

Suggested Answer / Marking Scheme

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

(a) Study Source A.

Why was this cartoon created at this time? Explain your answer. [5]

Target skill: Inference with purpose

Level	Level Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identifies sub-message or invalid purpose <i>Source A was meant to show that Germany and Italy were allies.</i>	[1m]
L2	Specific context of 1939 or use of contextual knowledge <i>Source A was created when the Allies had decided that Hitler was not to be trusted after he invaded Czechoslovakia and thus they had to be wary of him.</i>	[2m]
L3	Identifies the main message Source A was created to show that Hitler cannot be trusted. Source A shows Hitler using fake promises to get more rewards from a candy machine which is labelled as “appeasement sweets of conquest”. There have already been several discarded wrappers on the ground labelled as Czechoslovakia and Austria while Mussolini also watches having taken his share of Abyssinia. This proves that appeasement is a failure as it only encourages more violence and aggression by Hitler.	[3m]
L4	Reason based on purpose with contextual knowledge and outcome Award 4m for purpose, 5m for purpose with context Source A was created to tell the western readers that they had to take a stand against Hitler and support their governments’ mission to rearm. Source A shows Hitler using fake promises to get more rewards from a candy machine which is labelled as “appeasement sweets of conquest”. There have already been several discarded wrappers on the ground labelled as Czechoslovakia and Austria, while Mussolini also watches having taken his share of Abyssinia. This proves that appeasement is a failure as it only encourages more violence and aggression by Hitler and thus a stronger response is needed. (4m) This was especially important as Hitler had begun threatening Poland, especially after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, despite the Munich agreement. (5m)	4-5m

(b) Study Source B.

How far is source B useful in helping you understand Britain’s perspective of Hitler
[6]

Target skill: Utility

Level	Descriptors	Marks
-------	-------------	-------

L1	Undeveloped provenance	[1m]
L2	Helpful based on content, supported and explained using source details OR Not helpful due to missing information <i>Award higher mark for more detailed responses</i> Source B is useful in telling me that Britain viewed Hitler as an ally. Source B states that “Hitler has taken upon himself to fight against our common enemy, the communists, the biggest threat. Those of you who have called themselves the heralds of woe, that Hitler is the coming of the second war, need only look at his actions and judge them”. This means Hitler was deemed as trustworthy ally in their efforts to combat communism which was perceived to be the biggest threat. OR Source B is not useful due to missing information. Source B merely states the contributions of Hitler to fight against communism but does not tell us about Hitler’s own self-serving objectives to train up his military in the Spanish civil war therefore its not helpful.	[2-3m]
L3	Both parts of L2	[4m]
L4	helpful/Not helpful based on attempt to evaluate what is said by cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge (Answers that address just reliability and not utility should be given L2:3marks) Source B is useful and reliable in telling me that Britain viewed Hitler as an ally after cross referencing to source C. Source C states that “we cannot foresee the time when our defense forces will be strong enough to safeguard our territory, trade, and vital interests against Germany, Italy and Japan simultaneously. We cannot, therefore, exaggerate the importance, from the point of view of Imperial defense, of any political or international action that can be taken to reduce the numbers of our potential enemies or to gain the support of potential allies”. This means that getting Hitler on their side was a necessary measure to increase their own national security which implies that they trusted Hitler. As both sources agree on a shared national interest to ally with Hitler due to his value in the alliance, Source B is useful and reliable.	[5m]
L5	Not Helpful based on evaluating purpose in context. Source B is not useful and not reliable after analyzing its purpose. Source B is by Chamberlain who is the architect of the appeasement policy and as such would be expected to defend his decision to do so and his wooing of Hitler as an ally. Source B states that “Hitler has taken upon himself to fight against our common enemy, the communists, the biggest threat. Those of you who have called themselves the heralds of woe, that Hitler is the coming of the second war, need only look at his actions and judge them”. This means Hitler was deemed as trustworthy ally in their efforts to combat communism which was perceived to be the biggest threat. As he is trying to convince the British parliament about the necessity of this	[6m]

	approach to get them to support him in this endeavour, this makes it unreliable and hence not useful.	
--	---	--

(c) Study Source C.

How surprised are you by what this source says about the British security considerations? Explain your answer. [5]

Target skill: Surprised

Levels	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Answers that did not address surprise	1m
L2	Answers Surprised/ Not Surprised, unexplained	2m
L3	Answers Surprised/ Not Surprised based on content, explained I am not surprised from source C in saying that British security considerations were global. Source C states that “But the outstanding feature of the present situation is the increasing probability that a war started in any one of these three areas [Africa, Asia and Western Europe] may extend to one or both of the other two”. This means that the British empire had to consider the security of their empire and plan accordingly as they all had interconnected networks. This isn’t surprising as the British empire had multiple colonies around the world so they had to consider each one carefully. I am not surprised that British security considerations were complex. Source C states that “We cannot, therefore, exaggerate the importance, from the point of view of Imperial defense, of any political or international action that can be taken to reduce the numbers of our potential enemies or to gain the support of potential allies.” This means that British security measures had to extend beyond simple military deterrence but rather diplomacy as well. This isn’t surprising as diplomacy and deterrence normally go hand in hand in ensuring that peace can be maintained.	3m
L4	Answers surprised/not surprised based on perspective Source C is not surprising due to its perspective. As it is a report by the Chief of Staff of Britain naturally it would be comprehensive and well researched with facts as it concerns the future of Britain. Source C states that “We cannot, therefore, exaggerate the importance, from the point of view of Imperial defense, of any political or international action that can be taken to reduce the numbers of our potential enemies or to gain the support of potential allies.” This means that British security measures had to extend beyond simple military deterrence to diplomacy as well. This isn’t surprising as the report was done in the consideration that Britain had severely cut spending on the military in favor of job creation and thus leaving them severely unprepared to tackle future military threats.	4m

Levels	Descriptors	Marks
L5	L3+ Answers Surprised/ Not Surprised based on contextual knowledge Source C is not surprising in stating that British security considerations were complex after cross referencing to contextual knowledge. As the Axis alliance had been signed in 1937 which increased the likelihood of war which Britain could not be certain to win due to the strength of all 3 of those empires and their geographical challenges, Britain had to reinforce their security around the world, thus posing a huge logistical challenge for it as the size of their empire became a liability both within Europe and Asia, thus, they had to prioritise the European theatre instead of Asia, which left it relatively weaker, which contributed to the swift victories of Japan in 1941.	5m

(d) Study Sources D and E.

Having read source E, how reliable is D as evidence about the perception of Hitler?
[6]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Describes sources only/Reliability based on provenance	[1-2m]
L2	Comparison of reliability based on comparison of source content Example: Source D is reliable in its portrayal of Hitler as a person without integrity whom the western powers have to be firm with after reading source E. Source D states "That man has no shred of humanity, only greed and rage. Our people have sacrificed before, now I'm afraid that another generation will see the ravages of war again because of that madman. I have advised Chamberlain not to pursue that foolish path and work on rearmament of which the USA will assist." This implies that Hitler cannot be reasoned with and Britain has to step up to fight him. This corroborates with source E which shows Chamberlain and Halifax indicating "we will fight" to Hitler and the other Nazi leaders after they had threatened Poland. The strong arm on which the words are printed on implies that Britain had continually built up the military strength to finally take a stand against Hitler whom they mistrust.	[3m]
L3	L2+Comparison of reliability based on cross-reference to contextual knowledge or other source Award higher mark for more developed answers After reading Source E, Source D is reliable in its portrayal of Hitler as a person without integrity whom the western powers have to be firm with after cross referencing to Source A. Source A corroborates Source E's portrayal of Hitler as a person without integrity as it shows Hitler	[4-5m]

	using fake promises to get more rewards from a candy machine which is labelled as “appeasement sweets of conquest”. It was also shown in the source that there had already been several discarded wrappers on the ground labelled as Czechoslovakia and Austria, suggesting that appeasement was no longer viable as it only encouraged more violence and aggression by Hitler who abused their trust and thus a stronger response is needed. Thus, as Source A supports Source E’s claim that Hitler was not a trustworthy person and had to be resisted, Source D is reliable. OR After reading Source E, Source D is reliable in its portrayal of Hitler as a person without integrity whom the western powers have to be firm with after cross referencing to contextual knowledge. By this point, Chamberlain had abandoned appeasement and promised to support Poland if attacked, (p.268) This corroborates Source E showing that Britain could “no longer remain unmoved” and would resist Hitler. Thus, it confirms that by 1939 Hitler was widely perceived as a threat. Therefore, having read Source E, Source D is reliable.	
L4	Comparison of reliability based on purpose After reading Source E, Source D might be unreliable as evidence about the perception of Hitler. Source E is a British cartoon likely aimed at <i>rallying public opinion to resist Hitler</i>, and exaggerates by showing Britain finally standing firm against Hitler and Chamberlain holding a letter that reads “we cannot remain unmoved”. Similarly, Source D, a private remark by Roosevelt, uses highly emotional language, calling Hitler a man with “no shred of humanity, only greed and rage”. This reflects his likely <u>purpose of persuading his aides to abandon appeasement and support rearmament with US help</u>. Both sources exaggerate because of their purposes, but they still agree that Hitler was seen as a serious threat by 1939. Therefore, having read Source E, Source D is reliable in showing that perception of Hitler as a person without integrity whom the western powers have to be firm with.	[6m]

(e) Study **all** the sources.

“Britain was justified to pursue the policy of appeasement.” How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer [8]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no valid source use.	1
L2	Yes OR No, supported by valid source use. Award 1 mark for each source use up to a maximum of 4 marks.	2 – 4

Yes (Sources B, C, E)

Source B supports the view. Source B states that "Hitler has taken upon himself to fight against our common enemy, the communists, the biggest threat. Those of you who have called themselves the heralds of woe, that Hitler is the coming of the second war, need only look at his actions and judge them". This means that appeasement was logical considering that Hitler was viewed as a trustworthy ally against communism.

Source C supports the view. Source C states that "we cannot foresee the time when our defense forces will be strong enough to safeguard our territory, trade, and vital interests against Germany, Italy and Japan simultaneously. We cannot, therefore, exaggerate the importance, from the point of view of Imperial defense, of any political or international action that can be taken to reduce the numbers of our potential enemies or to gain the support of potential allies". This means that appeasement was justified to buy time for Britain to strengthen its military to ensure that they were able to fight a multi-front war.

Source E supports the view. Source E shows Chamberlain and Halifax indicating "we will fight" to Hitler and the other nazi leaders after they had threatened Poland. The strong arm on which the words are printed on implies that Britain had continually built up the military strength to finally take a stand against Hitler and therefore it justifies the policy of appeasement to buy time to rearm.

No (Sources A, D, E, F)

Source A does not support. Source A shows Hitler using fake promises to get more rewards from a candy machine which is labelled as "appeasement sweets of conquest". There have already been several discarded wrappers on the ground labelled as Czechoslovakia and Austria while Mussolini also watches having taken his share of Abyssinia. This proves that appeasement is a failure as it only encourages more violence and aggression thus Britain is not justified to pursue it.

Source D does not support. Source D states that "I appealed to Hitler's sense of humanity; that hundreds of millions would recognize his peaceful actions as a historic service to humanity. How could I do so? That man has no shred of humanity, only greed and rage. Our people have sacrificed before, now I'm afraid that another generation will see the ravages of war again because of that madman. I have advised Chamberlain not to pursue that foolish path and work on rearmament of which the USA will assist." This means that appeasement would have only worked on someone that is reasonable and since Hitler's ambition only grew further, it destroys the objective of appeasement to contain his ambitions and prevent war thus Britain is not justified to pursue it.

Source E does not support. Source E shows Chamberlain and Halifax indicating "we will fight" to Hitler and the other nazi leaders after they

	had threatened Poland. The fact that they had indicated they were willing to fight means that the objective of appeasement had failed since it was meant to preserve the peace thus Britain is not justified to pursue it. Source F does not support. Source F states that “We reclaimed our sovereignty in the Rhineland. We not only rebuilt but strengthened our proud military. We are battle-tested in the far west of Europe and have perfected our strategies. Now it is our job to ensure that his sacrifices and trust in our destiny is rewarded.” This means that appeasement had failed in its objective for peace as it allowed Germany to strengthen itself as they felt that the western allies would not intervene which would eventually lead to war, thus Britain was not justified in pursuing appeasement.	
L3	Yes AND No. supported by valid source use. Award 5 marks for one Y and N supported by valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks. e.g. Both aspects of L2 While Source B agrees, it is not useful and not reliable after analyzing its purpose. Source B is by Chamberlain who is the architect of the appeasement policy and as such would be expected to defend his decision to do so and his wooing of Hitler as an ally. Source B states that “Hitler has taken upon himself to fight against our common enemy, the communists, the biggest threat. Those of you who have called themselves the heralds of woe, that Hitler is the coming of the second war, need only look at his actions and judge them”. This means Hitler was deemed as trustworthy ally in their efforts to combat communism which was perceived to be the biggest threat. As he is trying to convince the British parliament about the necessity of this approach to get them to support him in this endeavour, this makes it unreliable and hence not useful. (reliability) As Source E disagrees, it is further backed up by contextual knowledge that Hitler had already signed Axis alliance in 1937 which had already aroused the suspicions of the Allies and made aggressive moves to annex territories beyond what was acceptable. They should have seen the signs that Hitler would not have stopped in his quest to demand more and appeasement was not justified as it had no clear means to stop them thus leading them to take a firmer stance as seen in source E in 1939 when they realized the folly of their actions. (CK)	5 – 8

For L2 and L3, award a bonus of up to 2 marks (+1/+1) for use of contextual knowledge to evaluate a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency, etc. The total mark for the question must not exceed 8.

Notes:

- To score in L2/L3 there must be source use, i.e. direct reference to source content.

- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues in the sources is not enough.
- Higher marks in L2/L3 to be awarded on numbers of sources used.

Section B: Essays

- 2 'The structural weaknesses of the League of Nations was the most significant factor that made it incapable of preventing conflict in the 1920s.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identify/Describes reasons <i>Award 1m for identifying 1 reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing 1 reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.</i>	[1 – 3]
L2	Explains yes or no <i>Award 4m for an explanation of how structural weakness of LON led to war (OR) other reasons (s), and an additional mark for additional reason (s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	[4 – 5]
L3	Explains Yes AND No <i>Award 6m for an explanation of how structural weakness of LON led to war and other reason and additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> Yes. The League of Nations had various structural weaknesses that resulted in their failure to conduct peacekeeping effectively. Sanctions could only be passed on LON members and they could leave voluntarily thus negating the effects of sanctions. They also had to be passed with a unanimous vote which was impossible because the offending party would simply vote no and no action could be undertaken. For example, when Poland invaded Vilna, the LON could not make Poland withdraw as Britain and France did not vote to act against Poland. While this was in consideration to each countries' sovereignty, it severely curtailed the LON's ability to deter aggression. The LON also lacked members which created a problem in terms of collective security and oversight over global problems. They had little to no means to do peacekeeping as their measures were ineffective. Thus this made the LON incapable of preventing conflict in the 1920s. No. It was the lack of authority and credibility that led to the LON being unable to prevent war. The LON members were made up of the victorious nations in WWI and thus its reputation as the victors did not sit well with other nations that were not invited in the LON. Moreover, the USA which had suggested the idea of the LON did not join it which removed the moral authority of the organization in the first place. Many of the peacekeeping/disarmament measures that succeeded in 1920s were done outside the LON such as the Washington Naval conference	[6 – 8]

	which meant that there was an impression that the LON was worthless as such measures could be conducted between nations without the need for a middleman. Therefore this led to countries ignoring the LON as a credible peacekeeping organization which led to aggressors being undeterred by it and conducting aggression to other states leading to conflict in 1920s.	
	Evaluation <i>Award an additional 2m (to a max of 10m) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i> In conclusion, yes it was the structural weakness of the LON that led to war. The measures of the LON were heavily dependent on the rules set by the organisation themselves and by inadvertently putting such loopholes, it set itself up for failure which no number of additional members could solve or credibility. Even if there had been adequate members, it would still be impossible to have enacted effective measures due to the lack of unanimous agreement thus making it the root cause of their lack of authority. Therefore, it was the fault of the structural weakness that led to the LON being weak which led to war.	+2m

- 3 “Germany under Hitler was thriving in all aspects of life.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.[10]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identify/Describes reasons <i>Award 1m for identifying 1 reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more. Award 2m for describing 1 reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.</i>	[1 – 3]
L2	Explains yes or no <i>Award 4m for an explanation of how Germany under Hitler was prosperous, how it wasn't and an additional mark for additional reason (s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	[4 – 5]
L3	Explains Yes AND No <i>Award 6m for an explanation of Germany under Hitler was prosperous and that it was not prosperous and additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks</i> Yes. Germany under Hitler was thriving in all aspects of life as it had solved its economic issues. In the early 1930s, the Germany that Hitler took over was beset with huge unemployment due to the aftermath of the Great Depression in 1929. The Weimar government which collapsed due to their inability to solve it as US cash dried up had left Hitler with a population depending on soup kitchens and government handouts. Hitler embarked on a massive rearmament campaign which created jobs for the unemployed soldiers. He was also able to conduct	[6 – 8]

	huge infrastructural projects to simulate the civilian economy. These measures immediately helped to revive the economy and decrease unemployment. As wages increased, the German people thrived and thus Germany became prosperous under Hitler. No. Germany under Hitler was not thriving in all aspects of life as there was a climate of fear present. When the Nazis came to power, they quickly removed their political opponents to ensure that their grip on power was secure. In the Night of the Long Knives and using the Reichstag fire as an excuse, they got rid of their political opponents namely the communists but also ex-presidents such as Schleider. They also systemically exterminated undesirables such as gays, gypsies and more significantly the Jews. They also persecuted priests who did not conform to the official doctrine of the Nazi church, this meant that any opposition to the Nazis would be met with swift clampdowns and thus creating an atmosphere of fear for the people living in Germany thus making it oppressive rather than thriving. Also accept: Germany being thriving as Hitler brought back national pride (breaking of TOV, taking back Rhineland etc)	
	Evaluation <i>Award an additional 2m (to a max of 10m) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i> Overall yes, I would argue that it was still thriving as the vast majority of Germans approved of Hitler's rule due to the extent of their lives being improved. They would not have supported Hitler if their lives had been worse than before and the people being persecuted were minorities thus considering the scale of the population, it is undeniable that Germany would be considered thriving under Hitler especially as even though there was a climate of fear, the vast majority could accept it as long as they saw tangible improvements in their standard of living thus they felt that they were thriving as compared to under the Weimar government.	+2m

- 4 “The USSR’s external economic burdens was the main reason for the downfall of the USSR” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
[10]

Level	Descriptors	Marks
L1	Identify/Describes reasons <i>Award 1m for identifying 1 reason, 2m for identifying 2 or more.</i>	[1 – 3]

	<i>Award 2m for describing 1 reason, 3m for describing 2 or more.</i>	
L2	Explains yes or no <i>Award 4m for an explanation of how détente led to USSR collapse (OR) how other reason (s) contributed to the downfall of USSR and an additional mark for additional reason (s) or further supporting detail, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	[4 – 5]
L3	Explains Yes AND No <i>Award 6m for an explanation of how détente led to USSR collapse and other reason(s) and additional mark for further supporting detail or reason, to a maximum of 8 marks</i> Yes the USSR external economic burdens was the main reason that led to downfall of the USSR as it increased the pressure on the USSR which they could not respond to effectively leading to their demise. The USSR was involved in multiple proxy wars such as the Arab-Israeli conflicts and its own invasion of Afghanistan. These were all substantial financial burdens especially as the Mujahideen were supported by the USA. As the war in Afghanistan raged on, the USSR found themselves in a war that they could not win against an adversary proficient in guerilla war and supplied by an economic superpower USA. As it was untenable that the Soviet economy could sustain such a wasteful expenditure and standard of living within the USSR was poor, the USSR under Gorbachev eventually gave up and initiated reforms, abandoning the old systems thus leading to its eventual collapse. No it was glasnost that led to the downfall of the USSR. As Gorbachev sought to increase the public trust in USSR, he liberalized free speech within the USSR as a means to restore trust. He allowed for public debates and criticisms of the USSR government, he also allowed opposing political parties to contest in elections while giving citizens access to foreign news and more importantly he guaranteed that free speech would be a right for all soviet citizens. However this backfired as the soviet citizens managed to find out about all the secrets that were kept from them through foreign news media outlets and were able to vent their frustrations openly. This increase in public anger led to a wave of protests across the USSR which under glasnost the USSR government could not forcibly put down. Hence, it led to collapse of the government as the public forced them to step down which led to the downfall of the USSR. Also accept: Perestroika, foreign policy reforms, declining confidence in USSR	[6 – 8]
	Evaluation <i>Award an additional 2m (to a max of 10m) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different reasons.</i>	+2m

	““In conclusion, I agree that the USSR external economic burdens was the main reason that led to the collapse of USSR. The need to win wars, by spending heavily, to preserve their status as superpower resulted in renewed pressure that exposed the deep structural weaknesses of the Soviet command economy and placed unsustainable demands on its budget. It was in response to this external strain that Gorbachev introduced glasnost and perestroika as a reactive attempt to rescue a faltering system.” OR “In conclusion, I disagree that the USSR external economic burdens was the main reason that led to the collapse of USSR. The USSR economic burdens intensified internal pressures on the Soviet Union, but it was Gorbachev’s response to these pressures that fundamentally altered the Soviet system. His reforms of glasnost and perestroika, rather than strengthening the USSR, unintentionally destabilised the political structure and encouraged nationalist and democratic movements. Thus, it was Gorbachev’s reforms that directly set the USSR on the path to collapse.”	
--	---	--