

Candidate Marks Report

Series : 6 2018

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	J410
Candidate No :	Component Code :	02
Candidate Name :		

Total Marks :

Question Part

1	<p>The world economic depression deeply impacted international relations in Europe. It gave way to aggressive economic protectionism, with the tariffs placed on imported goods causing trade to break down. The depression also led to the election of extremist parties, such as the Nazi Party who, through re-arming and acting aggressively toward other nations, (such as the aggression from the Nazis towards the Poles) caused a deep mistrust among nations in Europe, damaging international relations further.</p>
2	<p>The USA gradually became more involved in the war in Vietnam due to the fear of it turning communist. The US had already given much money to the French in order for them to defeat the communist Viet Minh. However this had failed, and the US had already made a large investment in the prevention of communism in Vietnam by 1954. Over By the early 1960s, the leader they had installed as a dictator to the South after the Geneva Conference, Diem, had begun to lose control of the countryside to the communist Viet Cong, and there was growing fear that the South would be overrun by the Communists. On top of this, there was a fear of a 'domino effect', which said that should the whole of Vietnam turn communist,</p>



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Question Part

it may cause a spread of communism across South Asia. ~~Thus~~ Therefore the US became more desperate to stop this, at first sending officials to train the South Vietnamese Army and then Operation Rolling Thunder, bombing the Viet Cong strategically, and then with full invasion forced in 1968, & escalating their involvement due to their increasing worry, and their policy of Truman doctrine.

3. The view of Robert Farber on Appeasement could definitely be considered a fair comment. He writes in 1993, after the end of the Cold War when Soviet archives are opened to the western Powers, giving way to the popular view ~~that~~ of 'Chamberlain back on trial', as the archives reveal that it was due to the ignorance of Chamberlain, and his ~~naïve ego or arrogance~~ arrogance that the policy of Appeasement was pursued, and other more viable options were ignored. His interpretation of Appeasement therefore has perhaps more credibility than other interpretations, as it has more evidence for it.

He could also be seen as taking the 'Guilty Men' view that was popular between 1939 and 1948, ~~but~~ as he directly blamed Chamberlain for the failure to prevent World War Two due to Appeasement, as did the group of writers



Question Part

under the alias 'Cato' when they published the book 'The Guilty Men', a direct and personal attack on British policy makers. However, 'the Guilty Men' view may have been born of the disappointment and fear caused by the ~~or~~ invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the sudden breakdown of the 'Well done Chamberlain' view that came about after the Munich Agreement, and the proclamation of 'Peace in our Time!'. Therefore, to say that *Robert Parker took this view would be wrong, as his view is based on no sudden anger, but on the documents from the Soviet Archives, and actual ~~prop~~ ^{Parker's view} ~~prop~~ ^{prop} ~~sentiment~~ ^{sentiment}. Furthermore, ~~it~~ ^{it} pushed no agenda, much unlike the view taken from the '60s to the late '80s of 'Rehabilitating Chamberlain', which came out of the widely popular ~~the~~ 'Peace Movement'. Chamberlain became revered during this time as a man who had pursued peace despite insurmountable odds, and a great deal of difficulty, and who, despite his obvious failure, really had done his best. The problem with this view is that it is merely in this Movement that he was rehabilitated, and this was only due to ~~agendas~~ ^{agendas} political agendas and, perhaps bias*, in order to show Peace WAS a real prospect.



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Question Part

		<p>Parker's lack of any discernible agenda makes his view more credible.</p>
4		<p>Some historians may take issue with the view of the US historian James Patterson as it is of the 'post-revisionist view', which fairly equally places placed the blame for the beginning of the Cold War on both the USA and the USSR, a view popular from the mid-70s to the late 1980s, and was created by the warming of relations between the US and the USSR, as well as the withdrawal of the American troops from Vietnam.</p> <p>However, Those of the revisionist view would take issue with the blame by Patterson of the USSR, as according to them it is due to the aggression shown by the USA in Europe in Marshall Aid, which which was a blatant attempt on the part of the USA to assert economical dominance over Europe, and therefore had in this way forced the USSR, in defence, to form the Eastern Bloc. The actions of Truman at the Potsdam conference were also a cause for blame, as he had been aggressive towards the Soviets, telling Stalin directly that the USA had successfully launched a nuclear weapon.</p> <p>Other historians of the US orthodox view</p>



Question Part

	<p>would take issue with it as well for its blame of the USA, as it was due to the atrocities committed by the Red Army in Eastern Europe, as well as Stalin's determination to take full control over Eastern Europe, his aggressive expansionism, that the US was forced to give Marshall Aid to stop the rest of Europe ^{suffering} the same fate. Due to Stalin's unwillingness to negotiate, there was little agreement. However, this view was taken in the Red scare, out of fear of blacklisting, whereas in 1996, Pitterson wrote free of restraint.</p>
5	<p>In West Germany, 3.5 million cases were brought before a review board, and under 400 were executed. Nazi officials were removed from their posts, and the education system was completely reformed. The Nazi Party was banned. However in East Germany, Nazi officials were sent to labour camps, and many thousands of trials were held for those merely suspected of Nazism, and many thousands were executed.</p>
6	<p>After 1933, the Nazis persecuted some groups in order to fulfill their beliefs, and stir up some sort of pro-Nazi fervor among the</p>



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Question Part

people. After the Reichstag fire, a Dutch Communist Karl von der Lubbe was accused, and a further 6000 communists were arrested. This was due to the strict anti-Communism followed by the Nazis, and was done as they wanted to prevent the growth of Communism. The Jews were also persecuted in accordance with the Nazis 25-point programme, which was deeply anti-Semitic, and also blamed Jews for the 'stab in the back' myth, which caused the loss of Germany in WW1. Groups such as homosexuals were also persecuted, as they were seen by the Nazis as a direct affront to family life, something they saw as vital to the growth and continuation of the 1000 year Third Reich.

7 Source A is more useful to historians looking at the roles of women in Nazi Germany than Source B. This is as source B, while it does indeed show the reader the plight of women in Germany, is written in (at the latest) 1934, only a year into Hitler's rule as Chancellor, and possibly only just as he had become the Führer. Seeing as this is the case, and Hitler wasn't the Führer until August of that year, it is very likely to be



Question Part

have been written in Weimar Germany's time, and therefore show the life of women in Weimar Germany, and is meant to be a plea to Hitler to change this.

As Hitler had Goebbels in charge of the Nazi Propaganda Machine, the source A shows the desired role of women in Nazi Germany, and, as it is produced in the late 1930s, means it is more definite to show this role, as it had had time to develop and to come into fruition.

8 The statement that² the Nazis were only able to take power in Germany due to the impact of the worldwide economic depression is true.

The party, in 1928, had only 3 per cent of the vote. By 1933, it had 33 per cent (240 seats); and a majority. This ^{was} able to happen, ^{slowly} as the industries of Germany ~~collapsed~~, businesses collapsed, and unemployment soared. ~~This led~~ This led people to lose faith in parties such as the Communists who failed to come up with any real, clear plan to get Germany back on its feet, and turn instead to the Nazis, who had remained organized, and offered extreme economic solutions, such as the halt of



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Question Part

reparations payments, which were already widely opposed. Their vision also of a better, more powerful Germany, enticed those who were living in abhorrence to vote for them.

There was also a fear that the Wall Street Crash and the subsequent Depression that followed were evidence of the collapse of ~~some~~ Capitalism, which Karl Marx and Lenin hailed as the time for the workers revolution, and the eruption of Communism. Therefore, many voted for ^{the Nazis} them in order to prevent the Communists from coming to power. In this way, had it not been for this fear catalyzed by economic depression, it is possible that the Nazis would not have been able to seize power, with their majority.

It could also be argued, however, that it was due to Hindenburg and his affront to democracy in Germany that the Nazis grew in power. He had passed laws allowing his ^{Ernst} chancellor and him to pass laws without the consent of the Reichstag. These laws cut wages and benefits, and raised taxes, and angered the people more into voting Nazi. To conclude, this is a fair statement.



