



CANDIDATE
NAME

CENTRE
NUMBER

S	2	3	8	6
---	---	---	---	---

CLASS

--	--	--

INDEX
NUMBER

--	--

HUMANITIES (HISTORY)

2261/02

Paper 2 The Making of the 20th Century Modern World, 1910s-1991

26 August 2025
1 hour 50 minutes

No Additional materials are required.

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

1	(a)	<p>Study Source A.</p> <p>What is the source implying about the Korean War? Using your own knowledge and details from the source, explain your answer.</p>	[5]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	<p>Describes source without an inference</p> <p>E.g. The source shows how Mao Zedong is shovelling his soldiers into a cannon.</p>		1
L2	<p>Sub-message, supported <i>Award 3 marks for use of contextual knowledge</i></p> <p>E.g. The source is implying that China was whole-heartedly involved in the Korean War. From the source, I can see that Mao Zedong is shovelling his soldiers into the barrel of a cannon. There are also a lot more platoons of soldiers stationed at the base of the cannon, as though they are waiting to be shovelled into it as well. This indicates that China was supporting North Korea in the conflict by sending his own soldiers, and Mao was willing to send more soldiers as long as the conflict continues.</p>		2-3
L3	<p>Message, supported and explained <i>Award 4 marks for valid message with source content use, and 5 marks for contextual knowledge made with reference to the cartoon being published when the Korean War was going on.</i></p> <p>E.g. The source is implying that Soviet Union was only providing military support to China during the Korean War, while Chinese soldiers were the ones being sent to fight in the war directly. From the source, I can see that Stalin was standing behind Mao, looking with a smile on his face, while Mao was shovelling his soldiers into the barrel of a cannon. The caption also reads, "Always glad to loan my neighbours a shovel." This suggests that Soviet Union had backed China militarily during the Korean War, providing weapons and support, but didn't deploy any Soviet troops. Instead, Mao was sending Chinese soldiers to fight and die in large numbers while Stalin watched behind the scenes. [4m] As this cartoon was published at the height of the Korean war, the cartoonist could be criticising how Soviet Union supplied arms and logistics, avoiding direct involvement in the combat, while the Chinese forces intervened directly to support North Korea, resulting in massive Chinese casualties. [5m]</p>		4-5

1	(b)	<p>Study Source B.</p> <p>How useful is this source about China's entry into the Korean War? Explain your answer.</p>	[6]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	<p>Answers based on undeveloped provenance</p> <p>E.g. Source B is useful because it shows the perspective of an ex-military officer from the Chinese Communist Party.</p>		1
L2	<p>Useful / Not useful based on source content</p> <p>E.g. Source B is useful in showing that China's entry into the Korean War was due to the need to safeguard their security. Source B shows that "this ignores the historical fact that the US military insisted on crossing the 38th Parallel, posing a great threat to China's security. The Americans had forced the Chinese forces to enter North Korea." This means that due to the presence of American troops in North Korea, China felt the need to safeguard their border, and therefore decided to enter the Korean War.</p>		2
L3	<p>L2 + Useful / Not useful based on cross-reference</p> <p>E.g. L2 + This is supported by my contextual knowledge that MacArthur had ignored Truman's advice to limit operations north of the 38th Parallel, and continued advancing towards the Yalu River even with China's warning that it would intervene if it happened. MacArthur was even willing to use nuclear weapons on China if necessary. This shows that the actions of the US was perceived by China to be aggressive, which resulted to China's entry into the war to defend its interest. Since my contextual knowledge supports Source B, it makes source B reliable hence useful.</p>		3-4
L4	<p>L2 + Useful / Not useful based on analysis of provenance <i>Award 6m for answers that are well-explained.</i></p> <p>E.g. L2 + This source was published in a government website, which would have a vested interest to protect the image of the Chinese Communist Party, thus it would be biased in its portrayal of China's entry into the Korean War, in order to justify China's entry into the Korean War. This affects the reliability and hence usefulness of the source.</p>		5-6

1	(c)	Study Source C. Why do you think Kim Il Sung made this speech? Explain your answer.	[5]
Level	Descriptor		Marks
L1	Reference to source content e.g. Kim Il Sung made this speech to inform the Koreans that the Americans would destroy Korea and enslave its people.		1
L2	Sub-message <i>Award the higher mark of the level for more developed answers.</i> E.g. Kim Il Sung made this speech to persuade Koreans that the Americans were going to colonise Korea and exploit Korea's resources if left unchecked. In his speech, he mentioned that the Americans are "implementing their long meditated predatory plan of conquering the Korean people by force of arms and intimidation, enslaving them and plunging them into poverty and starvation." This reflects Kim's perception on the reason for the Americans' involvement in the Korean War.		2
L3	Context E.g. Kim Il Sung made this speech because the Korean War had started a few months back, and the United States was getting involved by supporting South Korea through the UN forces. Kim did not want the North Korean forces to be driven back as they had been advancing rapidly, taking over most of South Korea.		3
L4	Main message E.g. Kim Il Sung made this speech to persuade Koreans that the US was preventing the unification of Korea for ulterior motives. In his speech, he mentioned that the Americans are "implementing their long meditated predatory plan of conquering the Korean people by force of arms and intimidation, enslaving them and plunging them into poverty and starvation." This reflects Kim's perception that the Americans wanted to take over control of Korea and exploit its resources, which will result in the deterioration of people's standard of living.		3-4
L5	Reason based on purpose <i>(Because of what he wanted the Koreans to do.)</i>		4-5

	<p>E.g. Kim Il Sung made this speech to <u>persuade [PV]</u> <u>Koreans [A]</u> that <u>the US was preventing the unification of Korea for ulterior motives [M]</u>. In his speech, he mentioned that the Americans are “implementing their long meditated predatory plan of conquering the Korean people by force of arms and intimidation, enslaving them and plunging them into poverty and starvation.” This reflects Kim’s perception that the Americans wanted to take over control of Korea and exploit its resources, which will result in the deterioration of people’s standard of living. <u>Kim made this speech when the United States became involved in the Korean War by supporting South Korea through the UN forces.</u> As the North Korean forces had advanced rapidly and had taken over most of South Korea, the involvement of the UN forces had thrown off the plans of North Korea. [C] Thus, Kim made this speech <u>to rally the Koreans against the UN forces [O]</u>, in the name of protecting Korea’s independence and preventing the US from taking over control of Korea.</p>	
--	--	--

1	(d)	<p>Study Sources D and E.</p> <p>How far does Source D make you surprised by what Source E shows about the involvement of the US in the Korean War? Explain your answer.</p>	[6]
---	-----	--	-----

Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Not surprised based on source type/provenance</p> <p>E.g. I am not surprised by Source E because it shows President Truman’s perspective towards the Korean War.</p>	1
L2	<p>Surprised/Not surprised based on content <i>Award the higher mark for more developed responses.</i></p> <p>E.g. I am surprised by what Source E shows because it is different from Source D. Source D shows that the US played a strong role in creating tensions between North and South Korea. In the source, the North and South Korean soldiers had a hand holding the pin of the grenade, representing the fact that the tension was very high and the pin could be pulled out at any time by one of them. The huge hand that dwarves the two soldiers represented the US, which had a finger on the ring as well, which implies that the US played a massive role in supporting South Korea and adding on to the tension. On the other hand, Source E shows that the US was only getting involved in the Korean War to prevent the spread of communism. President Truman mentioned in his speech that “the Communists in the Soviet Union are engaged in a monstrous conspiracy to stamp out freedom all over the world. If</p>	2-3

	they were to succeed, the United States would be numbered among their principal victims." This suggests that the US did not actively escalate tensions between North and South Korea, but rather intervened only out of obligation to defend South Korea, ensuring that a communist victory would not prevail.	
L3	<p>L2 + cross reference to another source/contextual knowledge, supported <i>Award the higher mark of the level for more developed answers.</i></p> <p>E.g. L2 + I am surprised by Source E, however, because it is not supported by Source C. Source C shows that the US was actively making plans to attack Korea. It mentions that "the US imperialist invaders are implementing their long meditated predatory plan of conquering the Korean people by force of arms and intimidation, enslaving them and plunging them into poverty and starvation." This implies that the US forces were the aggressors, and were actively trying to exert its control in the region. This does not support Source E's impression of the US being the protectors against the spread of communism, thus I am surprised by Source E. [4m]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. L2 + I am not surprised by Source E, as it is supported by my contextual knowledge. I know that the United Nations only agreed on using force to drive the North Koreans out of South Korea because of North Koreans' refusal to withdraw its attack on South Korea. Furthermore, US General MacArthur was appointed as Chief Commander of the UN Joint Command, which meant that the role of the US was to lead the UN forces to liberate South Korea from North Korea's attack. Thus, this supports Source E in that the US were not the aggressors in the Korean War. [5m]</p> <p><i>Note: Candidates who cross-reference Source D to other sources or contextual knowledge = L3/4 (unless they can explain how the cross-referencing diminishes or increases the credibility of Source D, and hence make Source E surprising or not surprising)</i></p>	4-5
L4	<p>L2 + Source E is not surprising because of its provenance <i>Award 6m for well-developed answers.</i></p> <p>E.g. L2 + I am not surprised by Source E because of its provenance. As the source is from President Truman, who was the US President during the Korean War, he would likely try to justify the intent of US for intervening in the Korean War, that there was a need to put a stop to the spread of communist aggression. He would want the US people to support the</p>	5-6

	government's decision in the Korean War. Thus, I am not surprised by Source E. Note: Sound analysis of provenance/purpose without L2 = L4/4	
--	--	--

1	(e)	Study all the sources. 'The communist countries were responsible for increasing the tensions in Korea.' How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your view.	[8]
Level	Descriptor	Marks	
L1	Identifies sources that support / do not support the view without valid source use	1	
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use <i>Award 2m for one Y or N supported by valid source use, and additional 1m for each subsequent valid source use (up to a maximum of 4m).</i> E.g. Yes , Sources A, E and F support the statement. Source A supports the statement. Source A shows that <u>Soviet Union and China's support contributed to the tensions in Korea</u> . The source shows how Soviet Union provided the shovel to China, allowing Mao Zedong to shovel the Chinese soldiers into the big cannon, which is indicative of how China got involved in the conflict in Korea directly with the logistical support from Soviet Union. Thus, Source A shows that the involvement of Soviet Union and China contributed to the increase in tensions in Korea. Source E supports the statement. Source E shows that <u>the Soviet Union was playing an active role in the conflict in Korea, thus making it necessary for the US to become involved to stop them</u> . President Truman said that "The Communists in the Soviet Union are engaged in a monstrous conspiracy to stamp out freedom all over the world. If they were to succeed, the United States would be numbered among their principal victims." This reflects that the support from Soviet Union encouraged North Korea to start the attack against South Korea, hence making it necessary for the US to become involved in order to stem the spread of communism to other countries. Source F supports the statement. Source F shows that <u>the implicit support from Stalin and Mao Zedong had encouraged Kim Il Sung to launch the attack on South Korea</u> . Khrushchev mentioned that "it wasn't Stalin's idea, but Kim's. Stalin, of course, didn't try to dissuade him." Furthermore, "Mao Zedong approved Kim's suggestion". This reflects that even though Kim	2 – 4	

	<p>initiated the discussion on launching the attack on South Korea, it was Stalin and Mao who supported Kim's idea, thus further encouraging Kim to attack South Korea.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. No, Sources B, C and D do not support the statement.</p> <p>Source B does not support the statement. Source B shows that <u>it was America's support for South Korea that increased the tensions in Korea</u>. In the source, the ex-military officer stated that "the US military insisted on crossing the 38th Parallel, posing a threat to China's security. The Americans had forced the Chinese forces to enter North Korea." This implies that the US played an active role in going against North Korea, thus increasing the tension by supporting South Korea.</p> <p>Source C does not support the statement. Source C shows that <u>the Americans were the ones who had intentions to use the conflict in Korea to take control of the country, thus leading to the extension of war</u>. In Kim's radio address, he mentioned that "the US imperialist invaders are implementing their long meditated predatory plan of conquering the Korean people by force of arms and intimidation", and that "all the Korean people and the heroic People's Army are fighting as one to liberate and win an ultimate victory over the US imperialist invaders." These words imply that the involvement of US had contributed to the conflict in Korea, and encouraged Koreans to fight back, thus lengthening the armed conflict within Korea.</p> <p>Source D does not support the statement. Source D shows that <u>the US played a role in stirring up the tension between North and South Korea</u>. From the source, it can be seen that while both the North and South Korean soldiers have a hand on the pin of the grenade, the US also had a finger laid on it, representing the antagonistic actions that the US had taken to trigger the reactions of North Korea. Furthermore, the hand that represented the US was drawn bigger than the soldiers themselves, so it further reflects the idea that the US played a bigger role compared to the Koreans themselves in stirring up tensions.</p> <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>To be awarded L2 or L3, there must be a direct reference to source content.</i>- <i>Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues raised by the sources is insufficient.</i>	
L3	Yes AND No, supported by valid source use <i>Both aspects of L2 up till 7 marks.</i>	5 – 8

	<p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Bonus of 2m (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency, etc but the total for this question must not exceed 8m.</i> <p>E.g. Source F is also reliable because it is supported by my contextual knowledge. Based on what I know, Kim Il Sung had broached the topic on invading South Korea with Stalin and Mao Zedong multiple times for months, thus gaining the support from Soviet Union and China before North Korea launched the first attack on South Korea in June 1950.</p>	
--	--	--

Section B: Essays

2	'The US ended its involvement in the Vietnam War because of the Tet Offensive.' How far do you agree with this statement?	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Identifies/describes the reasons behind US ending its involvement in the Vietnam War</p> <p><i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i></p> <p><i>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</i></p> <p>Other possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rising anti-war sentiments among the American public - Role of the media 	1 – 3
L2	<p>Explains how the Tet Offensive led to US ending its involvement in the Vietnam War OR how other factors led to it</p> <p><i>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how the Tet Offensive led to US ending its involvement in the Vietnam War OR how other factors led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i></p> <p>E.g. I agree that the Tet Offensive was a key factor that led to the United States ending its involvement in the Vietnam War. Launched by the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces during the Tet holiday in 1968, the Tet Offensive was a massive and coordinated surprise attack on more than 100 cities and military installations across South Vietnam, including the US military base at Khe Sanh. Although the US and South Vietnamese forces eventually regained control, the scale, coordination, and boldness of the offensive</p>	4 – 5

shocked the American public. It directly contradicted official claims that the US was winning the war and that the conflict was nearing an end. The offensive also raised serious doubts about the effectiveness of US military efforts, especially given the enormous resources being poured into the war. Despite superior weaponry and manpower, the US was still caught off guard, leading many Americans to question whether the war was worth continuing. The destruction of the historic city of Hue and the heavy civilian casualties further eroded public support. As confidence in a clear US victory crumbled, so did the political will to sustain the war effort. Therefore, the Tet Offensive undermined both public and government support, contributing to the US decision to withdraw from Vietnam.

OR

E.g. Another reason that led to the United States ending its involvement in the Vietnam War was the **role of the media**. At the beginning of the war, the media generally supported the US government, which was eager to gain domestic backing for its actions in Vietnam. Journalists were given access to war zones, official briefings, and interviews, allowing them to report freely. However, after the Tet Offensive in 1968, the tone of media coverage shifted dramatically. Many journalists began to doubt the possibility of a US victory and became more critical of the war effort. Graphic images and reports of the violence, destruction, and civilian suffering were broadcast to the American public, creating a growing sense of disillusionment. As media reports turned increasingly negative, public opinion also began to turn against the war. The US government was thus forced to rethink its involvement in Vietnam in order to maintain public support.

OR

E.g. Another reason that contributed to the United States ending its involvement in the Vietnam War was the **rising anti-war sentiments among the American public**. Extensive media coverage revealed the harsh realities of the war, including shocking incidents such as the My Lai Massacre, where unarmed South Vietnamese civilians were killed by American soldiers. Graphic and widely publicised images—such as the execution of a Viet Cong captain by a South Vietnamese general—deeply disturbed the American public and intensified opposition to the war. These revelations sparked widespread protests and demonstrations across the country, as more Americans began to question the morality and purpose of the war. Faced with mounting public pressure and a deeply divided nation, the US government was compelled to reconsider its involvement, eventually leading to its withdrawal from Vietnam.

L3	<p>Explains how the Tet Offensive led to US ending its involvement in the Vietnam War AND how other factors led to it</p> <p>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the Tet Offensive led to US ending its involvement in the Vietnam War AND how other factors led to it, and additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>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 reasons.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>E.g. L3 + In conclusion, <u>I believe that the Tet Offensive was the key event that triggered the United States to begin ending its involvement in the Vietnam War</u>. Although the war had already reached a stalemate before the offensive, the US remained determined to continue fighting. However, the scale and surprise of the Tet Offensive deeply shook both American troops and the public, causing many to question the purpose and effectiveness of the war effort. This turning point was further reinforced by the growing influence of the media, which exposed the harsh realities of the conflict and intensified anti-war sentiment across the country. As public support declined, the US government was ultimately forced to reconsider its position and move toward withdrawal.</p>	6 – 8
----	--	-------

3	'The Cold War came to an end because of Gorbachev's economic reforms.' How far do you agree with this statement?	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	<p>Identifies/describes the reasons behind the end of Cold War</p> <p>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.</p> <p>Other possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decline of Soviet Union (Weaknesses of economy, Opposition to Communism in Eastern Europe, Ageing leadership) - US economic and military superiority - Gorbachev's political reforms - Gorbachev's foreign policy reforms 	1 – 3

L2	<p>Explains how Gorbachev's economic reforms led to the end of Cold War OR other reasons that led to it</p> <p>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how Gorbachev's economic reforms led to the end of Cold War OR other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</p> <p>E.g. I agree that Gorbachev's economic reforms contributed to the end of the Cold War. These reforms, known as Perestroika, or "restructuring," aimed to revitalize the Soviet economy. They included encouraging innovation and allowing managers to try new approaches without seeking prior approval from the government. Managers were also encouraged to involve workers in discussions and decision-making processes regarding their workplaces. The goal was to foster new ideas, improve efficiency, and combat corruption. However, these reforms largely failed to produce an overall increase in output. Persistent problems such as unemployment, the growth of black markets, and shortages of basic necessities continued. <u>This led to increased criticism of Gorbachev's reforms and fueled the emergence of opposition groups that challenged the communist government. These developments ultimately contributed to the government's collapse and the end of the Cold War.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. Another reason that led to the end of Cold War was Gorbachev's political reforms. One of his political reforms include Glasnost, which allowed open political debate by Communist Party members who disagreed with the government. It would also allow criticism of the government in the media. However, Glasnost backfired because it released much resentment against the communist government. It also exposed shortcomings of the government officials such as their inefficiency and corruption. <u>This led to decreasing confidence in the party.</u> The Soviets were also further exposed to aspects of the outside world, especially the better quality of life in the US and Western European countries, through popular Western culture. As a result, the positive picture of Soviet life that the government previously presented to the public quickly fell apart. <u>Many in the Soviet bloc felt deceived and lost confidence in the vision and rule of the communist governments. This eventually brought about the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of Cold War.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>E.g. Another factor that contributed to the end of the Cold War was Gorbachev's foreign policy reforms. He began reducing defense spending, which led to the shrinking of the Red Army. He also withdrew Soviet troops from Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, and</p>	4 – 5
----	--	-------

	Vietnam, signaling a shift away from ideologically driven actions aimed at spreading communism worldwide and challenging the United States. Gorbachev even convened leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries to explain his new stance. <u>These moves helped to ease Cold War tensions with the US</u> , and they paved the way for US President Reagan to meet with Gorbachev. The two leaders reached agreements to further reduce their nuclear arsenals. <u>These arms control agreements, along with Gorbachev's policy of non-intervention in the affairs of other communist countries, led to the erosion of credibility and confidence towards Soviet Union's influence and power</u> , thus paving the way for the end of Cold War.	
L3	<p>Explains how Gorbachev's economic reforms led to the end of Cold War AND other reasons that led to it</p> <p>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how Gorbachev's economic reforms led to the end of Cold War AND other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>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 reasons.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>E.g. L3 + In conclusion, I believe that <u>Gorbachev's political reforms were the most significant factor</u> that led to the end of the Cold War. These reforms had a profound impact on changing people's perceptions of communism itself, causing the government to lose support among the populace. Additionally, the failure of the economic reforms fueled further criticism of the government, making it increasingly difficult for it to maintain popularity and control, which contributed to its eventual collapse. Gorbachev's willingness to implement policies of non-interference in other communist countries and to reduce the Soviet military also played a crucial role in easing Cold War tensions. These diplomatic efforts were equally important in bringing about the end of the Cold War.</p>	6 – 8

4	'Malaya attained independence because of the impact of the Emergency.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.	[10]
Level	Descriptor	Marks
L1	Identifies/describes the reasons for Malaya attaining independence <i>1 mark for identifying one reason, and 2 marks for identifying 2 or more.</i>	1 – 3

	Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing 2 or more.	
L2	<p>Explains how the impacts of how the Emergency led to independence OR other reasons that led to it</p> <p>Award 4 marks for an explanation of how the impacts of the Emergency led to independence OR other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</p> <p>E.g. I agree that the impact of Emergency had an important role to play in Malaya attaining independence. The Emergency that was declared by the British was a reaction to the communist insurgency in 1948. After the murder of plantation managers, the British responded with a variety of measures to curb communist activities in Malaya. These included political reforms as well as military responses had many effects and impacts on society that led to independence. As a part of the British response to Emergency, the British sought to nurture a locally elected government made up of anti-communist leaders who were credible and acceptable to the people. The British believed that this <u>would weaken the MCP's support and its claim to be fighting for a free Malaya</u>. In 1951, the British introduced the Member System to the Federal Legislative Council. This gave leaders in Malaya <u>opportunities to be involved in local administration and to gain political experience in governing their own country</u>. By <u>providing the locals with such opportunities in administration, it equipped the people with the skills and knowledge to run a country independent, making independence a viable reality</u>. This <u>in turn hastened Malaya's path to independence as circumstances created by the Emergency led to more political autonomy being channelled to the locals, further ensuring that they were ready and prepared for independence</u>.</p>	4 – 5
L3	<p>Explains how the Emergency led to independence AND other reasons that led to it</p> <p>Award 6 marks for an explanation of how the impacts of the Emergency led to independence AND other reasons that led to it, and an additional mark for additional reason(s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>E.g. Another reason that Malaya attained independence was the formation of the Alliance. In response to the Malayan Union, various ethnic groups in Malaya became actively involved in the politics of the country. UMNO, MCA and MIC were formed to look out for the rights of their respective Malay, Chinese and Indian residents. In the early days of their formation, due to the vastly differing experiences of the racial groups in the Japanese Occupation, multi-racial groups were not popular and locals tended to support their own respective ethnic political parties.</p>	6 – 8

<p>However, the British preferred a multiracial government for Malaya and was willing to accept an ethnic-based political system if the three parties could show that they could resolve their differences. In response to the British's terms, UMNO and MCA began a policy of cooperation. They agreed not to compete against each other in the Kuala Lumpur elections in 1952; this was followed by their success of winning 9 of 12 seats in the election. This cooperation further expanded in 1955 when MIC joined forces with UMNO and MCA to form the Alliance and contest the federal elections together. They won 51 out of 52 seats, gaining a landslide 81% of the vote. <u>This decisive victory of the Alliance convinced the British that local leaders were capable of negotiating amongst themselves and able to find common political grounds to stand on.</u> This in turn led to the <u>London Talks</u> that outlined the terms of the Merdeka Constitution that <u>Malaya's independence would be founded on</u>. By showing that the Alliance could overcome ethnic lines and present a united front, the British became confident to take next steps to ensure Malaya's formal independence.</p> <p>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 terms. 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).</p> <p>E.g. L3 + In conclusion, I believe that the impact of the Emergency had a larger part to play in Malaya's independence. Specifically, the British response to the Emergency determined the political trajectory of the Malayans. The British decision to respond to the Emergency with political reforms actively engaged the local community in shaping their path to independence. Political reforms provided locals with the skills and capabilities early on to engage in political campaigning. Such campaigning know-how served the Alliance well as shown in their subsequent successes at the elections.</p>
