

## Answer Structures

### Part One: Knowledge Questions

#### **Describe (4 marks)**

- Use FOUR different basic points or TWO developed points to describe a certain event or policy.
- You don't have to evaluate or judge. Simply describe an event or policy in enough detail.

*Describe the Spartacist uprising on January 1919. (January 2012)*

*The Spartacists were a group of Communists who resented the new Republic so they rebelled: on the 5th January 1919 they took over the Government newspaper's headquarters. The Government enlisted the Freikorps to help and on the 10th, they gained control of the Spartacist own headquarters. Eventually, on the 15th, the Spartacists were defeated and the uprising was quashed. The leaders, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were killed, and 100 Spartacists died compared to a mere 13 Freikorps.*

*4/4 - A substantial amount of detail for a describe question. Well done!*

*Describe the role of women in Nazi Germany (June 2010)*

*In Nazi Germany the role of women was mainly to look after the home and give birth to as many children as possible. Hitler wanted a strong, Aryan army to defend Germany, so needed more youths to increase the army's numbers. Women were given 'Honour Crosses' depending on how many children they bore: bronze for four, silver for six, and gold for eight. This made them seem like heroes for giving birth so encouraged them to do so.*

*Mr Lewis: 3/4 - To get to full marks you could briefly discuss how the policies towards women changed after 1938.*

*When the birth rate increased in 1938 the Nazis changed their policies towards women: marriage loans were abolished and the 1938 Divorce Law allowed a man to divorce his wife if she was unable to bear children, showing that the women had served their purpose.*

#### **Explain (6 marks or 8 marks)**

- You need to *explain (showing direct links to the question)* why an event happened or why an event was seen as significant.
- One, well explained, paragraph will get you 4/6 and two, well explained, paragraphs will get you 6/6.
- If the question is an 8 mark question, you can try to explain three reasons. However, you can still get 7/8 with 2 well explained reasons.

#### **Example:**

*Explain why the Weimar Republic faced an economic crisis in 1923. (January 2012)*

*One reason why the Weimar Republic faced an economic crisis was because French and Belgian troops invaded the Ruhr, an important industrial region of the country, as Germany could not keep up with reparation payments. The Weimar Republic encouraged workers to go on a general strike to avoid giving raw materials to the troops. With fewer people working, the Republic had less money, and goods to trade with other countries, which negatively affected the economy. Moreover, strike pay had to be given out, depleting the economy further. MR LEWIS: 1 well explained point.*

*As a result of this, the Republic printed more money. However, this did not solve the economic crisis but rather exacerbated it: it resulted in hyperinflation, where prices and the value of money fluctuated continuously. Money that could have bought a house before 1923 could not have bought a loaf of bread in 1923! Since the value of money decreased so dramatically, it damaged the German economy, contributing to the 1923 economic crisis. MR LEWIS: Second point developed enough to gain the marks.*

*MR LEWIS: 6/6 - A perfect length. Well done.*

## Evaluate (10 marks)

- This is the question that you must use TWO sides of an argument. This will often be FOR or AGAINST a statement, POSITIVE or NEGATIVE effects, CHANGE or CONTINUITY.
- To structure this, you need to have *at least* one paragraph for each side of the argument and then a conclusion.
- If you are aiming for an A or A\* you should identify the two sides of the argument within your introduction (only very briefly) and then say which side you fall on.

### Example:

'The Munich Putsch of 1923 was a disaster for Hitler and the Nazi Party.' How far do you agree with this statement? (January 2010)

MR LEWIS: I would recommend having a brief introduction that clarifies your argument at the beginning. It might only be one sentence that summarises your argument but it could help to get to the 10/10 mark.

The Munich, or Beer Hall, Putsch of 1923 was an unsuccessful attempt to take over the city. It can be said that it was a disaster for Hitler and the Nazi Party because of this, however other outcomes of the Putsch made it less of a disaster.

In some ways, the Munich Putsch was a disaster: the Nazi Party had indeed been defeated and the rebellion had been quelled by the police and army. In fact 16 Nazis were killed, the leaders arrested, and Hitler was shot during the fracas. So Hitler failed to take over Munich as he had planned- meaning the attempted rebellion was a failure in this way. Initial media coverage of this was likely been negative, which may have discouraged Germans to support the Nazis, meaning the Munich Putsch was not as successful as it could have been. MR LEWIS: A good strong opening paragraph dealing with the failures of the putsch. Could be developed through Hitler's belief that the people of Germany would rise up in anger at the Weimar Government, something that subsequently failed to happen.

TASK: What punishments were given to Hitler? How might this have damaged the party?

Hitler was imprisoned for 9 months and forbidden to speak in public until 1927- with the Nazi's leader unable to appear and speak publicly, the party appeared weak and ineffectual. Again, they could have lost votes as a result.

On the other hand, after the arrest, Hitler utilised the media coverage, providing Germany with a more positive representation of the Nazi party and their aims. He gave speeches; every word Hitler said was recorded and published in newspapers. This meant their objectives were spread to a large number of citizens, so they could gain more supporters, making the 1923 uprising less of a disaster.

Later, when Hitler was imprisoned, he wrote 'Mein Kampf', including his beliefs and ideas. This became a best-seller despite the fact he was in jail. Millions of Germans read it and became familiar with his theories. Support for the Nazis grew, especially since the Weimar Republic was undergoing a period of weakness. So although imprisonment was a negative outcome of the Putsch, his autobiography combined with general opinion of the Weimar Republic made it less of a disaster.

To sum up, although the Nazi's defeat in Munich was a failure, it led to opportunities for Hitler to advertise his ideology and gain the support of the citizens of Germany. As a result, it was not a complete disaster, so I mostly disagree with the statement.

MR LEWIS: 9/10 A\* - A little more on the first side of the argument and a brief introduction would easily get this to 10/10

## Part Two: Source Questions

### What is the message of Source X? (7 Marks)

- The marker wants to know what the cartoonist's opinion is of a certain topic. The MESSAGE is simply another word for OPINION in this case.
- You need to tell the marker what the MESSAGE is at the beginning of your answer.
- Pick out parts of the source that back up your interpretation.
- Apply contextual knowledge to the cartoon to show you understand the time period.

#### Have a look at this full mark answer.

The message of this cartoon is that racist opponents of immigration are fascists. The men are writing on the wall that 'blacks' should go home and the man walking by identifies the slogan writers as fascists with a sarcastic comment about Hitler's birthday. Poor spelling in the slogan, 'britan' and 'wite', is used as another way of criticising them. The cartoon is clearly against racism.



A British newspaper cartoon, 1967.

The context for the cartoon is the formation in 1967 of the National Front, and their policy – end immigration into Britain. Immigration after the Second World War was necessary to provide a labour force that would allow Britain's economy to grow. The country welcomed immigrants from a range of countries including the Caribbean islands and India. Many people did not like black people moving into the country.

To conclude, the message of this source is that the racist people in Britain are stupid and wrong.

### Why was Source X published in YEAR? (7 marks)

- Here the marker is looking for you to suggest the PURPOSE of the source.
- Try to work out what the source is suggesting and then suggest *why* it has been made.
- The source to the right has been taken from a LYNX advert for men.
  - The MESSAGE of the source is, if you wear LYNX, women will be attracted to you.
  - The PURPOSE of the source is, to get you to buy LYNX products!
- To get to the TOP marks you then need to suggest why it was published in the year it has.
  - For example – In 2015 there were a huge number of deodorants being sold within Britain, therefore LYNX needed to ensure that they raised their sales above the competitors through using clever advertising such as this.



### How useful is source X for TOPIC? (7 marks)

- For this type of question you need to decide how useful a source is to study a specific topic.
- You are expected to suggest why it *is* useful for that topic and why it may not be.
- To do this, you need to judge how useful the CONTENT of the source is (What does the source say? Does it actually help understand more about that topic?)
- Then judge the source based on the TYPE of source, the ORIGIN of the source or the PURPOSE of the source. Does this make it less useful because it isn't reliable or less trustworthy?
- Then reach a conclusion.

### How accurate is source X/Which is more accurate, Source X or Source Y? (8 marks)

- To measure accuracy you must have a good range of contextual knowledge. It is asking you if what you have seen in the source is reflective of what you have learnt throughout the course.
- You also need to try and judge the accuracy based upon the TYPE of source, the ORIGIN of the source or the PURPOSE of the source. Is there a reason this source may not be accurate?
- HINT: You can also CROSS REFERENCE to other sources to show that a source is accurate. Below is a full mark answer – I have highlighted the cross referencing for you. Even though they have not been asked to judge the accuracy of Source A, they have used it to suggest that one of the sources they are evaluating is indeed accurate as they say the same thing.

Q: Study Sources D and E. Which source do you think gives a more accurate view of the reception given to immigrants in Britain in the 1960s?

I think that Source E gives a more accurate impression of the reception given to immigrants. In Source E, the man remembers leaving Pakistan and trying to get work in Nottingham, but was disappointed that he was only able to get a cleaning job. Many other immigrants found themselves in similar situations. The man in Source E says that he was aware of this before he left Pakistan. The source says that many qualified or skilled people were only able to get low paid, low skilled jobs. This accurately reflects the experience of many Commonwealth immigrants. **Source A shows the kind of prejudice that many immigrants faced in Britain and the racism that they faced.** All this supports Source E and makes it accurate.

Source D, I feel is less accurate. It shows friendly people with 'Welcome to Britain' signs. However, its purpose was to promote good race relations against a background of tension which existed in Britain since the 1958 race riots in London and the Midlands. This is not a typical reaction of the time, and gives a false impression of the immigration situation in Britain. It only shows the actual arrival of the immigrants, rather than how they were treated by the communities they settled in, and does not reflect the picture of racism, ignorance and abuse often encountered. Immigrants found it difficult to find anywhere to stay and many people put notices in the windows saying 'no blacks here'. Others supported Enoch Powell when he said there were too many immigrants coming into the country. So Source D is not very accurate about the reception most immigrants received.

**8/8 – Full marks.**

### How far does Source X prove Source Y wrong? (8 marks)

- This type of question simply wants you to compare two sources and decide which is the most useful to a historian.
- You will be expected to compare CONTENT (Measure how far the sources agree or disagree with each other)
- Then you need to decide which source is the most trustworthy. Use the TYPE of source, the ORIGIN or the PURPOSE to do this.

*The below answer got full marks! Take a look at how they have deployed each of the skills.*

Source C proves Source D wrong to an extent. Source D argues that Labour made changes that benefitted people in society, especially women whilst Source C argues that Britain has become a less civilised place because of the Labour Party. Source D refers to the 'Divorce Reform Act' and the 'Matrimonial Property Act' of 1970 which many saw as a way of releasing some women that were trapped in unhappy marriages whilst Source C says that this has actually broken Britain and this has led to 'marriages which only last a few minutes' and creating 'deprived children'.

#### SOURCE C

From 1964 to 1970 Labour has made Britain a far less civilised place to live. Labour attacked what they saw as 'out of date' laws. But at least people knew how to behave in the 1950s. Now we see shouting and swearing and violence in the streets. Now we have marriages which last only a few minutes, leaving women miserable and isolated, broken families and deprived children. We have the terrible toll of unborn children who have been killed by selfish, reckless young women running eagerly for abortions.

*From an article in the pro-Conservative newspaper, The Daily Telegraph, in 1970. There was a General Election that year.*

#### SOURCE D

Roy Jenkins and his colleagues made Britain a better place, especially for women. When Labour took power in 1964 the existing laws were clearly inadequate for the modern age. Many laws were viciously unfair to women. The Divorce Reform Act of 1969 was just one of the many great liberal and civilising reforms of the 1960s. This Act ended the emphasis on guilt and fault. The Matrimonial Property Act of 1970 recognised that a wife's work was an important contribution to a marriage. The laws represented a change in marriage from an unequal contract into a partnership based on affection and companionship.

*From an obituary for the Labour MP Roy Jenkins who served in Labour governments in the 1960s and 1970s and died in 2003. An obituary is an article written about someone soon after their death.*

However, the trustworthiness of both sources must be taken into consideration. Source D is an obituary and therefore, negative comments are not going to be made about Roy Jenkins impact on society. Some phrases are exaggerated as the source states 'the laws represented a change in marriage from an unequal contract into a partnership based on affection and companionship.' Not all marriages after these laws would be like this. However, Source C is taken from a pro-Conservative newspaper and will therefore, try to be negative about the Labour Party as it is in an election year. There is a lot of emotive statements to try and persuade people not to vote for Labour such as referring to 'selfish' women 'running for abortions'. Therefore, it could be argued this source is less trustworthy than Source D.

To conclude, both sources are most untrustworthy and are taken from two ends of the political spectrum and therefore, one source does not prove the other wrong.

**'Statement' – Use the sources and your own knowledge. How far do you agree with this statement? (16 marks)**

- For this type of question you must look at BOTH sides of the argument.
- You must also use both the SOURCES and your OWN KNOWLEDGE to answer the question.
- To get full marks you need to deploy a good range of your own knowledge and references to the sources.

This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three skills. Notice the way they have structured their answer into AGREE/DISAGREE/CONCLUSION.

*Q: 'In the period 1939–1975, immigrants were welcomed into Britain.' How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use your knowledge of British society 1939–1975 and the sources to explain your answer.*

I only partially agree with this interpretation. At first immigrants received a mixed reception. Soon after they arrived many of them met with discrimination. For example, many landlords put up notices that said 'No blacks here'. Source C shows that immigrants from India were not welcome, because the leaflet is trying to discourage immigrants from coming to Britain. Source A shows people writing racist slogans telling immigrants to 'Go home'. There were also race riots at this time. In Notting Hill mobs of Teddy Boys attacked the houses of West Indian people. In 1962, the government passed a law restricting immigration into Britain which shows that they were not welcome. Enoch Powell contributed to all this with his Rivers of Blood speech in 1968. Many well educated immigrants like teachers and lawyers found that they were not welcome and they ended up with jobs as labourers and cleaners as shown in Source E.

On the other hand, some immigrants did receive a positive welcome. The first large group of West Indian immigrants arrived in 1948 on the Empire Wind Rush. At the end of the war, there were a lot of labour shortages in Britain and the West Indians were welcomed in by London Transport and the National Health Service. At the end of the 1940s Indians began arriving in large numbers and many of those were welcomed into the textile factories. Some even opened up corner shops and ran Post Offices. In 1972 many Asian-Ugandans fled to Britain after being expelled by Idi Amin and they were welcomed as people could see that they were fleeing from persecution. Source B describes the experiences of a West Indian woman who was much happier after moving to Britain. This suggests that she must have been welcomed by her fellow workers and neighbours. The photograph in Source D also shows immigrants being welcomed into Britain. The people in the photograph are holding up placards saying 'Welcome to Britain'.

Overall, while there were many immigrants who were not welcomed and had to experience much discrimination, there are also many examples of immigrants being welcomed for a wide range of reasons over the whole period and so on balance I agree with the interpretation.