

Paper 2 (Sourcework) – Markschemes and sample answers to mark in class

General Tips

- **Paragraphs** - to structure your responses
- **Focus** - On the question: don't just say everything you can about the sources
- **Substantiate** - your points by using background knowledge / cross-references to other sources

1. How far do these two sources differ?

L1	Summarises what each of the sources says	1
L2	Points out that one source says something the other doesn't	2
L3	Agreements or disagreements	3-4
L4	Agreements and disagreements	5

Tips

- Two paragraphs – one on agreements, one on differences

2. Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer.

L1	Unsupported points, general answers, summaries of the source	1-2
L2	Points based on content or provenance of the source	3-4
L3	Points based on content and provenance of the source	5-6

Tips

- Two paragraphs – one on the content of the source, one on its provenance

3. Do you think that the writer was lying in this source?

L1	Unsupported points, general answers, summaries of source	1-2
L2	One sided answer, based on content and / or provenance of source	3-5
L3	Two sided answer, based on content or provenance of source	5-6
L4	Two sided answer, based on content and provenance of source	7-8

Tips

- Two paragraphs – one on "lying", one on "telling the truth";
- Check content against other sources and background knowledge
- Check provenance against your knowledge of the writer's purpose / audience

4. How similar are the messages of these two sources?

L1	Description / summary of source(s) or unsubstantiated assertions	1
L2	Interpretation of source(s)	2-3
L3	Similarities or differences	4-5
L4	Similarities and differences	6-7

Tips

- Two paragraphs – one on similarities, one on differences

5. "These two sources prove [X]". How far do you agree?

L1	Description / summary of source(s), unsubstantiated assertions	1
L2	One sided answer, based on content and / or provenance of source(s)	2-4
L3	Two sided answer, based on content of each source	4-5
L4	Two sided answer, based on content and provenance of each source	6-7

Tips

- Two paragraphs – one agreeing, one disagreeing
- Round off with a comment about the unreliability of source(s) to get into L4

6. Do these sources show that the author changed his mind?

L1	Description / summary of source(s), unsubstantiated assertions	1
L2	One sided answer, based on content and / or provenance of source(s)	2-4
L3	Two sided answer, based on content or provenance of source(s)	4-5
L4	Two sided answer, based on content and provenance of source(s)	6-7

Tips

- Two paragraphs – one agreeing, one disagreeing
- Round off with a comment about the purpose of source(s) to get into L4

7. How far do you agree that...

L1	No use of sources in the answer	1-2
L2	One sided answer, based on sources	3-5
L3	Two sided answer, based on sources	6-8
L4	As L4, plus comment(s) on reliability of sources used	9-10

Tips

- Two paragraphs – one agreeing, one disagreeing
- Refer to at least two sources in each paragraph
- Round off with a comment about the reliability of source(s) to get into L4

Sample Answers

1. How far do these two sources differ?

L1	Summarises what each of the sources says	1
L2	Points out that one source says something the other doesn't	2
L3	Agreements or disagreements	3-4
L4	Agreements and disagreements	5

Sample 1

These two sources differ in a variety of ways. First of all, one source was published in 1971, the other in 1972. One is 5 lines long, the other weighs in at 6 (an increase of 20%). In other ways though they are similar: both are written in the Arial font, and appear in the examination paper, and both come from history textbooks.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 2

The main way in which the sources differ is that Source A refers to Hitler's "consistency in aim and patience in preparation", but in contrast Source B refers to the Anschluss as an "unexpected development".

However, there are similarities too: Source A refers to Hitler's "hasty opportunism in action" which helps to explain why [B] regards the Anschluss as an "unexpected development". Another similarity is that Source A states that the Anschluss was a long term objective stated in Mein Kampf; Source B agrees that it was "essential for Eastwards expansion".

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 3

Source A states that Hitler had "patience" and "consistency" but that he was able to blend this when appropriate with "hasty opportunism in action" which reflected his own "hesitations and indecision". With regard to the Anschluss, Hitler's policies were a long term objective stated many years before in his book "Mein Kampf" (from my background knowledge I know that this translates as "My Struggle")

Source B describes the Anschluss as an unexpected development. It focuses on the fact that Schussnig cancelled a plebiscite about whether the Austrians wanted to join with Germany, and tells us that Hitler was persuaded by Goering to get rid of him as a result. From my background knowledge I know that this is true.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

2. Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer.

L1	Unsupported points, general answers, summaries of the source	1-2
L2	Points based on content or provenance of the source	3-4
L3	Points based on content and provenance of the source	5-6

Sample 1

In some ways I am not surprised by this source. It tells me that Hitler was aggressive to Schussnig: "I have only to give the order and your ridiculous defences will be blown to bits". I know from background knowledge that Hitler was aggressive – the Night of the Long Knives is a good example. Hitler also says in the source that he had a "historic mission", which is a view he expressed in "Mein Kampf".

In other ways, though, I am surprised by this source – Hitler says that Austria has always been guilty of "High Treason" and yet in Source D Hitler appears to welcome them as fellow Germans.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 2

I am not surprised by this source whatsoever. It tells me that Hitler was aggressive to Schussnig: "I have only to give the order and your ridiculous defences will be blown to bits". I know from background knowledge that Hitler was aggressive – the Night of the Long Knives is a good example.

Also, this dramatic event is exactly the sort of thing I would expect to see in published memoirs, because the author is of course trying to sell a "juicy" story.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

3. Do you think that the writer was lying in this source?

L1	Unsupported points, general answers, summaries of source	1-2
L2	One sided answer, based on content and / or provenance of source	3-5
L3	Two sided answer, based on content or provenance of source	5-6
L4	Two sided answer, based on content and provenance of source	7-8

Sample 1

I think Hitler is most definitely lying in this source. He says that "when I...give my word for something, then I keep it" which is a load of nonsense – from background knowledge I know that at the Munich Conference he promised not to invade Czechoslovakia, but did so less than a year afterwards!

Also, we have to remember that he is talking to a British journalist in this source, and so he would obviously be really keen to keep the British happy.

Finally, the source says that the Anschluss had taken Hitler by surprise, but Source A tells us that Hitler had aimed to take over Austria for ages!

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 2

In some ways, I think it's possible Hitler was lying in this source. We have to remember that he is talking to a British journalist in this source, and so he would obviously be really keen to keep the British happy.

In other ways, I think it's possible Hitler was telling the truth. He says that he was angry with Schussnig ("deception is something I cannot tolerate") and this is backed up by Source C ("The whole history of Austria is just one act of high treason").

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

4. How similar are the messages of these two sources?

L1	Description / summary of source(s) or unsubstantiated assertions	1
L2	Interpretation of source(s)	2-3
L3	Similarities or differences	4-5
L4	Similarities and differences	6-7

Sample 1

Source E shows Hitler and Mussolini standing at a mountain pass. Hitler is carrying his catch of the day, which is an animal representing Austria. Mussolini doesn't mind and waves at Hitler, which implies that they are friends.

Source F shows Hitler and Mussolini sitting on a jetty doing some fishing. Hitler has already caught Italy (symbolised by the "boot shaped" fish) and is now reeling in Austria as well from under the nose of Mussolini, suggesting that Germany has stolen Austria from Italy. Mussolini is smiling – suggesting Adolf is his friend – but Hitler is about to push him in the water, suggesting that Germany is not an ally that can be trusted.

One source is from Britain, and one is from Russia, which might help to explain why they see things differently.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 2

In some ways, the sources are similar. Both of them refer to the Anschluss – in the first, Austria is represented by a dead animal, in the second by a fish: either way, Austria has been "captured" by Germany. Both of them show Mussolini as being involved on Germany's side in all of this: in the first source he waves happily to Adolf, and in the second he smiles lovingly at him.

However, there are important differences. In particular, the first source suggests that Mussolini and Hitler are very friendly; but in the second source, Hitler is about to push Mussolini into the water – suggesting that Germany is going to betray Italy now she has what she wants.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

5. "These two sources prove it was wrong for Britain and France to oppose the Anschluss". How far do you agree?

L1	Description / summary of source(s), unsubstantiated assertions	1
L2	One sided answer, based on content and / or provenance of source(s)	2-4
L3	Two sided answer, based on content of each source	4-5
L4	As L3, but with a reference to the provenance of one or both sources	6-7

Sample 1

Source G suggests that Britain and France were right to oppose the Anschluss. The cartoon shows a large soldier (representing Germany) crushing her neighbours in a "domino effect" which eventually reaches Britain. The cartoonist is suggesting that although the events might start off far away, they will eventually reach Britain and France and so Germany needs to be stopped.

Source H suggests that Britain and France were wrong to oppose the Anschluss. It shows the Austrian people excited and happy that their country has become part of Germany, which suggests that Britain and France were wrong to see the Anschluss as being an aggressive act by Germany.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

6. Do these sources show that the author changed his mind?

L1	Description / summary of source(s), unsubstantiated assertions	1
L2	One sided answer, based on content and / or provenance of source(s)	2-4
L3	Two sided answer, based on content or provenance of source(s)	4-5
L4	Two sided answer, based on content and provenance of source(s)	6-7

Sample 1

These sources show that Chamberlain changed his mind so much that he must have had a brain transplant or something. In the first source, Chamberlain is refusing to get involved with Austria at all ("The British government cannot take responsibility"). In the second one though but he offers the "strongest condemnation" against Germany! There is only four days between these two sources, but the message is completely different. I am so astounded by the difference between the two sources that I am dizzy. I need to put my pen down for a few moments and pull myself together before moving on to question 7.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 2

In some ways these sources suggest that Chamberlain changed his mind about the Anschluss. In the first source, Chamberlain is refusing to get involved with Austria at all ("The British government cannot take responsibility"). In the second one though but he offers the "strongest condemnation" against Germany!

In other ways, though, these sources do not show that he changed his mind. After all, he could refuse to offer firm support to Austria, and at the same time though condemn Germany for her actions. Also, we have to remember that the first source was an official, private message between two governments ("nothing to do with us, get over it!") whilst the other one was a public statement ("we are morally outraged!") – Chamberlain hadn't changed his mind at all, he was just tweaking what he said for the audience he was aiming it at, the sly rascal!

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

7. Study ALL the sources.

How far do you agree that Britain and France were to blame for the Anschluss?

L1	No use of sources in the answer	1-2
L2	One sided answer, based on sources	3-5
L3	Two sided answer, based on sources	6-8
L4	As L4, plus comment(s) on reliability of sources used	9-10

Sample 1

It can be argued that France and Britain were to blame for the Anschluss, as they were to blame for all of Hitler's aggression. Germany had been severely weakened by Versailles, and desperate for revenge. The mistake of Britain and France was to give in to Germany enough to make her powerful and aggressive again, but not so much that she stopped wanting revenge. The French allowed Germany to remilitarise the Rhineland; the British signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement with Germany, and when Germany took over Austria, neither Britain nor France bothered getting involved.

On the other hand, it is too simple to blame France and Britain completely. If the USA had joined the League of Nations when it was set up, the League would have been much stronger, and would likely have stood up to such acts of aggression. Hitler would never have risked remilitarising the Rhineland or re-introducing conscription. Also, without the Wall St. Crash and the Depression, Hitler would never even have become chancellor of Germany.

In conclusion, Germany was to blame for causing the Anschluss; Britain and France were to blame for not reversing it.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 2

Sources A&B do not blame Britain and France. Instead, they focus on Germany's role – Hitler needed to expand eastwards, he had planned to do this since writing Mein Kampf, and he was provided with a great chance in 1938.

Sources E&F blame Italy. In both cartoons Mussolini is just standing aside and letting Hitler "get away with it" – Austria is shown as Hitler's "prey".

Source G does blame Britain and France though. Both countries are refusing to get involved in the crisis because it is "all so far away". This is backed up by Source I, in which Chamberlain says that Britain is "unable to provide protection" to Austria.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments:

Sample 3

Sources A&B do not blame Britain and France. Instead, they focus on Germany's role – Hitler needed to expand eastwards.

Source C blames England and France – Hitler says England will not "lift a finger" and that "it is too late for France" after backing down over the Rhineland issue – although we should remember that this source was written by Schussnig, who may have been exaggerating for effect so his memoirs would sell better (he might also have been bitter with Britain and France).

Source D doesn't blame anyone really.

Source E blames Italy - Mussolini is just standing aside and letting Hitler "get away with it" – Austria is shown as Hitler's "prey".

Source F blames Italy - Mussolini is just standing aside and letting Hitler "get away with it" – Austria is shown as Hitler's "prey".

Source G blames Britain and France though. Both countries are refusing to get involved in the crisis because it is "all so far away".

Source H doesn't blame anyone.

Source I blames Britain, which is "unable to provide protection"

Source J doesn't blame Britain, because she is condemning Germany.

Your mark for this answer:

Your comments: