

PAPER 2 (ESSAY-TYPE QUESTIONS)

1. Choose two of the following issues and examine how the Hong Kong government tackled the problems arising from these issues.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of the relevant problems and the ways the Hong Kong government tackled them, supported by solid historical data that stretch over a considerable period of time.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the relevant problems and the way the Hong Kong government tackled them. Historical data stretch over a considerable period of time.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt of examining the relevant problems and the way the Hong Kong government tackled them; but discussion is obviously lopsided to either the problems or the way they were tackled, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical data cover a considerable period of time.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion is based on vaguely identified 'problems'.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question, and discussion is based on vaguely identified 'problems'.	E	6-7
- Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralisation, or - Primarily a narration of the Hong Kong government's policies implemented in the periods concerned, without obvious efforts to identify the relevant problems.	E/F	5
- A narration of Hong Kong's development in the periods concerned, without any efforts to discuss relevant problems and the Hong Kong government's responses.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Problems: how the issues affected colonial governance and livelihood.
- Ways of tackling: policies that the Hong Kong government adopted to tackle corresponding problems.

2. **‘The Qing government failed to transform China in the period 1900-12, whereas the Nanjing government succeeded in transforming the country in the period 1927-37.’ Do you agree? Justify your view.**

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation of with balanced treatment of both periods, able to focus the argument on ‘transform’. Discussion is supported by solid historical examples that cover most of the period.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to provide a generally balanced treatment of both periods and focus the argument on ‘transform’. Historical examples cover a considerable part of the period, possibly marred by minor lopsidedness.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to handle both periods, but contains lopsidedness and/or obvious weakness in understanding the keyword ‘transform’ (for example, mistaking it for ‘change’). Historical examples cover a good part of the period, possibly marred by minor lopsidedness.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, with obvious inadequacy in handling ‘transform’; only tackles one period, or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; the answer contains obvious inadequacy in handling ‘transform’ and rough arguments, and/or - Tackles only one period, marred by minor mistakes, or attempts to tackle both but containing obvious mistakes and rough contents.	E	6-7
- Primarily a narration of developments in the periods in question, with only one or two lines on ‘transform’ and /or ‘change’.	E/F	5
- A narration of developments in the periods in question without any efforts on ‘transform’ and/or ‘change’.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following facts may be covered:

‘Transform’ means ‘fundamental change’. Candidates should give separate accounts of the two periods about whether China had been transformed as a result of the various reforms by the regimes in place.

3. Discuss the factors that worked for, and those that worked against, the development of the relationship between the People's Republic of China and Japan in the period 1949-2000.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with a logical and balanced discussion of how the two sets of factors affected the relationship in the period in question, supported by solid historical examples that cover a considerable part of the period.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the ways the two sets of factors affected the relationship in the period in question. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, with a good attempt to discuss the ways the two sets of factors affected the relationship in the period in question; but discussion is noticeably lopsided and contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question and obvious efforts to narrate the factors, but it is not always clear in explaining how such factors affected the relationship, or - Only tackles one set of factors, or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question, with noticeable efforts to narrate the factors, but the answer is weak in explaining how such factors affected the relationship, or - Tackles only one set of factors, marred by minor mistakes, or attempts to tackle both but containing obvious mistakes and rough contents.	E	6-7
- Primarily a narration of the relationship between the PRC and Japan, with only one or two lines that causally touch upon the factors behind.	E/F	5
- A general narration of the relationship between the PRC and Japan in the period in question, without any efforts to discuss the factors behind.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Such factors may include the USA, Taiwan, historical issues, history textbook issues, economic cooperation, etc.

4. 'Germany was more aggressive in the 1930s than it was before the First World War.' Comment on the validity of this statement.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of the extent of Germany's aggressiveness in the two periods, supported by solid historical examples of different aspects that cover a considerable period of time.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the extent of Germany's aggressiveness in the two periods. Historical examples cover a considerable period of time. Contents cover reasonably diverse aspects.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to examine the extent of Germany's aggressiveness in the two periods; but obviously lopsided to either period, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover reasonably diverse aspects and a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and the discussion focuses merely on one period; or tackles both but marred by rough arguments.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; the discussion attempts to tackle one period only, marred by rough arguments; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough arguments and lopsidedness.	E	6-7
- Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralization, or - Primarily a narration of Germany's diplomacy in the two periods with only one or two lines that casually touch upon the relative aggressiveness.	E/F	5
- A general narration of Germany's diplomacy in the two periods without assessing the relative aggressiveness.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- German diplomacy before the First World War: alliance system, 'blank cheque' to Austria-Hungry, Schlieffen Plan, etc.
- German diplomacy in the 1930s: reoccupation of the Rhineland, territorial annexation (Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, etc), etc.

3. Discuss the factors that worked for, and those that worked against, the development of the relationship between the People's Republic of China and Japan in the period 1949-2000.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with a logical and balanced discussion of how the two sets of factors affected the relationship in the period in question, supported by solid historical examples that cover a considerable part of the period.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the ways the two sets of factors affected the relationship in the period in question. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, with a good attempt to discuss the ways the two sets of factors affected the relationship in the period in question; but discussion is noticeably lopsided and contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question and obvious efforts to narrate the factors, but it is not always clear in explaining how such factors affected the relationship, or - Only tackles one set of factors, or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question, with noticeable efforts to narrate the factors, but the answer is weak in explaining how such factors affected the relationship, or - Tackles only one set of factors, marred by minor mistakes, or attempts to tackle both but containing obvious mistakes and rough contents.	E	6-7
- Primarily a narration of the relationship between the PRC and Japan, with only one or two lines that causally touch upon the factors behind.	E/F	5
- A general narration of the relationship between the PRC and Japan in the period in question, without any efforts to discuss the factors behind.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Such factors may include the USA, Taiwan, historical issues, history textbook issues, economic cooperation, etc.

4. 'Germany was more aggressive in the 1930s than it was before the First World War.' Comment on the validity of this statement.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of the extent of Germany's aggressiveness in the two periods, supported by solid historical examples of different aspects that cover a considerable period of time.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the extent of Germany's aggressiveness in the two periods. Historical examples cover a considerable period of time. Contents cover reasonably diverse aspects.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to examine the extent of Germany's aggressiveness in the two periods; but obviously lopsided to either period, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover reasonably diverse aspects and a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and the discussion focuses merely on one period; or tackles both but marred by rough arguments.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; the discussion attempts to tackle one period only, marred by rough arguments; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough arguments and lopsidedness.	E	6-7
- Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralization, or - Primarily a narration of Germany's diplomacy in the two periods with only one or two lines that casually touch upon the relative aggressiveness.	E/F	5
- A general narration of Germany's diplomacy in the two periods without assessing the relative aggressiveness.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- German diplomacy before the First World War: alliance system, 'blank cheque' to Austria-Hungary, Schlieffen Plan, etc.
- German diplomacy in the 1930s: reoccupation of the Rhineland, territorial annexation (Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, etc), etc.

5. 'A characteristic of the Cold War (1946-91) was US response to USSR challenges rather than USSR response to US challenges.' Do you agree? Justify your view.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of challenges and responses between the USA and the USSR in the period 1946-91, supported by solid historical examples that stretch over a considerable period of time.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines challenges and responses between the USA and the USSR in the period 1946-91. Historical examples stretch over a considerable period of time.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to examine challenges and response between the USA and the USSR in the period 1946-91, but slightly lopsided to challenges or responses, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and the answer is overwhelmingly about challenges or response, or - The answer contains rough arguments and/or vagueness.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question, and the answer is overwhelmingly about challenges or response, and marred by rough arguments and overgeneralisation.	E	6-7
- Primarily a narration of US-USSR relationship in the period in question with one or two lines that casually touch upon challenges and/or response.	E/F	5
- A narration of US-USSR relationship in the period in question without any efforts to discuss challenges and response between the two superpowers.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Various issues in the Cold War, such as Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and Molotov Plan, Berlin Blockade, NATO and Warsaw Pact, Vietnam War, Cuban Missile Crisis, and space race.

6. **Discuss the relative importance of nationalism and foreign intervention in shaping Arab-Israeli relations in the period 1945-2000.**

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of nationalism and foreign intervention in terms of their relative importance in shaping Arab-Israeli relations in the period 1945-2000, supported by solid historical examples that cover a considerable period of time.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the relative importance of nationalism and foreign intervention in shaping Arab-Israeli relations in the period 1945-2000. Historical examples cover a considerable period of time.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to examine the relative importance of nationalism and foreign intervention in shaping Arab-Israeli relations in the period 1945-2000, but discussion is slightly lopsided to either nationalism or foreign intervention, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion focuses on either nationalism or foreign intervention; or tackles both but marred by rough content.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; discussion focuses on either nationalism or foreign intervention, marred by rough content; or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content and lopsidedness.	E	6-7
- Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralization, or - Primarily a narration of Arab-Israeli relations, with only or two lines that casually touch upon the relative importance of the two factors in shaping such relations.	E/F	5
- A narration of Arab-Israeli relations in the period without analyzing the relative importance of the two factors in shaping such relations.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Nationalism: issues of nationalism and conflicts focusing on the legitimacy of ruling Jerusalem and Palestine.
- Foreign intervention: intervention by countries such as Britain, the USA and the USSR, role of the UN, etc.

7. **Select one regional intergovernmental organisation (such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the European Economic Community) covered in your History course, and explain its formation and development up to the end of the 20th century.**

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable and balanced discussion of the formation and development of the chosen organisation, supported by solid historical examples that cover a considerable part of the period.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to discuss the formation and development of the chosen organisation. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to discuss the formation and development of the chosen organisation, but marred by lopsidedness and occasional vagueness. Historical examples cover a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion focuses on either the formation or development of the chosen organisation; or tackles both but marred by rough content.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; discussion focuses on either the formation or development of the chosen organisation; or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content and lopsidedness.	E	6-7
- Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralization, or - A narrative narration of the chosen organisation, with only one or two lines that casually touch upon its formation and development.	E/F	5
- A general narration of the chosen organisation, without discussing its formation and development.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2