

GCSE HISTORY

(8145)

Marked Papers 1B/B –
Conflict and Tension: The inter-war years,
1918–1939

Understand how to apply the mark scheme for our sample
assessment papers.

Version 1.0 April 2018

EXAMPLE RESPONSES



Example responses plus commentaries

The following student responses are intended to illustrate how the mark scheme can be interpreted and how it is likely that students will respond to the questions, allowing the student and teacher to explore and reflect upon the mark scheme and how answers can be improved.

Paper 1, Section B: Conflict and tension 1918–1939

Questions 01–04

Question 01

Study **Source A**.

Source A opposes Germany. How do you know? Explain your answer using Source A and your contextual knowledge.

[4 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

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: Germany was depicted as a criminal being arrested by Allied forces of law and order; Germany was untrustworthy as implied by the legend in the cartoon; the devastation in the background may be seen as linked to Germany's 'crimes'.	
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 German looks evil; it was published by the British at the end of the war and therefore was bound to be anti-German.	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Responses

Student one

Source A opposes Germany because Britain and France are showed as policemen whereas Germany is shown as a criminal with an unpleasant face. This is because Germany was blamed for starting the war and was made to sign the war guilt clause. Also in the picture the background is in ruins because it shows the amount of damage Germany had done by the end of the war.

Commentary – Level 2

The response shows developed analysis of the source. It supports the given inference by explaining the content of the source with relevant supporting context.

Student two

We know Source A opposes Germany because Germany is caught as the criminal. This suggests that Britain and France are the police officers. Also, there is an unpleasant expression Germany's face. Germany lost the war and they were the enemy in Britain and France's eyes hence they are the criminal. The policemen show law and order and this means that Britain and France are the victors of the war. The background is in ruins so this shows the damage Germany had done in the war.

Commentary – Level 2

The response shows a developed analysis which uses context to explain the content of the source. The given inference (the cartoon opposes Germany) is partially explained, and the answer could be improved by directly explaining how it opposes Germany.

Student three

The source opposes Germany because it is from Britain and shows Germany being tied up. People in Britain hated Germany because of war. As the cartoon was published in Britain it is always going to show people's anger at Germany because of what the Germans did to Britain.

Commentary – Level 1

The response shows simple analysis. It identifies relevant features from the content and provenance of the source and supports them with simple knowledge and understanding. To progress, the response could use contextual knowledge to further explain the content of the source.

Question 02

Study **Sources B and C**.

How useful are Sources B and C to a historian studying opinions about the Treaty of Versailles?

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

[12 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

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

10–12

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...taken together the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes to the severity of Versailles, but also recognise their limitations arising from provenance as both were from acknowledged critics of Versailles and neither, for example, reflected on the legitimate needs of France for security and recovery from the devastation of war. In assessing utility students may observe (eg) that Source C has greater value due to the author's expertise and detached objectivity.

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

7–9

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how Source B, as part of the emotive popular press coverage, might reflect contemporary

German attitudes in that it depicts the French as sucking the lifeblood out of the German people and that Germany was the innocent and defenceless victim. Source C revealed doubts towards the settlement, as an informed British view saw Germany's treatment as immoral, counter-productive and short-sighted.

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, students may explain that Source B is useful because it shows how the Germans saw Clemenceau and the French as sucking their lifeblood away.

Keynes' accusation of the immorality of the terms (Source C) may be used by historians to shed light on the validity of German resentment in 1919.

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, Keynes is suggesting the terms were too harsh; the message of the cartoon that France was like a vampire.

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

Responses

Student one

Source B shows a vampire, Clemenceau, draining a weak looking Germany while two bats look on, representing Britain and the USA. This shows an opinion that Clemenceau was harsh at the Treaty of Versailles as a lot of the farming and industrial land in France was ruined during the war. So he thought that the terms of Versailles were fair, particularly those that gave German land to France, such as Alsace Lorraine. The source wanted to show that Germany was a victim of the Big Three. This is useful because it was printed in a German newspaper which suggests that it was the opinion of many Germans in 1919. They saw Germany as a victim of the 'dictat', and were outraged by the £6.6 billion they had to pay in reparations and losses to the German military, so they blamed Clemenceau for the damage done to them.

Source C describes attitudes of the Big Three in the Treaty of Versailles. The content is useful for opinions because it argues that the Big Three were only acting out of self-interest at Versailles. For example, Clemenceau wanted revenge and Lloyd George wanted to make himself popular for an election. The provenance is also useful because JM Keynes worked for the British government, which meant that he knew a lot about the treaty and the people who were there. He resigned in protest, so the book must have been published to turn people against the treaty. So, even though Lloyd George was treated like a hero in Britain after the treaty was signed, C is useful because it shows that not all British people liked the treaty.

Commentary – Level 4

Both sources are evaluated in a complex way. For source B, the content and provenance is used in combination and substantiated with relevant contextual knowledge to evaluate usefulness regarding the negative opinion of 'many Germans' about the treaty. The evaluation of Source C shows a sustained judgement about usefulness relevant to the issue in the question. The content and provenance of the source are evaluated, with accurate contextual knowledge used to explain how the source reflected the anti-treaty view of some in Britain.

Student two

Source B shows Clemenceau as a vampire sucking Germany's blood. This could represent that Clemenceau wanted to suck the resources out of Germany. The cartoon also shows a German perspective. It shows that Germany thought it was Clemenceau to blame for the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles. The cartoon also creates sympathy for Germany, and, being a German cartoon, it might be biased towards Germany. It is effective, however, in showing a German opinion.

Source C is from an English economic leader's point of view. It states that the Treaty was way too harsh on Germany as the war was the parents' fault, not the children's who were now forced to suffer because of the Treaty. It also states an accurate viewpoint of each leader's aims as it is written that Clemenceau wanted to crush Germany, Lloyd George wanted to keep trade but wanted to please the British and French and that the President wanted to be just and right. Source C does not seem to be biased as it was from a British person and yet it is criticising the treaty. Britain was on the winning side and this supports Source B as it depicts the same thing – that Clemenceau wanted to crush Germany.

These sources are very important for a historian studying the Treaty as it shows how the Germans felt and a supporting viewpoint from a British person – which was uncommon.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed evaluation. For example, the evaluation of B refers to purpose and later the answer includes some use of the sources in combination. To progress in to level 4, the response could show a sustained judgement on the utility of source B by explaining how its purpose (evoking sympathy for Germany) is useful for studying opinions about Versailles. Alternatively, the use of the sources in combination could show complex thinking if the evaluation were further substantiated.

Student three

Both sources are useful because of their opinions. Source E shows what the Germans thought of France sucking the life out of their country. It is obviously anti-French because it shows Clemenceau as a vampire with bats in the background. This is useful because it tells us what the Germans thought after the treaty.

Source F is from a British economist who didn't agree with the Treaty because he thought that it was not fair on future children. He was a "leading" expert at the treaty of Versailles on the British side. He thought that the treaty was too harsh on Germany, which turned out to be true. Overall, both sources agree that the that the treaty was negative which is useful because this was true.

Commentary – Level 2

The answer shows 'simple' evaluation of both sources, based on their content and provenance. Simple knowledge is used in support of the evaluation. To progress in to Level 3, the response could develop the evaluation of provenance by explaining the purpose of each source relevant to the issue in the question.

Question 03

Write an account of how events in Manchuria became an international crisis in the years 1931–1933.

[8 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

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 increased at different stages and/or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example... analysis of the different consequences of the Japanese invasion which was seen as blatant aggression by Britain and France and was made worse by Japan's status as a fellow permanent member, which meant that Japan was supposed to adhere to the Covenant. Following investigation of Japan's actions, the crisis deepened as Japan was insulted by the League's approval of the Lytton Report. The Lytton Report called for Japan's withdrawal from Manchuria. Britain and France then felt humiliated and powerless when Japan left the League and invaded Jehol. Failure to deal with obvious aggression merely deepened the sense of crisis about future prospects for peace.

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 increased at one stage in the process.

For example... one consequence was that tension grew in the Council when Japan, a permanent member, carried out blatant aggression by invading Manchuria; Japan was supposed to support the Covenant by keeping the peace. This angered Britain and France who felt the League had been undermined. But there was a real risk of damaging the League so Britain and France delayed matters by setting up the Lytton Commission to investigate the crisis.

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, Japan was behind the crisis as its invasion of Manchuria was seen as clear aggression, which angered the League, so it set up the Lytton Commission to investigate and report on what action should be taken to resolve the problem.

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 event such as when Japan invaded Manchuria which meant it had broken the rules of the League.

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

Responses

Student one

One way that events in Manchuria became an international crisis was because Britain and France felt let down by Japan's invasion of Manchuria. As a permanent member of the League, Japan should not have committed aggression. This meant that the League was in difficulties because it couldn't be seen to let Japan get away with it. They set up the Lytton Commission, which reported that Japanese forces should not have occupied Manchuria, which was an international crisis because Japan walked out of the League in fury.

Another way that events in Manchuria led to an international crisis was because it took the League so long to react. It took Lord Lytton a long time to travel to Japan, which meant that the League did not respond until a whole year after the invasion and Japan got to keep Manchuria. This was an international crisis because one of the League's aims was to discourage aggression and the members were supposed to trust that the League would protect them. However after the Manchurian crisis the League was no longer respected, because it showed that it couldn't deal with more powerful countries, which led to more aggression later by Italy and Germany in Abyssinia and the Sudetenland.

Commentary – Level 4

The response is complex as it directly addresses the focus of the question by analysing more than one way in which events in Manchuria became an international crisis, supported with accurate knowledge and understanding.

Student two

Manchuria was a place in China. Japan wanted Manchuria for itself and so invaded Manchuria. Japan was a permanent member of the League of Nations and so should have obeyed the League's rules. Japan claimed to have only entered Manchuria to restore peace. The League then sent out Lytton to investigate the matter. The Lytton commission took a whole year to bring back sufficient evidence where it showed that Japan were in the wrong to invade Manchuria. By Lytton taking one year to produce the report, Japan had settled in Manchuria. Japan was then annoyed by the stern 'telling off' that Britain and France gave them and so left the League and then went on to invade Jehol. This damaged the League's reputation as one of its leaders had disobeyed the rules.

Commentary – Level 3

A well-developed analysis of one way in which events in Manchuria became an international crisis (relating to the damage done to the League of Nations). To progress in to Level 4, the response should seek to analyse a second way in which Manchuria became an international crisis.

Student three

The events in Manchuria became an international crisis because Japan, who was in the League of Nations, invaded Manchuria. What made this even more wrong than it already was, was that Japan was a permanent member of The League. Therefore it damaged The League's reputation. Another factor was the report, which took a year to be written and then did not put full blame on Japan. Also, the League put no economic sanctions on Japan, but Japan could've traded with America, if there were. Britain and France could not really afford to introduce economic sanctions as they were both in the aftermath of the great depression. After Japan had invaded Manchuria, she left the League which made the League seem unimportant.

Commentary – Level 3

A developed explanation of one element in the crisis. The response links events in Manchuria to the international crisis, so is credited at Level 3.

Question 04

'The Nazi-Soviet Pact was the main reason for the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

[16 marks]

Mark scheme

Question 4 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

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	13–16
	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.	
	This might be related, for example... to the way reasons interacted. Such as: although the Nazi-Soviet Pact was the trigger for war against Poland, the principal underlying cause was the aims of Hitler, such as lebensraum, which could not have been achieved without military conquest and which had already alienated Britain sufficiently to guarantee Polish independence.	
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 Nazi-Soviet Pact provided the opportunity to go to war, as Hitler knew he could attack Poland in safety as Stalin would remain 'neutral'. He could concentrate on Britain and France in the west as they had guaranteed to defend Poland if attacked, thereby starting the war.

Students may additionally argue for other reasons such as Hitler's aims to build a thousand year Reich and create lebensraum made conflict inevitable plus the appeasement policies of Britain and France which allowed Hitler to gain in strength also enabled Germany to cause conflict.

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, students may argue that the Nazi-Soviet Pact provided the opportunity to go to war because of such reasons as Hitler knew he could attack Poland in safety as Stalin would remain 'neutral'. He could concentrate on Britain and France in the west as they had guaranteed to defend Poland if attacked, thereby starting the war.

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.

For example, students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact meant Hitler would only have to fight in the west on one front. This provided the opportunity for war.

Students may offer basic explanation of other factors, for example, the Second World War broke out because the League of Nations did not stop aggression during the 1930s.

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

Responses

Student one

The Nazi-Soviet Pact was a cause for the outbreak of war. The pact was between Germany and USSR, and it said that they would not attack each other if there was war. Also Poland would be split half and half between them. This made the invasion inevitable and also gave Russia some time to build up its defences and its army. The invasion was inevitable because Germany knew that they could invade Poland without having to fight Russia. Britain and France promised Poland that they'd defend them, so when Germany invaded in September 1939 Britain, France and Germany all declared war on each other that would last for six years.

Some historians argue that appeasement was the main cause. Neville Chamberlain and France had given Hitler chances before Germany invaded Poland and didn't stand up to him, which made him more aggressive because he wanted more lebensraum. For example, the re-militarisation of the Rhineland was not opposed, which led to Hitler invading other lands, like when Germany annexed Austria the year before because he knew that he wouldn't be challenged. Finally, when Germany took over the Sudetenland, Britain and France had agreed to let him keep the land at the Munich conference, and Hitler betrayed that agreement when he took over the rest of Czechoslovakia. Therefore, appeasement led to the invasion of Poland and the start of the war because Hitler thought that France and Britain would stay out of it again, like they had in 1938.

Hitler's aims were also a reason because Hitler would only have been able to achieve his aims by starting a war. He wanted to destroy the Treaty of Versailles and get lebensraum for the German people, which meant that he had to take over land in Poland and Czechoslovakia because that was where the land was. The League of Nations couldn't stop him after it failed in the Abyssinian crisis when Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1936 and the League of Nations only gave a moral sanction to Italy and Mussolini took the whole country. This meant that Hitler wasn't afraid to act aggressively because he saw that the League was not able to deal with invasions, which gave him a reason to invade Poland and start the war.

In conclusion, the Nazi-Soviet Pact was important but not the most important reason for war in 1939. Appeasement was the most important reason for war because it made Hitler more aggressive in achieving his aims because he knew that his biggest rivals were afraid to stop his army, like they showed when he invaded the Sudetenland. This is why he signed the Nazi Soviet pact, because it gave him permission to invade Poland which he wouldn't have done if he was afraid of Britain and France.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows complex explanation of the reasons for the outbreak of war in 1939. The given factor and two other factors (appeasement, Hitler's foreign policy) are explained with a range of accurate supporting knowledge and understanding. Complex thinking is shown in the concluding paragraph, where the judgement about the main reason for war is justified by showing the relationship between the reasons.

Student two

I agree to a certain extent with the statement. France and Britain wanted to ally with Russia but hesitated. Russia saw Britain and France as weak. Whereas Germany had no hesitation in forming an alliance with Stalin. Also Russia were a bit scared of being

invaded by Germany as Russia hadn't fully rearmed yet, by signing the pact it prevented Germany from invading, at least for a while. Now that they were Germany's ally, Germany became more powerful and Britain and France could do nothing about it. The pact was a reason for the outbreak of WWII because Germany wouldn't invade there if there was a chance it would make Russia side with Britain and France. Germany and Russia agreed to split Poland up and share the land fairly.

Which meant war because it made Britain and France defend Poland and declare war on Germany. I also disagree because there were other events that led up to the outbreak of WWII so I don't think it can be blamed on one single event. Although the pact did make Germany more powerful, the tensions were already high before the pact. Germany had broken lots of terms in the treaty of Versailles, such as when they had built their army up and built battleships and aircraft, all of which strengthened Germany's military and the League of Nations had done nothing about it. Hitler saw them as weak because they didn't act during the Manchurian crisis or Abyssinia. This meant war because Hitler saw them as weak and thought he could do what he wanted.

To conclude, I don't think that the pact was the main reason for war because other events also contributed. Hitler thought that he could do what he wanted because he didn't respect Britain and France and the League of Nations, which was the big factor in the outbreak of the war.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed explanation of the given factor. Other factors are addressed (Germany foreign policy, weakness of the League) and show simple explanation, and the judgement is summative. The response could progress if the judgement is further explained and supported with evidence.

Student three

The Nazi Soviet Pact led to the Second World War because Russia agreed to not attack Germany and Germany agreed not to attack Russia. This meant that Russia would not be an ally of Britain and France, which made the situation tense between Germany and the allies. Germany was already invading the Rhineland before the pact so Britain and France knew that they would do it again.

On the other hand, other reasons led to war. The Treaty of Versailles was the start because Germany wanted revenge for the harsh terms. Britain and France should have stopped Hitler earlier but because of appeasement, he was allowed to carry on which made him want more and the League of Nations didn't take action when the Treaty of Versailles was broken.

Overall, there were many reasons for war not just the Nazi Soviet Pact, like the League of Nations and appeasement, which means that the Nazi Soviet Pact was not the most important.

Commentary – Level 2

The response shows simple explanation of the given factor and other factors. It comes to a judgement, which could progress with further justification. To progress in to level 3, the response should seek to directly explain how the identified reasons led to the outbreak of war in 1939.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/8145

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3861