

1.1 History: sources and the prescribed subject

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 34 marks

KEY WORDS purpose • collective security

History: sources and the prescribed subject

Objective

Apply the Paper 1 question techniques (comprehension, value and limitations, comparison, the mini-essay) with OPVL tied to the enquiry, and command the prescribed-subject menu with the move-to-global-war case studies (Paper 1 and the prescribed subjects).

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Paper 1 toolkit. Four sources, one hour, 24 marks. Q1 [3 + 2] comprehension: what a written source says, and a visual source's message; quote the source, no outside knowledge. Q2 [4]: value and limitations with reference to origin, purpose and content, relative to the enquiry. Q3 [6]: compare and contrast two sources, linked point by point. Q4 [9]: thesis, the sources, outside knowledge, counter-case, judgement. Purpose = the intended effect on an audience, inferred from form and moment. OPVL handles: origin (who, when, where), purpose, value, limitation – always relative to the question; bias is evidence, never disqualifying. Prescribed subjects: military leaders; conquest; move to global war (Japanese 1931–41, German and Italian 1933–40); rights and protest; conflict and intervention. Timing: give Q4 the most time.

2 Practice

2.1 State the OPVL letters and what each stands for.

[2]

2.2 A source is a government poster from 1936. Give one reason it may be VALUABLE and one reason LIMITED, for an enquiry into living standards. [2]

2.3 Distinguish a source's purpose from its content. [2]

2.4 Name the two case studies of “the move to global war” with one key year each. [2]

2.5 Explain why “this source is biased, so it is useless” is a weak argument. [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 (*Q2 style.*) With reference to its origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source A – a private diary entry by a foreign minister written the night before a 1938 conference – for a historian studying the decisions reached at that conference. [6]

3.2 (*Q2 skill: purpose.*) A 1933 state radio broadcast praises rearmament. Using its origin and content, identify the likely purpose and one effect the broadcaster intended. [4]

3.3 (*Q4 style.*) “Collective security failed in the 1930s because the aggressors were bolder than the democracies were resolute.” Using the sources and your own knowledge of German and Japanese expansion, evaluate this claim. [8]

3.4 (*Q3 style.*) Two classroom sources written for this sheet. Source C, in the voice of a British newspaper, October 1938: “The agreement signed at Munich has spared Europe a war that no nation wanted, and Germany’s claim was to German-speaking districts.” Source D, in the voice of a Czech journalist, October 1938: “Our country was divided at a table where we were not allowed to sit. Today it is the Sudetenland; tomorrow we will learn what such promises are worth.” Compare and contrast what Sources C and D reveal about the Munich Agreement. [6]

Solutions

2.1 Origin, purpose, value, limitation (2 – 1 for three or four letters expanded).

2.2 Valuable: it shows what the government wanted citizens to believe about conditions: evidence of official messaging and priorities (1). Limited: a poster is persuasion, not measurement; it records living standards only as the state wished them seen, so it cannot support quantitative claims about real conditions (1).

2.3 Content is what the source says (its statements, claims, images) (1); purpose is the intended effect on its audience – to persuade, reassure, legitimise, warn – inferred from form and moment, not read off the words alone (1).

2.4 German and Italian expansion 1933–40 (e.g. Rhineland remilitarisation, 1936; accept Abyssinia 1935, Anschluss or Munich 1938) (1); Japanese expansion in East Asia 1931–41 (Manchuria, 1931; accept China 1937) (1).

2.5 Bias is itself evidence – it shows the author’s allegiance and intended message, which a neutral source would not (1). The right move is to state the bias and use it: the source is limited for the opponent’s case and valuable for the author’s (1).

3.1 Value: the diary’s ORIGIN (private, contemporaneous, by a decision-maker) makes it strong evidence of the writer’s genuine expectations and intentions entering the conference, unguarded where a memoir would be self-serving (2). Its content can reveal what the minister believed was negotiable and what was settled in advance (2). Limitations: it records ONE participant’s pre-conference view – misjudgements are likely, the final decisions may have moved against him, and a diary is still a performance for its future reader, so claims of frankness need corroboration (2).

3.2 Purpose: to build public support for rearmament – to persuade citizens that rearmament is necessary, legitimate and glorious (origin: state broadcasting, a controlled channel; content: praise, not argument) (2). Intended effect: acceptance of the programme and of the regime behind it; pride in national strength rather than anxiety about cost or treaty breach (2).

3.3 Thesis: the claim is half true – the aggressors were bold, but the democracies’ choices, not the aggressors’ nerve, broke the system. For the aggressors’ audacity: Japan took Manchuria in 1931 while the League deliberated; Germany reoccupied the Rhineland in 1936 with troops that would have had to retreat at any resistance (2). For the democracies’ weakness: the League’s verdict on Manchuria went unenforced; appeasement at Munich, 1938, handed over the Sudetenland without the Czechs at the table – each retreat taught the aggressors the lesson of allied hesitation (2). Weighing: audacity was real but OPPORTUNISTIC – it expanded exactly where resolve was absent; the systemic failure was the unwillingness to pay enforcement’s costs, so the democracies’ choices are the deeper cause (2). Judgement with the counter-case accepted: had the democracies enforced any one threshold (Rhineland, Manchuria), later audacity would have faced a different calculus (2).

3.4 Similarities: both show that the agreement handed the Sudeten districts to Germany and avoided an immediate war (C says war was spared; D names the Sudetenland as lost) (2). Differences: C presents the transfer as a fair settlement of a claim to German-speaking land, while D presents it as a decision imposed on Czechoslovakia without its

consent; C treats peace as secured, while D expects further demands (2). The answer links C and D point by point in each sentence rather than describing one and then the other (2).

Local review guidance: value and limitation must NAME the origin's features, not assert "reliable"; (R1 3.2) purpose is an effect, not a summary of content; Q4 wants both sources AND knowledge in every paragraph; Q3 credit needs comparison linked within sentences. Authored classroom guidance.