



GCSE History 8145
Specimen Paper 1 Section B (Conflict and
tension, 1918–1939)
Student 1 Questions 11–14
Specimen Answer and Commentary
V1.0

Specimen answer plus commentary

The following student responses illustrate approaches to assessment. This response has not been completed under timed examination conditions and it's not intended to be viewed as a 'model' answer. The marking has not been subject to the usual standardisation process.

Paper 1 Section B (Conflict and tension, 1918–1938): Specimen Questions 11–14

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

[4 marks]

Student response

Source D 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 broke 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, 750,000 homes and 15,000 factories.

Commentary – Level 2

Developed analysis with the source, well supported by context. Reaches the top of a Level 2.

12 Study Sources E and F. How useful are Sources E and F to an historian studying opinions about the Treaty of Versailles? Explain your answer using Sources E and F and your contextual knowledge.

[12 marks]

Student response

Source E 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 F is from an English economic leader's point of view. It states that the Treaty was way too harsh on Germany as if was only the parents' fault, not the children's who were know forced to suffer because of the Treaty.

It also states an accurate viewpoint of each leaders 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 F cannot be biased as it was from a British person. Britain was on the winning side and this supports Source E 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

Extended reasoning used to try and explain the evaluation. Refers to purpose with some cross-referencing. Mid-Level 3 answer.

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

[8 marks]

Student response

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 but it was good that they did as Manchuria was in shambles. 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. Another way that this damaged the reputation of the League was that League leaders did not impose sanctions such as economic ones. This was because of the Great Depression and the Japan was still going to trade anyhow with the US.

This had so damaged the League as not even its leaders took it seriously and that the League could not oppose and put sanctions in place. It showed that the League was useless to maintain peace.

Commentary – Level 3

A well-developed explanation of one element in the crisis. Answer achieves top of a Level 3.

14 '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]

Student response

The Nazi-Soviet Pact was a pact between Germany and USSR that depicted that neither one of them would oppose the other in case of a war and that Poland would be split half and half between them. This made the invasion inevitable and also gave Russia some time to regain defences and its army.

Britain and France had said to Poland that if Poland was to be attacked that they would come and defend Poland. Because of the Pact mentioned earlier, this would cause a war that involved Britain, France and Germany/Russia making the war a massive war already.

Some people may argue that it was the appeasement that led to the ultimate uproar that was WWII. Chamberlain and France had given Hitler too much time and chances before and appeasement gave Hitler the resources and power to gain such a massive army in a short amount of time. Appeasement then led to the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the demise of Poland.

Whereas, some historians may say that the second world war was inevitable from the start. The re-militarisation of the Rhineland then led to Germany and Hitler pushing their luck and increasing their

borders and invading other lands. This then led to a sort of snowball effect where Britain and France gave more and more chances – enough for Hitler to start a war that would last 6 years and kill billions of lives.

I personally think that it was how Britain and France had dealt with Hitler and his requests was to blame for the second world war. Britain allowed Germany enough time to gain back land from plebiscites and France had no authority in themselves as they had relied on Britain to make decisions for the duration between WWII and WWI. If France had stopped Germany from re-militarising the Rhineland, Germany would have not tried to accomplish Anschluss. If Britain and France had opposed Anschluss, Germany would not have accomplished to take over the Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia and Poland. Ultimately, if Britain and France had not given Germany any chances (allowing a more larger army than the Treaty had depicted) the second world war may have not started. So, I disagree with the statement.

Commentary – Level 3

One developed and two simple explanations to just about reach Level 3.