

Section A: Source-Based Case Study

Hitler and the Nazi Party's relationship with the workers

Source A: An election poster by the Social Democratic Party* in March 1933. It is titled, "The Worker in the Empire of the Swastika".



*The Social Democratic Party represented the workers in Germany.

1(a) Study Source A. What can you infer about life under Nazi rule for the workers? Explain your answer, using details of the source and your knowledge. [5]		
L1	Description of Source / Answers based on PROVENANCE details. <i>E.g. I can infer that the worker was chained.</i>	1
L2	UNDERDEVELOPED Inference, UN/SUPPORTED <i>Award 3m for supported answers.</i> <i>E.g. From Source A, life under Nazi rule for the workers was painful.</i> DEVELOPED Inference, UNSUPPORTED <i>Award 3m.</i> <i>E.g. From Source A I can infer that life under Nazi rule for the worker was harsh.</i>	2-3
L3	DEVELOPED Inference, SUPPORTED <i>Award 5m for answers that provide relevant contextual knowledge or answers that discuss the strict control over the workers.</i> <i>E.g. [Point] From Source A I can infer that life under Nazi rule for the worker was harsh. [Evidence] In Source A, it shows a worker tied up in chains with razors. The worker is tied to a Nazi swastika. [Explanation] This suggests that the German workers were tightly controlled by the Nazi government. They would have their personal freedoms and rights taken away. [Context] Some workers would have felt like this as the Nazi party was strongly anti-communist by this point and promised to ensure that any opposition to Nazi rule would be dealt with harshly, especially opposition by communist backed workers. Such suppression was carried out by the brown shirts or the Sturmabteilung.</i>	4-5

Source B: *An advertisement from the Kraft durch Freude (Strength Through Joy), published in the late 1930s. It depicts a happy, prosperous family with their Volkswagen (People's Car) and Volksempfänger (People's Receiver), a mass-produced radio.*



1(b) Study Source B. How useful is Source B as evidence of German workers' support for Hitler's rule? Explain your answer, using details of the source and your knowledge. [6]

Target Skill: Usefulness/Utility

L1	Description of source / Answer based on Provenance, undeveloped <i>E.g. Source B is not useful as it shows a family having fun.</i>	1
L2	Usefulness based on Source Content / Not useful based on missing information <i>E.g. Source B is useful as evidence of German workers' support for Hitler's rule as it suggests that they had better standards of living under Nazi rule and supported Hitler's rule. Source B shows workers enjoying leisure items such as a car and radio. This suggests the workers supported Hitler as they were able to afford such luxurious items which they were never able to before the Nazi party rose to power. This indicates their living conditions improved dramatically under Nazi rule.</i>	2
L3	Usefulness is limited as the source is unreliable because of its PURPOSE <i>Award 3m for less developed purpose answers.</i> <i>Award 4m for an answer that considers a fuller context to the poster.</i> Limited usefulness based on Purpose [1st Paragraph] Source B is useful as evidence of German workers' support for Hitler's rule as it suggests that they had better standards of living under Nazi rule and would have supported Hitler's rule. Source B shows workers enjoying leisure items such as a car and radio. This suggests the workers would have supported Hitler as they were able to afford such luxurious items which they were never able to before the Nazi party rose to power. This indicates their living conditions improved dramatically under Nazi rule. [2nd Paragraph] However, Source B's usefulness is limited as it is unreliable because of its purpose. Source B was a poster created by the Strength Through Joy organisation. It aimed to convince workers that life under Nazi rule was better as they could afford luxurious goods now so that they would continue to work hard and support the Nazi regime. Although the workers did enjoy some luxuries, it came at the expense of their rights as Hitler and the Nazi government strictly controlled their wages and movement. They were not allowed to protest or required approval to change their jobs. Hence, not all workers supported Hitler's rule.	3-4

1(b) Study Source B. How useful is Source B as evidence of German workers' support for Hitler's rule? Explain your answer, using details of the source and your knowledge. [6]

Target Skill: Usefulness/Utility

L4	Usefulness is ENHANCED/LIMITED because it is reliable based on cross-referencing to other sources / contextual knowledge <i>Award 4m for answers that cross-reference to other source.</i> <i>Award 5m for answers that cross-reference to contextual knowledge.</i> <table><tr><td>Limited/Enhanced usefulness based on Cross-reference</td></tr><tr><td> [1st Paragraph] Source B is useful as evidence of German workers' support for Hitler's rule as it suggests that they had better standards of living under Nazi rule and would have supported Hitler's rule. Source B shows workers enjoying leisure items such as a car and radio. This suggests the workers would have supported Hitler as they were able to afford such luxurious items which they were never able to before the Nazi party rose to power. This indicates their living conditions improved dramatically under Nazi rule. </td></tr><tr><td> [2nd Paragraph] Moreover, Source B's usefulness is enhanced as it is reliable when I cross-reference to my contextual knowledge. Based on my contextual knowledge, a significant number of German workers supported Hitler's rule as their lives improved under it with schemes such as the Strength Through Joy as they could finally afford such luxurious items previously unavailable to them. It also meant that they had stable employment that enabled them to save up for such items which include theatre and cinema tickets and even trips overseas. OR [2nd Paragraph] However, Source B's usefulness is limited as it is unreliable. It is unreliable as it is contradicted by my contextual knowledge when I cross-reference to it. Based on my contextual knowledge, Hitler and the Nazi party heavily limited the rights of the workers, banned all trade unions and worker protests, and froze their salaries. All workers were forced to join the DAF (<i>Deutsche Arbeitsfront</i>) German Labour Front and even prevented from changing to better paying jobs. Therefore, some German workers resented such strict control over them. </td></tr></table>	Limited/Enhanced usefulness based on Cross-reference	[1st Paragraph] Source B is useful as evidence of German workers' support for Hitler's rule as it suggests that they had better standards of living under Nazi rule and would have supported Hitler's rule. Source B shows workers enjoying leisure items such as a car and radio. This suggests the workers would have supported Hitler as they were able to afford such luxurious items which they were never able to before the Nazi party rose to power. This indicates their living conditions improved dramatically under Nazi rule.	[2nd Paragraph] Moreover, Source B's usefulness is enhanced as it is reliable when I cross-reference to my contextual knowledge. Based on my contextual knowledge, a significant number of German workers supported Hitler's rule as their lives improved under it with schemes such as the Strength Through Joy as they could finally afford such luxurious items previously unavailable to them. It also meant that they had stable employment that enabled them to save up for such items which include theatre and cinema tickets and even trips overseas. OR [2nd Paragraph] However, Source B's usefulness is limited as it is unreliable. It is unreliable as it is contradicted by my contextual knowledge when I cross-reference to it. Based on my contextual knowledge, Hitler and the Nazi party heavily limited the rights of the workers, banned all trade unions and worker protests, and froze their salaries. All workers were forced to join the DAF (<i>Deutsche Arbeitsfront</i>) German Labour Front and even prevented from changing to better paying jobs. Therefore, some German workers resented such strict control over them.	4-5
Limited/Enhanced usefulness based on Cross-reference					
[1st Paragraph] Source B is useful as evidence of German workers' support for Hitler's rule as it suggests that they had better standards of living under Nazi rule and would have supported Hitler's rule. Source B shows workers enjoying leisure items such as a car and radio. This suggests the workers would have supported Hitler as they were able to afford such luxurious items which they were never able to before the Nazi party rose to power. This indicates their living conditions improved dramatically under Nazi rule.					
[2nd Paragraph] Moreover, Source B's usefulness is enhanced as it is reliable when I cross-reference to my contextual knowledge. Based on my contextual knowledge, a significant number of German workers supported Hitler's rule as their lives improved under it with schemes such as the Strength Through Joy as they could finally afford such luxurious items previously unavailable to them. It also meant that they had stable employment that enabled them to save up for such items which include theatre and cinema tickets and even trips overseas. OR [2nd Paragraph] However, Source B's usefulness is limited as it is unreliable. It is unreliable as it is contradicted by my contextual knowledge when I cross-reference to it. Based on my contextual knowledge, Hitler and the Nazi party heavily limited the rights of the workers, banned all trade unions and worker protests, and froze their salaries. All workers were forced to join the DAF (<i>Deutsche Arbeitsfront</i>) German Labour Front and even prevented from changing to better paying jobs. Therefore, some German workers resented such strict control over them.					
L5	L3/L4 + STILL Usefulness <i>Award 5m for those that used purpose.</i> <i>Award 6m for answers that cross-reference to contextual knowledge.</i> <i>E.g.</i> Despite its limitations, Source B is still useful in helping us understand why some workers were supportive of Nazi rule because of the better standard of living it offered to some segments of the working population.	5-6			

Source C: *Adapted from a speech by Joseph Goebbels, on Hitler's birthday, 1941.*

Thus, we greet him on the eve of his birthday. The entire nation joins in this greeting, and in expressing its deepest and most profound thankfulness for him. Our soldiers bear his names on their lips, wherever they may stand or march. Our workers sing his name as they work. Our farmers and workers greet him as their Führer and our women thank him for fighting for the future of their children. The German youth give him their strongest faith. He is ours. He has made this people what it is today. Where would we be if he had not come?

1(c) Study Source C. Why do you think Goebbels made this speech? Explain your answer. [5]

Target Skill: Purpose

L1	Description of source / Answer based on Provenance, undeveloped / Answers not expressed as a reason (as/because) <i>E.g. Source B is about celebrating Hitler's birthday and wishing him well.</i>	1
L2	Sub-Message <i>E.g. Goebbels made this speech to thank Hitler.</i>	2
L3	Message or Outcome UN/Supported <i>Award 3m for unsupported answers.</i> <i>Award 4m for supported answers.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: VMA] Goebbels made this speech to emphasise to the German workers how Germans had benefitted from Hitler's leadership. [Evidence] In Source C, it says "He has made this people what it is today. Where would we be if he had not come?" [Explanation: Message] This suggests that the German people wholeheartedly support Hitler and the Nazi rule as they had given them a better life. All of them agree in unison that his rule had benefitted them.</i> <i>OR</i> <i>E.g. [Point: VAO] Goebbels made this speech to the German workers so that they would continue to support Hitler's rule and work diligently. [Evidence] In Source C, it says "He has made this people what it is today. Where would we be if he had not come?" [Explanation: Outcome] It was especially crucial to shore up German support for Hitler during this time, as Germany was on a war footing and needed all Germans to be committed to the war effort. Hence, Goebbels sought to build an image and steadfast support for Hitler.</i>	3-4
L4	Purpose SUPPORTED <i>E.g. [Point: VMAO] Goebbels made this speech to emphasise to the German workers how Germans had benefitted from Hitler's leadership and actions wholeheartedly so that they would continue to support his rule and work diligently. [Evidence] In Source C, it says "He has made this people what it is today. Where would we be if he had not come?" [Explanation: Message] This suggests that the German people wholeheartedly support Hitler and the Nazi rule as they had given them a better life. All of them agree in unison that his rule had benefitted them. Hence, on behalf of the people, Goebbels is expressing their deep thanks to Hitler on his birthday. [Explanation: Outcome] It was especially crucial to shore up German support for Hitler during this time, as Germany was on a war footing and</i>	5

1(c) Study Source C. Why do you think Goebbels made this speech? Explain your answer. [5]*Target Skill: Purpose*

	needed all Germans to be committed to the war effort. Moreover, there was growing resistance amongst Germans such as 400 Catholic Priests or the White Rose. Hence, Goebbels sought to build an image and steadfast support for Hitler so that the Germans would be committed to Hitler's government.	
--	---	--

Source D: An adapted extract from a flyer by the exiled Social Democratic Party, 1934.

Nazi rule means an unprecedented increase in social antagonisms. The suppression of all organisations of workers and employees, their total disempowerment. Taking back democratic rights is becoming a necessity to make the workers' movement possible. Every democratic right, however, is becoming a threat to the dictatorship's continued existence. The struggle for democracy is thus expanding into a struggle for the total defeat of the National Socialist control of the state.

Source E: A picture of the deck on a 'Strength through Joy' cruise to Madeira, Portugal in 1938.



1(d) Study Sources D and E. How far does Source E prove that Source D is wrong? Explain your answer. [6]

Target Skill: Detect values, bias, recognise utility

L1	Source E does not prove based on Provenance <i>E.g. Source E does not prove that Source D is wrong because they are from different dates.</i>	1
L2	Source E proves that Source D is wrong, Vague CONTENT, UN/SUPPORTED <i>Answers in this level only referred to Source E to answer the question. The answers did not consider Source D in their answer or made minimal reference to it. Award 2m for unsupported answers. Award 3m for supported answers.</i>	2-3
L3	Source E proves that Source D is wrong based on CROSS-REFERENCE, SUPPORTED <i>Award 3m for underdeveloped answers. Award 4m for well-developed answers.</i> <i>E.g. [Point: ATQ + Tool] Source E proves that Source D is wrong as Source E contradicts Source D about the well-being of workers in Nazi Germany. [Inference of Source E] In Source E, the workers appear to enjoy higher standard of living and better quality of life. In Source E, it shows workers enjoying a cruise trip to Portugal. This suggests that they enjoyed a better standard of living, and they were doing quite well under Nazi rule. [Inference of Source D] However, in Source D, it suggests that worker rights were severely hampered and they were suffering under Nazi rule. In Source D, it says "the suppression of all organisations of workers and employees, their total disempowerment". This suggests that Nazi rule was detrimental to the lives of workers as they were suffering immensely under Nazi rule.</i>	3-4
L4	Source E does not prove that Source D is wrong because of its motive.	5-6

1(d) Study Sources D and E. How far does Source E prove that Source D is wrong? Explain your answer. [6]

Target Skill: Detect values, bias, recognise utility

Award 5m.

Award 6m for well organised and supported answers.

E.g. **[Point: ATQ + Tool]** Source E is unable to prove that Source D is wrong as Source E is unreliable as it has a purpose. **[Purpose of Source E]** Source E was published to convince German workers that Nazi rule had given them a better standard of living so that the workers would be committed to doing the work of the regime. In Source E, it shows, workers enjoying a cruise trip to Portugal. This suggests that they enjoyed a better standard of living as they were able to afford such luxuries unlike before under the Weimar government. This was done, so that the workers would realise how much better their life was now and they would continue to work hard towards going on such trips for themselves. However, in truth, not all German workers benefitted from such trips and even the famed Volkswagen was never produced in time for them. So, it is not a very reliable source.

[Reference to Source D] Moreover, Source D is somewhat reliable as the workers did suffer from a lack of rights under Nazi rule as many could not change jobs or demand for higher wages. Hence, Source D is not wrong either.

Source F: *A popular joke told by ordinary German workers during Nazi rule.*

Hitler asks a worker: How long do you work every day?

Worker: Eight hours.

Hitler: Well, and if you were sent to work in an armaments factory, how long then?

Worker: Sixteen hours.

Hitler: And if you were to work for our party?

Worker: Then, of course, 24 hours.

Hitler: Very good! What do you do you anyway?

Worker: I'm a gravedigger!

1(e) Study all sources. 'Hitler and the Nazi Party enjoyed the support of the German workers.' How far do the sources support this view? Explain your answer. [8]

Target Skill: Drawing conclusions based on an analysis of historical sources

L1	Writes about the topic in general without using sources	1
L2	Supports OR Does Not Support the view <i>Award 2m for support or does not support, supported by a valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 4 m¹.</i>	2-4 (5)
L3	Both aspects of Level 2 <i>Award 5m for support or does not support, supported by a valid source use, and an additional mark for each subsequent valid source use up to a maximum of 7 marks².</i>	5-7 (8)

Source	Support	Does not support	Reliability
A	N/A	N/A	N/A
B	Workers had a higher standard of living and therefore support Nazi rule.		Reliable. Workers enjoyed better amenities and experience such as holidays under the KdF schemes.
C	Workers were thankful for the better economic opportunities		Reliable. Workers were able to find jobs with the Reich Labour Service on public works projects. Unreliable. German workers were threatened with punishment should they oppose Hitler's rule so many support him out of fear of being imprisoned in a labour camp.
D		The workers suffered under Nazi rule as their rights would be limited	Reliable. Strikes and trade unions were banned. All workers were to join the DAF.
E	Workers had a higher standard of living and therefore support Nazi rule.		Reliable. Workers enjoyed better amenities and experience such as holidays under the KdF schemes.
F		The workers only supported the Nazi party out of fear.	Reliable. German workers were threatened with punishment should they oppose Hitler's rule so many to support him out of fear of being imprisoned in a labour camp.

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

² Ibid.

Section B: Essays

2 'The impact of colonial rule on the local people was detrimental mainly due to the loss of power.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer with reference either to Indonesia or to Vietnam. [10]

Unpacking of the **proposed** argument, "loss of power". The proposed argument refers to the political transformation the Sultans and Malay rulers experienced under the British where they lost their ability to rule such as making laws and collecting taxes.

Unpacking the **counter argument** would be to discuss alternative reasons why British colonial rule was disastrous for the locals. This can include changes to the economy where locals became exposed to the global export-oriented economy or social changes such as a plural society.

L1	IDENTIFIES / DESCRIBES reasons. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing two or more.</i>	1-3
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason OR other reasons. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason AND other reasons. <i>Award 6 marks for explanations of both the given reason and other additional reasons. Award an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <i>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors.</i>	6-10

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

Loss of Power, Unit 1, pp. 113-114

- ✓ **[Evidence] [How did the French govern Colonial Vietnam?] [P.113]** Pre-colonial Vietnam had a central administration where the officials reported to the court at Hue. Vietnam also had a traditional hierarchy from the emperor at the top followed by the Nobles and then the Mandarins. It was mainly Confucian system of governance. There was Direct rule in Cochinchina and Indirect rule in Annam and Tonkin.
 - o [P.114] The French Administration controlled everything in Cochinchina. In the Northern Annam and Tonkin, the traditional bureaucracy was kept but the French had their own new administration and closely monitored the traditional one. French Residents were appointed in Annam and Tonkin. The French also took over the control of economic resources such as the collection of taxes. Unlike the Vietnamese before, the French could levy taxes on individuals and force them to pay their taxes in cash. French institutions and laws were implemented.
 - o **[Explanation] [What was the impact of French rule in Vietnam? Why was it disastrous?]** Even in Indirect rule, the traditional bureaucracy was subservient to the authority provided by the French. The local rulers lost their traditional powers and thus lost their status in Colonial Vietnam. They could no longer command the kind of authority that they used to possess. Their lives were thus worse off than before the coming of the French as they were mere figureheads now.

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

Cash and Export-Oriented Economy, Unit 1, pp. 115-117

- ✓ **[Evidence] [How did the local economy transform under the French?] [P. 115]** Like the rest of Pre-colonial Southeast Asia, barter trade was prevalent. Food was grown for one's own consumption. Crops were used to feed the family. Only surpluses were traded. Vietnam also used coins like those in China such as the Silver Dragon Coins.

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

- o With colonisation, everything was to be paid using standardised currency to make trade more efficient and fairer. The French issued Vietnamese piastre and coins. The French encouraged the Vietnamese to grow rice, and only rice for export. However, these actions made the Vietnamese economy more vulnerable to fluctuations in price and thus losing huge amounts of money. By 1920, Vietnam was the world's third largest exporter of rice.
- o In Tonkin, the irrigation systems were ancient and dilapidated. The plots of land were small. Thus, the peasants could farm little for export. Moreover, the Red River frequently flooded its banks leading to destroyed crops. It was different in Cochinchina as the Mekong River provided for very fertile lands. Rice cultivation there grew four times by the late 1930s. Rice exports between 1860 and 1900 grew tenfold.
- o By 1930, Vietnam was the largest producer of coal in Southeast Asia.
- o Large French companies such as Michelin established rubber plantations in Vietnam. By 1929, the land area under rubber cultivation in Cochinchina had risen from 15,000 to 90,000 hectares.
- o **[Explanation] [What was the impact of the economic transformation? How did the locals lose out?]** However, it was the wealthy landowners that mainly benefitted. Though the cash economy brought about more trade, it adversely affected the poor as they did not have enough cash to trade and borrowed at high interest rates simply to keep up with tax payments or to earn a living. Though the cash economy brought about more trade, it adversely affected the poor as they did not have enough cash to trade and borrowed at high interest rates.
- o [P.116] Many also suffered as they were left vulnerable due to the worldwide fluctuations in prices as peasants also experienced significant losses when demand prices trapping many in a vicious cycle of poverty.
- o [P.117] Growing rice was also not easy as the crop could fail due to pests, diseases, poor weather. This caused many peasants to lose income, and many became saddled with high levels of debt.

Land Alienation, Unit 1, p. 117

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What was land ownership like in precolonial and colonial Vietnam?]** [P.117] Before, land was owned communal or by small-scale private landowners. [P.117] The French colonial government needed to find ways to extract more profit from existing lands. To open new areas for cultivation, the colonial state introduced private land ownership. To do so, the French declared large uninhabited tracts of land in Southern Vietnam as Public Domain. They gave them to wealthy Vietnamese collaborators or French colonists. Farmers who wanted to grow crops had to rent the land from landlords as tenants.
- **[Explanation] [What was the impact of the economic transformation? How did the locals lose out?]** Land Alienation became a serious problem as the local peasants simply did not have enough money to rent the land. The local peasants, who borrowed money at high interest rates also lost land when they could not afford to make their payment to the money lenders or pay their taxes due to the fluctuation of prices.
- Even when the peasants could find the money to rent the land, crop failure was especially common leading many to become heavily indebted to money lenders. Many were then forced to work for landlords under harsh conditions to repay their loans.
- By 1939, there were 225,000 landowners but over a million landless peasants. 2.5% of the population owned up to 45% of the land.
- The quality of life for workers deteriorated. In 1928, one in ten plantation workers ran away.

Increased taxation, and subordination of the local economy to the French Economy, Unit 1, pp. 119-120, 121-122

- ✓ **[Evidence] [How did the French tax the locals?]** [P.115] The French colonial state established monopolies on opium, alcohol and salt – item used extensively by the locals. The colonial government imposed high taxes on them. Some of these items were once self-gathered and consumed now cost more to buy.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [How did the French treat the local economy?]** [P. 119] Previously, private artisans and craftsmen could ply their trade on their own. The locals were free to purchase whatever products they desired. France set up high trade barriers with China. There were heavy taxes on imported goods not from France. The Vietnamese therefore had no choice but to purchase French goods. Despite the disastrous consequences of

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

the 1929 Great Depression, Vietnam still had to continue to export rice even if it meant letting the people go hungry.

- o **[Explanation] [What was the impact of the economic transformation? How did the locals lose out?]**
The needs of the locals were often neglected. The French were more concerned about supporting their country instead of the Vietnamese. The entry of French manufactured goods into Vietnam also displaced local artisans and craftsmen.

Weighing: Balanced Conclusion**Suggested Answer. Criterion: Root Cause**

- ✓ **[Weighing Criterion]** Overall, it was the **[Given Factor] loss of power by the local rulers** that was the main impact over the economic subordination of the local economy as it led to a foundational shift in Vietnamese society. **[Explaining the balance]** The French dismantled the traditional Confucian hierarchy and with that began imposing their own style of rule, and economic control. Hence, such changes were only possible with political control over French Vietnam.

3 'The main goal of the Big Three in the Treaty of Versailles was punishment.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Unpacking of the **proposed** argument, "punishment". The proposed argument refers to the use of the treaty to punish Germany for the devastation it was responsible for in World War One.

Unpacking the **counter argument** would be to discuss alternative reasons for the treaty such as the issue of prevention of a subsequent conflict or payment for the losses the Entente powers had experienced.

L1	IDENTIFIES / DESCRIBES reasons. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing two or more.</i>	1-3
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason OR other reasons. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason AND other reasons. <i>Award 6 marks for explanations of both the given reason and other additional reasons. Award an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <i>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors.</i>	6-10

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

Punishment, Unit 1, pp. 132-143

- ✓ **[Evidence] [In what way did the treaty punish Germany? What was the context before the war? What happened during the war?]** France had experienced widespread infrastructural destruction during the war. France lost some 1.7 million men in the war with Germany. Over the years, Germany also attacked France and took over important territories such as Alsace-Lorraine in 1871. Through Article 231, the War Guilt Clause, Germany was to accept total responsibility for the war. Additionally, Germany was to lose 10% of her land and 12.5% of her citizens. Her armed forces would be limited to 100,000 men, no air force or tanks – barely enough to defend her borders. Germany was to be stripped of all her overseas colonies and possessions too.
- **[Explanation] [How was the treaty a punishment?]** Therefore, these terms ensured that Germany would be economically and militarily weak – a huge humiliation for the once mighty German empire who had one of the biggest and most powerful militaries in Europe before the war.

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

Prevention, Unit 1, pp. 132-143

- ✓ **[Evidence] [In what way did the treaty prevent a future war? What was the context before the war? What happened during the war?]** Through Article 231, the War Guilt Clause, Germany was to accept total responsibility for the war. Additionally, Germany was to lose 10% of her land and 12.5% of her citizens. Her armed forces would be limited to 100,000 men, no air force or tanks – barely enough to defend her borders. Germany was to be stripped of all her overseas colonies and possessions too. She was only to have six battleships. Germany would also have to pay 6.6million pounds or 269 billion gold marks, a crippling amount at the time. Additionally, France was also concerned that with the German population being larger and younger, without punishing terms, Germany would be able to recover and fight a future war easily.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [In what way did the treaty prevent a future war? What was the context before the war? What happened during the war?]** The treaty also made provision of a new international organisation that would resolve international disputes peacefully. This would stop the need for secret alliances and treaties for national security, one of the main causes of the first world war.

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

- o **[Explanation] [How did the treaty prevent a future conflict?]** Therefore, these terms ensured that Germany would be economically and militarily weak. By being weak, Germany would not have the means or resources to create another war again. Without the resources to start a war, France need not worry about another German invasion again and Britain would not need to fret over any naval arms race. With the LON, it is hoped that international disputes would be settled amicably without needing to go to war. Therefore, preventing future wars.

Payment, Unit 1, pp. 132-143

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What happened during the war? What losses did the Entente powers experience? What were the terms of the treaty?]** In World War One, France lost 1.7 million men, roughly 4% of her population. Britain had lost 2% of hers. Both Britain and France experienced widespread devastation of their lands and had war debts they needed to pay off too. Through Article 231, the War Guilt Clause, Germany was to accept total responsibility for the war. Additionally, Germany was to lose 10% of her land and 12.5% of her citizens. Her armed forces would be limited to 100,000 men, no air force or tanks – barely enough to defend her borders. Germany was to be stripped of all her overseas colonies and possessions too. She was only to have six battleships. Germany would also have to pay 6.6million pounds or 269 billion gold marks, a crippling at the time. Additionally, France was also concerned that with the German population being larger and younger, without punishing terms, Germany would be able to recover and fight a future war easily.
- o **[Explanation] [How were the terms payment for the war losses experienced by Britain and France?]** By paying heavy reparations, Britain and France would both be well compensated for the losses they experienced in the war and using the funds to rebuild critical infrastructure and industries in their homelands.

Weighing: Balanced Conclusion

Suggested Answer. Criterion: Root cause

- ✓ **[Weighing Criterion]** The main goal of the Treaty of Versailles was punishment **[Given Factor] because it was the root to all the terms found in the treaty so that Germany would never again threaten the peace of Europe. [Explaining the balance]** While the treaty also aimed to prevent future wars and secure payment for damages, its harsh terms were primarily driven by a desire to make Germany suffer for causing World War I. Germany had long been considered an adversary in Europe and this was the chance the Big Three had to finally humiliate and punish her. This is evident in the War Guilt Clause, which forced Germany to accept full responsibility for the war, and in the severe military, territorial, and economic restrictions imposed. The heavy reparations and national humiliation reflected a clear intent to punish rather than reconcile. Prevention and payment were important, but they were ultimately rooted in the overarching aim of retribution.

4 'The British government's policy of appeasement was a failure in Europe in the 1930s.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [10]

Unpacking of the **proposed** argument, "failure". The proposed argument refers to the outright failure of the policy of appeasement to deter Hitler's aggression in Europe.

Unpacking the **counter argument** would be to discuss alternative reasons focused on the success of it, though limited, in how it allowed the Allies time to rearm.

L1	IDENTIFIES / DESCRIBES reasons. <i>Award 1 mark for identifying one reason, 2 marks for identifying two or more. Award 2 marks for describing one reason and 3 marks for describing two or more.</i>	1-3
L2	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason OR other reasons. <i>Award 4 marks for an explanation and an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 5 marks.</i>	4-5
L3	EXPLAINS GIVEN reason AND other reasons. <i>Award 6 marks for explanations of both the given reason and other additional reasons. Award an additional mark for additional reasons or additional supporting details, to a maximum of 8 marks.</i> <i>Award an additional 2 marks (to a maximum of 10 marks) for a balanced conclusion based on an explicit consideration of the relative importance of different factors.</i>	6-10

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

Failure (for various reasons) because it only emboldened Hitler, Unit 1, pp. 262-270

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What was appeasement about?] [P. 263]** The goal of appeasement was to maintain peace in Europe by avoiding conflict with Nazi Germany. After the devastation of World War I, leaders in Britain and France hoped that by conceding to some of Hitler's demands, such as territorial expansion, they could prevent another large-scale war as Hitler would be appeased and his demands satisfied.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [What were the considerations France and Britain had? Why did they adopt appeasement? What happened in World War One?] [P. 262]** World War I had a huge impact on both countries which had suffered tremendous losses in the war. They were not militarily prepared for another war of a similar scale. Public disgust towards war, along with the effects of the Great Depression on the economies of both countries, made rearmament very difficult even if their leaders wanted it. As both countries were democracies, they had to take public opinion into consideration in decision-making. For example, in Britain, Chamberlain realised that he would not have public support in a war against Germany when he saw the lack of interest by the British public when Germany remilitarised the Rhineland and the public enthusiasm when the Munich Agreement was signed. Hence, appeasement was adopted because it was believed that by giving into Hitler's demands, a war which was not wanted by the British and French public to begin with, would be averted.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [What were the considerations France and Britain had? Why did they adopt appeasement? Why were they sympathetic to Hitler and his demands?] [P. 262]** Many British politicians, including Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, believed that the Treaty of Versailles had been overly harsh on Germany. As a result, when Hitler claimed that ethnic Germans in Czechoslovakia were being oppressed, Chamberlain saw his grievances as legitimate and believed Hitler's intentions were limited to securing self-determination for German-speaking peoples—an idea that aligned with the original aims of the Treaty. This belief led to the policy of appeasement, as the British sympathised with Germany's position and assumed that meeting Hitler's territorial demands would satisfy him and prevent war. They viewed actions like the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the annexation of Austria as reasonable or tolerable. However, this was a grave misjudgment, as Hitler's ambitions extended far beyond reclaiming lost territory.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [What were the considerations France and Britain had? Why did they adopt appeasement? Why was communism considered the bigger threat?] [P. 262]** Many leaders in Britain and France feared communism more than they did Hitler's actions. It was vastly different from their ideas of democracy and

Proposed Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

capitalism and viewed it as a bigger threat than Hitler's Nazism. Hence, Hitler's domestic policies of banning the Communist Party and putting its leaders in concentration camps resonated with the leaders of Britain and France. Although the Western powers were aware of Germany's rapid remilitarisation programme from 1935 onwards, they believed that a stronger Germany could act as a buffer against the Soviet Union and prevent the spread of Communism to the West. Hence, they adopted appeasement to prevent the potential spread of Communism to their own countries.

- ✓ **[Evidence] [What were the considerations France and Britain had? Why did they adopt appeasement? Why was communism considered the bigger threat?]** [P. 262] Many leaders in Britain and France feared communism more than they did Hitler's actions. It was vastly different from their ideas of democracy and capitalism and viewed it as a bigger threat than Hitler's Nazism. Hence, Hitler's domestic policies of banning the Communist Party and putting its leaders in concentration camps resonated with the leaders of Britain and France. Although the Western powers were aware of Germany's rapid remilitarisation programme from 1935 onwards, they believed that a stronger Germany could act as a buffer against the Soviet Union and prevent the spread of Communism to the West. Hence, they adopted appeasement to prevent the potential spread of Communism to their own countries.
 - **[Explanation] [Why was appeasement a failure?]** Therefore, appeasement was a failure in Europe during the 1930s because it emboldened Nazi Germany rather than containing it. By allowing Hitler to annex territories like the Rhineland, Austria, and the Sudetenland without consequence, Britain and France signalled that they would not intervene militarily. This encouraged Hitler to pursue even more aggressive expansion, ultimately leading to the invasion of Poland in 1939 and the outbreak of World War II. Instead of preventing war, appeasement gave Hitler the confidence and time to grow stronger.
- ✓ **[Evidence] [What was the impact of the appeasement on the Soviets and ultimately the Germans?]** [P. 271] To Stalin, appeasement looked like Britain and France were giving into Hitler's demands and allowing him to take over Eastern Europe. Stalin feared for the Soviet Union's own ability, at the time, to defend against Germany. Hence, to secure the Soviet Union's own borders, the Soviet Union signed the Nazi-Soviet pact in 1939.
 - **[Explanation] [Why was appeasement a failure?]** Appeasement failed here as it influenced Soviets to find their own solution to their security concerns. In this way, the pact strengthened Hitler's appetite for war as it ensured that his eastern borders were secure and allowed him to focus his expansion westward rapidly, sparking war on the continent.

Counter Argument(s): Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations

Success because it gave the Allies time to rearm, Unit 1, pp. 262-270

- ✓ **[Evidence] [How did appeasement give time to the Allies time to rearm?]** [P.268] By the time Germany invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, it became clear that Hitler's ambitions went beyond uniting German-speaking peoples as it broke the promises made at the Munich Agreement. This marked the turning point when Britain and France realised that appeasement had failed to secure lasting peace, and they began preparing for the possibility of war. After the Munich Agreement in 1938, the British government accelerated its military buildup, especially in the Royal Air Force (RAF) and air defence systems. For example, Britain began mass-producing modern fighter aircraft such as the Supermarine Spitfire and Hawker Hurricane, which would later prove crucial in the Battle of Britain in 1940. The government also expanded its radar network and improved civil defence measures, including the construction of air-raid shelters and the implementation of blackout regulations. In addition, the time allowed for the introduction of conscription in early 1939 and the forging of stronger diplomatic ties, such as security guarantees to Poland. The time gained through appeasement also allowed France to reinforce the Maginot Line, a series of fortifications along its border with Germany.
 - **[Explanation] [So how was appeasement a success?]** Therefore, appeasement ensured that the war would not begin immediately. It gave Britain and France a critical window to prepare militarily for the conflict that was to come, ensuring that both countries would have the means to defend themselves.

Weighing: Balanced Conclusion**Suggested Answer. Criterion: Long vs Short Term**

- ✓ **[Weighing Criterion]** Appeasement was more of a failure than a success **[Given Factor]** because the **short-term gains were outweighed by the long-term consequences.** **[Explaining the balance]** In the short term, appeasement bought Britain and France time to rearm, build up their air forces, and prepare their populations for the possibility of war. This proved crucial, especially for Britain, whose strengthened Royal Air Force and radar systems would later be vital in resisting German attacks during the Battle of Britain. However, appeasement allowed Hitler to grow bolder with each unchallenged move and undermined the credibility of Britain and France. By the time Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, his military was significantly stronger, and the Allies had lost the opportunity to confront a weaker Germany earlier leading the devastation of World War Two.