarianist aggressors and caused WWI. The League of Nations was established in 1919 in Paris Peace Settlement. It aimed to maintain peace, but eventually encouraged the aggressors for causing WWI. The League was incapable of maintaining peace. For instance, when Japan invaded China and sparked Manchuria Crisis in 1931, the League only condemned Japan, but unable to force Japan retreat from China. Japan even withdrew from the League and continued its aggression. When Italy annexed Abyssinia in 1935, the League only imposed economic sanctions instead of military sanctions to Italy. Thus, it also failed to stop Italian expansion. Germany also followed suit to invade Sudetenland and withdrew the League. No heavy punishment on the aggressors made them confidently expand without worries, thus the League of Nations encouraged aggressors and directly caused the outbreak of WWI. Therefore, WWI is definitely a consequence of Paris

Peace Settlements.

To a small extent, the WWI is also caused by other factors, including Great Depression and Appeasement Policy.

Firstly, Great Depression has caused the outbreak of WWI. The Great Depression occurred in 1929 destroyed European countries' economy, including France and Britain. Most countries are suffering from serious economic problems, such as ^{high} unemployment rate. Therefore, due to Great Depression, they are forced to focus on their economic problems but not to resist aggressors. Also, The Great Depression made them incapable to resist strong Germany, Italy and Japan. Thus, the Great Depression made the aggressors more aggressive as they think that European powers like Britain and France are too weak, this make them more confident in colonial expansion and triggering WWI. Therefore, Great Depression is also a reason of outbreak of WWI.

Secondly, Appeasement Policy is another cause for WWII. As Britain and France are focusing on economic problems and not capable to win if the WWII broke out. Therefore they adopted the Appeasement Policy and hope to stop their aggression by sacrificing the land they wanted. They held the Munich Conference in 1938 to force Czechoslovakia give out Sudetenland to Germany. However, this encouraged Germany's aggression and confidence as she believed that Britain and France dare not to engage in a world war with her. However, Hitler planned for long to start a world war. Hitler invade whole Czechoslovakia and eventually Poland, which triggered off the WWII. Therefore, Appeasement Policy encouraged the aggressors and caused the outbreak of WWII.

However, it is strongly believed that WWII is a consequence of Paris Peace Settlement to a large extent.

Paris Peace Settlement is more important than Great Depression. As Paris Peace Settlement directly caused the rise of totalitarianism in both Germany and Italy, which directly caused the outbreak of WWI. However, Great Depression only indirectly encouraged the aggressors by wrecking the world economy. In comparison, Paris Peace Settlement is the root cause but Great Depression is only a minor cause that speed up the outbreak of WWI by encouraging the aggressors. Without Great Depression, WWI will still break out due to the rise of totalitarianism. But without Paris Peace Settlement, outbreak of WWI may be avoided as rise of totalitarianism is main cause. Therefore WWI is a consequence of Paris Peace Settlement rather than Great Depression.

Moreover, Paris Peace Settlement is more important than Appeasement Policy. The Paris Peace Settlement has larger coverage than Appeasement Policy as it is decided by 'Big Three' and other countries. However, Appeasement

policy is only restricted to Britain and France regarding the scale. Moreover, Paris Peace Conference directly caused the rise of totalitarianism, and thus causing WW2. But the Appeasement Policy is only adopted a few years before WW2, thus is only the minor caused. Thus, ~~the~~ WW2 is a consequence of Paris Peace Conference rather than Appeasement Policy.

To conclude, to a large extent, I agree.

Paper 2 Question 3

After WWII, the SCAP ruling mainly by US not only facilitated Japan's development in the period 1945-52, but continually impacted Japan's development towards 2000. Therefore, I agree that USA facilitated more than hindered Japan's development after WWII.

Firstly, regarding political aspect, US helped with Japan's development. After WWII, the US-led SCAP ruled Japan from 1945-52. The US adopted 1947 Shawa Constitution to facilitate Japan's political system. The Constitution includes introducing democracy to the Japanese political system. Although the US rule in 1952 ended, its impact continued until 2000. Under the influence of the Shawa Constitution, Japan entered the era of party politics. The political parties emerged, such as Liberal Party, ^(Democratic Party) and Socialist Party. In 1955, the two dominant parties combined to form Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and confirm the 1955 System that last until 1980s. The party politics last until 2000, which is due to the US facilitating Japan

in 1947 Showa Constitution. Therefore, US facilitate Japan's political development.

Secondly, in terms of economic, US facilitated Japan's economic recovery and continuous development until 2000. In SCAP period, the US carried out different policies, such as the Nine Principles for Economic Stabilization in 1948 and Anti-Monopoly Act. Also, US set up an 'Dodge Line' with 360 Yen to 1 US dollar. This helped recovery of Japanese economy quickly and the national growth of Japan reached 8%. The US influence continued after 1952 as the US policy laid good foundation for Japanese economic development and helped Japan to recover in the most difficult period. Therefore, Japanese economy continued to flourish. Moreover, US also act as trading partner with Japan, such as Japan joined GATT organised by US and they also have unilateral economic cooperations that help boost Japan's economy. US even become largest economy partner in 1980s. Therefore, US facilitated Japan's economic development.

Thirdly, US facilitated the diplomatic development of Japan. In SCAP period, ~~the~~ Japan signed Treaty of San Francisco under the rule of the US. The treaty provide cheap labour and market for Japan as the signing with East Asia countries like India. This not only boosted Japanese economy, but improved its diplomatic relations. As before and during WWII, the rise of militarism and territorial expansion to China, Korea etc made Japan under diplomatic isolation. The US helped Japan to step out of diplomatic isolation by establishing diplomatic relations with other countries. Although Japanese diplomacy is not helped by US after 1952, US laid foundation for Japan. Without US, more time is needed for Japan to step out of diplomatic isolation. Therefore US facilitated Japan's development in diplomatic aspect.

Fourthly, the US facilitated the military development of Japan. In SCAP period, the US cut off Japan's military expenditure to 1% of its national expenditure. As Japan's

Military expenditure took up 99% of national expenditure in 1944, US caused a fundamental change. Also, US stationed troops in Japan so that military expenditure and Japanese troops ~~and~~ can be further reduced under the US Japan Security Pact. Also, US tried to limit the power of militaries to prevent the revival of militarism. This can stabilize Japanese society in military aspect. Although US rule ended in 1952, the fundamental change by the US influenced Japan until 2000 as revival of militarism or expansions is prevented by the effort of US. Therefore, the US facilitated Japan's military expenditure after WWII.

Apart from facilitation, US also hinder Japanese development in some aspects.

Firstly, in economic aspect, the US adopted tariff against Japan. In 1970s, as US trade with Japan is trade deficit, US added 100% punitive tariff on Japan. This influenced negatively

on Japanese economy. As a result, Japanese export and import reduced greatly by over 20%. Therefore, the US hindered Japanese economic development.

Secondly, the Nixon shock hindered Japanese economy. In 1970s, the Nixon shock imparted on Japanese economy. As US President Nixon announced to cancel the direct exchange of US dollar to gold, the Japanese were shocked and wrecked the Japanese economy. The Japanese national GDP even experienced a negative 1.4% growth at that year. Therefore, US hinders Japanese economy.

However, in comparison, US still facilitate more than hindered Japan's development after the WWII. To begin with, in terms of coverage, the US facilitated Japan in various aspects, including the economic, diplomatic, military and political. But US only hindered Japanese economic development. Therefore, US still facilitated more than hindered Japan's

development in general.

Moreover, in comparison, regarding economic aspect, US facilitation has larger impact than hinderance. The Economic assistance and policies adopted by US has huge influence as it helped Japan in the most difficult period and laid good foundation for Japan's economic development from 1945-2000. However, US hinderance is not that great in influence as it only wrecked Japanese economy partly and the period Japanese economy is flourishing. Therefore the US facilitation outweighs the hinderance to Japan's development.

To conclude, I agree with the statement.

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.