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Question 1
Source A is critical of the League of Nations. How do you know?

Explain your answer using Source A and your contextual knowledge. [4 marks]

Mark scheme

Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

Level 2: Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 3–4

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the cartoon is critical of the League of Nations because it was produced at the time of the Manchurian Crisis when the League failed to stop the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. The title of the cartoon suggests that Japan is ignoring the League of Nations.

Level 1: Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 1–2

Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the cartoon shows that Japan is walking all over the League of Nations.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0
Student responses

Response A
Because it shows that Japan is walking over the league of nations and entering League of Nations Headquarters. It shows that Japan is in charge because the person behind the door bowing to him and has got flower in his hand.

This is a Level 1 response
The response shows a simple analysis of the source. Relevant features of the content are identified, and a simple inference is made though no contextual knowledge is included. It is credited at Level 1.

Response B
We know this as the cartoon was published in 1933. This was after the Manchurian Crisis which was detrimental to the league, showing it had no real power as it could not stop Japan from invading Manchuria. When they did invade, all the league could do was tell them off but Japan simply ignored them.

In the image Japan is depicted as walking over the league. This is in reference to the fact that Japan completely ignored them and did whatever they wanted to. This was Japan undermining the league of nations and showing how it can be completely ignored and walked all over. We know this as the league had no army to force Japan to stop.

This is a Level 2 response
The response demonstrates developed analysis of the provenance (time) of the source, which is supported with contextual knowledge. There is some repetition in the 2nd paragraph. Nevertheless, the response is credited at Level 2.
Question 2
How useful are Sources B and C to an historian studying the policy of appeasement?

Explain your answer using Source B and C and your contextual knowledge.

Mark scheme
[12 marks]

Target
- Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)
- Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)

In analysing and evaluating sources, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author’s situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4: Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance

Students may progress from a developed evaluation of the sources by complex reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and provenance. They may evaluate the relationship between the sources based on analysis of provenance and contextual knowledge.

For example, the sources are useful to show how difficult it was for the governments of the time to respond to the threats posed by Hitler. The Munich Agreement mentioned in Source B was the work of several countries, not just Britain alone, therefore the responsibility for giving in to his demands is a shared one. The American view in Source C is useful to show that even countries outside Europe were concerned with the issue of Czechoslovakia and the policy of appeasement.

Level 3: Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful for showing a positive view of appeasement as Chamberlain presented it to the people of Britain. The Munich Agreement allowed Hitler to occupy the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia despite it not being German land. However, in return for this concession, Chamberlain secured the Anglo-German declaration which was a promise that war would be avoided. Source C is critical of Chamberlain for thinking that Hitler will be content with the concessions. The Munich Agreement had allowed Hitler to take over land in Czechoslovakia. Hitler had promised not to make any further demands for more territory but many people at the time thought he would try and take more land.
For example, Source C is useful because it shows an opinion from outside Europe that was critical of Chamberlain's policy of appeasement. The cartoon reflects the view that by giving into Hitler the Munich Agreement would encourage his territorial ambitions even further. This prediction came true when Hitler invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia in 1939. Source B shows why, in the short term, appeasement seemed to have worked. Chamberlain wanted to use discussion to avoid war with Hitler and Source B was seen as evidence that he had achieved his aim.

**Level 2:** Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance 4–6

Students may progress from a basic analysis of the source(s) to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B shows that appeasement seemed to have worked. Chamberlain wanted to use discussion to avoid war with Hitler and this joint statement was seen as evidence that he had achieved his aim.

For example, Source C is criticising appeasement. The American cartoon is saying the Munich Agreement might not keep Hitler quiet for long. The Munich Agreement had allowed Hitler to take over land in Czechoslovakia. Hitler had promised not to make any further demands for more territory.

**Level 1:** Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Source B says that Germany and Britain agreed never to go to war.

Source C shows that Chamberlain is trying to keep Hitler quiet.

**Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question** 0
Student responses

Response A
Source B is useful to a historian studying the policy of appeasement. In the source it says ‘The Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935’ and ‘desire to avoid war’ from my contextual knowledge I know that Britain signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement with Germany stating that Germany can have a navy half the size of Britain’s- This was banned in the Treaty of Versailles but Britain did it to avoid war, this is the policy of appeasement. The nature of this source is a statement from Neville Chamberlain and Adolf Hitler in 1938. This means that this source is useful to a historian studying the policy of appeasement as it shows the policy in action.

Source C is useful to a historian studying the policy of appeasement. In the source it says ‘HE’LL BE QUIET NOW MAYBE’. This shows a figure named Chamberlain saying this. I can also see a baby sleeping with a bottle name ‘Munich agreement’ this baby also has a Swastika on it’s cot. From my contextual knowledge I know that Britain gave Hitler what he wanted in the Munich agreement to avoid war. The nature of this source is a cartoon published in October 1938. It’s origin is a American newspaper. The purpose of this source is to mock Neville Chamberlain, as many Americans thought he was weak for giving Hitler so many concessions at the Munich conference.

This is a Level 3 response
The response addresses both sources, and shows developed explanation of the purpose of source C in the final lines. The content of source B is addressed, showing simple evaluation. The response is credited at Level 3, at the lower mark in the level.
Response B

Source B is useful to a historian studying the policy of appeasement as it reveals the Prime minister, Chamberlain, and Hitler’s intentions behind signing it. The source states the policy shows “our countries’ desire to avoid war”, we know this to be true as the Munich Agreement allowed Hitler to reclaim the Sudetenland in return for no further invasions which could've lead to war. This is also useful in revealing public opinions – British and German citizens did not want war following the horrors and deaths of the First World War. Chamberlain claims he achieved ‘peace in our time’ through his policy of appeasement and the source supports the notion that he believed Germany would retain peace. The provenance of the source reveals that it is an adaptation of the statement issued by Chamberlain and Hitler; this first hand account gives validity to its content in expressing the truce claims behind the of appeasement.

Source C is useful to historians studying the policy of appeasement as it reveals attitudes of opposition towards it the source depicts Hitler as a baby, suggesting he is childish and erratic, being pacified by a bottle labelled ‘the Munich Agreement’. This suggests Chamberlain’s policy would only temporarily stop Hitler and that, when the bottle is empty he will continue to do as he pleases. Historians know this to be true as following the proposed reclaiming of the Sudetenland, Hitler would go on to invade Czechoslovakia. This broke the policy of appeasement as Hitler had no claim over the land and took it forcefully. These ideas are furthered by the text ‘Shh-hh! He'll be quite now-maybe!’ suggesting to Historians that Chamberlain know the policy would only be a temporary solution. The provenance reveals this cartoon was published in an American newspaper. At the time America practiced isolationism from European affairs, therefore the source is useful to historians as it reveals unbiased public opinions, of the time about effectiveness of the policy of appeasement.

This is a Level 4 response

The response shows developed evaluation of the content and provenance of both sources, supported with contextual knowledge. It also has a complex overall judgement at start of the first paragraph and again in paragraph 2 on basis of the relationship between the sources. It is credited at Level 4 at the top of the level.
Question 3
Write an account of how the League of Nations contributed to international peace in the 1920s.

[8 marks]

Mark scheme
Target
Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)

Level 4: Complex analysis of causation/consequence 7–8
Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension changed at different stages and/or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence reduced tension.

For example, the contribution to international peace by the League sometimes depended on the status of the country they were defending. In the issue of the Corfu invasion by Mussolini, the League originally upheld the complaint by Greece but this was undermined by the influence of more powerful countries such as Britain and France who chose to support Italy's interests.

Level 3: Developed analysis of causation/consequence 5–6
Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension was reduced at one stage in the process.

For example, the League contributed to peace because it helped to avoid a war breaking out between Sweden and Finland. Both countries wanted to claim ownership of the Aaland Islands. The League found a compromise that both countries accepted.
Level 2: Simple analysis of causation/consequence 3-4
Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the League of Nations created an international court of justice to settle disagreements between countries. Every member of the Assembly could vote to choose the judges.

Level 1: Basic analysis of causation/consequence 1-2
Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the League tried to prevent another war by discussing problems. The Commission for Refugees helped prisoners of war to return to their homes.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0
Student responses

Response A
The League’s main aim was to promote peace and they contributed to peace in the 1920s. For example, the Aaland Islands in 1921 was resolved by the League. Finland and Sweden both wanted the territory however the league managed to get both countries to agree to the land being given to Finland if they did not build forts. This showed other countries that the league was able to resolve situations about land peacefully, which helped the League’s reputation for building world peace.

The League also set up a slavery commissions and a refugee commissions, which helped to stop slavery in some countries in Africa. The Leagues actions also helped refugees, which was a big step in contributing to peace

This is a Level 3 response
The response shows developed analysis of how the League contributed to international peace, explaining the impact of the Aaland island dispute on relations between Finland and Sweden, and the League’s reputation. Further actions taken by the League are identified but are general in nature. The response is credited at Level 3.
Response B
The League of Nations contributed to keeping peace around the world throughout the 1920s. The league was useful in stopping smaller countries and protecting their independence from other smaller countries. One of the league successes was in 1921 with the Aaland island. This was a dispute between Sweden and Finland as they both wanted to have this land. The league had to make a decision on who it went too. They chose Finland and Sweden peacefully accepted and agreed this, with no further arguments. This was positive from the league as it showed that they did have some impact, especially on the less powerful ones. This then lead to other solutions being solved, one being Upper Silesia in 1923. This was between Poland and Germany as they both wanted this land. The league decided to split it into two giving Germany the rural side and Poland the industrial side. This cause tension as Germans wouldn't make as much money on the land. To solve this the League suggested Poland give Germany more off coal. This settled the tension, causing both countries to be peaceful. Another time the league contributed keeping international peace was with Bulgaria in 1925. This was when Greece had invaded Bulgaria in hope of taking over. Bulgaria pleaded to the League to help. This meant that the League ordered Greece to leave Bulgaria at once and pull their troops out. Greece obeyed and Bulgaria remained independent. The actions of the league of Nations through the 1920s, set examples to other smaller countries that they had to obey their order and keep peace throughout the world. The league contained big members with lots of influential power over the smaller countries. The big ones being Britain, Italy and France.

This is a Level 4 response
The response addresses multiple ways in which the League of Nations contributed to international peace in the 1920s, developing explanations of League actions in relation to the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia, and Bulgaria. It shows linkage and breadth throughout, and appreciates that the League was more adept at solving problems between smaller, less influential countries. It is credited at Level 4, at the top of the level.
Question 4
‘The loss of territory was the main reason why Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles.’

How far do you agree with the statement.

Explain your answer.

Mark scheme

Target

Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)

Level 4:

Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement.

For example, the loss of territory was not the main reason because Germany expected some losses. What they hated the most about the Treaty of Versailles was that Germany was excluded from the negotiations and it was a ‘Diktat’. This meant they could not influence the severity of the resulting terms. This meant they could not prevent the inclusion of Clause 231 concerning war guilt which said they were responsible for starting the war.
Level 3: **Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s) 9-12**

Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

Students may progress from a simple explanation of causation with developed reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles were the main reason why Germany hated it because they were humiliating and economically damaging. 10% of its land was given to neighbouring countries. A strip of land was given to Poland which effectively split Germany in two by creating a corridor that created access to the sea. As well as losing land outright, Germany also lost control of areas such as the coal rich Saarland which was put under a League of Nations mandate for 15 years and the Rhineland was demilitarised.

For example, the reparations payments were another reason why Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles because it would make it harder for Germany to recover. People were suffering from starvation after the war, and they were angry that the reparation bill was so huge. Germany had to pay money to the Allies for the damage caused during the war. It was estimated that it would take over 60 years to pay back the full bill.

Level 2: **Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s) 5-8**

Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

Students may progress from a basic explanation of causation by simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the War Guilt clause was hated by the German people because it forced them to accept the full blame for starting the war. Germany had no choice about signing the treaty; they were threatened with renewed fighting if they did not accept all the terms.
Level 1: Basic explanation of one or more factors 1–4

Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a basic line of reasoning, which is coherent, structured with some substantiation; the relevance might be implicit.

Students recognise and provide a basic explanation of one or more factors.

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as the Treaty of Versailles took a lot of land from Germany.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Germany was humiliated and forced to reduce the size of its army.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance descriptor</th>
<th>Marks awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy</td>
<td>4 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate performance</td>
<td>2–3 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold performance</td>
<td>1 mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No marks awarded</td>
<td>0 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The learner writes nothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The learner's response does not relate to the question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response A

I disagree with this statement as the loss of territory was a big reason why the Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles, but it was not the worst sanction.

Arguably, the worst sanction for Germany was the reparations Germany had to pay which equated to 6.6 billion which would later cripple Germany’s economy. This would leave Germany’s people in a state of depression and make them a poor country.

Another bad sanction of the Treaty of Versailles would be the loss of Army. Germany’s army was decreased to only 100,000 men, no airforce and only 1 submarine.

This was crippling for Germany as it lost them open for attack and making them way less powerful. This sanction also meant that Britain had naval supremacy.

Furthermore another sanction was that Germany had to take blame for starting the world war. (Article 231) so if it wasn't bad enough that Germany lost all of its money and majority of its Army, they also had to take the blame for the war which left a lot of the German’s furious.

Overall, I disagree with the statement as the other sanctions were way more serious than just the loss of land.

This is a Level 2 response

The response addresses the given reason and other reasons, showing simple explanation throughout. A judgement is attempted, though this requires further substantiation. The response is credited at Level 2, at a mid-point in the level.
Response B
I think the main reason why the Germans hated the treaty of Versailles was their loss of land. I agree that the Germans hated the treaty of Versailles due to the loss of territory as the Germans lost 10% of their land. They lost the Saar for 15 years as it was given control to France and the League of Nations. The Saar was a large industrial part of Germany that would of helped them pay their £6,600 million reparations. They only got it back 15 years later when the plebiscite voted 90% for Germany. They also lost their colonies in Africa which were given to Britain and provided them with lots of money and resources.

However their loss of military cover be the main reason why the Germans hated the treaty of Versailles. Their army was reduced to 100,000 men and their navy reduced to 15,000. They were not allowed an air force or submarines. The Rhineland was a strip of land on the border of France and Germany and the treaty of Versailles made them demilitarise the Rhineland. This left Germany feeling vulnerable to attack as it was well known that Georges Clemenceau wanted revenge on Germany. This also led to Germans turning to Hitler as he promised a strong army and rearmaments. He increased army to 1,000,000 and built his Luftwaffe This aggression comes from their previous loss of their military.

Overall I believe that the loss of territory was the main reason for the Germans hatred of the treaty of Versailles as they lost the large industrial Saar as well as their colonies and they lost 6,000,000 German speaking people due to the 10% of their land lost.

This is a Level 3 response
The response addresses the given reason and one other reason. It shows developed explanation for both. For example, in explaining how the German people reacted to the military clauses of the treaty, the response provides a range of evidence and addresses the focus of the question directly. While a judgement is attempted, this repeats much of what was already explained in paragraph 1. As a result, the response is credited at Level 3, towards the lower part of the level.
Response C

On one hand, I can agree with this statement because in total 13% of Germany's land was given away and was taken. This meant that many German people and German speaking people found themselves out of Germany. All of Germany's colonies in Africa were taken away as mandates but in reality, they were given to Britain and France. Additionally Alsace Lorraine was returned to France and the Rhineland was demilitarised meaning even parts of Germany itself wasn't properly controlled by Germany. The Saar was also taken which contained lost of industrial business. This meant that the once great power of Germany felt stripped of its power and many German people were forced to be a part of another new country.

However, War guilt could be seen as the main reason why the Germans hated the treaty so much because firstly, article 231, the war guilt clause pointed all the blame on Germany and the German people. This made the German population feel humiliated and they thought it was unfair because the Kaiser and the German government started the war, not the German people and how that the Kaiser had been humiliated and fled to Holland and they had a new Weimar republic, they believed that the blame shouldn't solely be on Germany. The people of Germany believe that the 'November criminals' signed the 'diktat' and it was their fault however, they did not understand that the government did not have a choice and have to sign the armistice or war would have continued.

The Germans also hated the reparations and restrictions from the military. Firstly the Germans were made to pay £6.6 billion in reparations to pay for the damage of the war. Germany was already struggling at the time (and people were homeless and dying of starvation of starvation. These reparations mostly effected the people who were not to blame for the war. Also the military, which used to be a proud part of Germany was restricted to 100,000 men, 6 battleships, 15,000 sailors in the navy, no airforce and no submarines. This gave Britain naval supremacy which was humiliating for the Germans and only gave them enough army to defend themselves.

What the Germans did not understand is that the treaty could have been much harsher, but the humiliation of the war guilt was probably the main factor because it hit the German people hard and made them outcasts to the rest of Europe and the fact that they were not allowed to join the League of Nations probably made it worse for them. The Treaty of Versailles should have been about the Government and the military leaders but instead it hit the ordinary people the most.

This is a Level 4 response

The response addresses the given reason and other reasons, leading to a sustained judgement. Each reason is explained in a developed manner, directly addressing the issue in the question with support. It provides a complex explanation of the way in which the factors are related, and distinguishes between different groups within Germany. A Level 4 response, at the middle mark of the level.
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