

Sample answer

Question 1 part a

According to source A, the significance of Article 16 in the covenant of the League of Nations is that it is used to prevent war between nations of the League and sets up the idea of collective security and economic sanctions as peacekeeping methods. Source A firstly states that 'Should any member of the League resort to war... it shall be deemed to have committed an act of war against all members of the League', which sets up that all nations of the League have to respond to an aggressor as if the aggressor is also at war with them. Secondly, source A states that the League will subject it [the aggressor] to

the severance of all trade or financial relations which thus authorizes complete economic sanctions of the aggressor collectively, which used to prevent war, and shows the enforcement of both economic sanctions and collective security. Thirdly, it states that in the event of an aggressor state, the League will for 'the prohibition of all exchange between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking state', and so puts pressure on it to its aggressive action. This also shows the idea of collective security as all countries act together

Examiner's comment

3 marks. Three clear points are made, supported by quotes from the source.

Sample answer**Question 1 part b**

The message of source C is that Mussolini, leading Italy, is determined to go to war with Abyssinia, regardless of how the League acts. Mussolini, representing the whole of Italy, is marching down a road with a sign 'to war' with a determined look on his face, and thus he personally wants to go to war. He holds a paper that says 'with the League, without the League, against the League', which is used to convey that regardless of how the League acts, he is going to war, even if that means going 'without the League'.

Examiner's comment

2 marks. The overall message is clear and supported by details from the cartoon.

Sample answer**Question 2**

Sources B and D agree that Britain's policy was guided by its fear that Italy and Mussolini would attack it. Source B states that the prime minister of Britain 'explained the great gravity of the European situation, including the danger that Mussolini might make a "mad dog" attack on the British fleet' and source D states 'Hoare and Laval apparently believed that Mussolini might go to war against Britain if Britain should impose an oil sanction.' Sources B and D also agree that other League members did not act as well as they could have, and that the failure of the Abyssinia crisis cannot be laid only on Britain. Source B states that Britain was 'bound to consider where we could rely on effective support from any other member of the League', while source D agrees when it states 'the Assembly refused to take the one decisive measure which would have halted the invasion – the prohibition of the exports of oil to Italy'. Thus the assembly of the League was responsible for the failure of the response instead of just Britain.

However, source B disagrees with source D on a couple of points. Firstly, source B expresses that Britain's policy was also affected by the fact that Britain felt 'bound to consider whether we could rely on effective support from any other members of the League', while source D disagrees as it states that in fact 'the other

League members were not backward in imposing sanctions against Italy'. Therefore, source B believes Britain was affected by the weakness of the other members, while source D believes the other members acted well and British policy was not affected by the other members. Source B also states that 'the League's policy is still the policy of the (British) government', and thus claims that British policy is bound to the League of Nations policy to prevent war, while source D disagrees by stating 'it was more important to have Mussolini as an ally against Hitler than to defend Haile Selassie', which means British policy acted more in self-interest than to defend the League. Source B also states that the British would be willing to use harsher measures, but feared a war with Italy would hurt diplomatically the integrity of Europe, and its policy was guided by this fact. It states 'though the results of [an irrational attack on the British fleet] must in the long run be the defeat of Italy, the war might... produce both losses and diplomatic complications of a serious kind', and so Britain's reluctance to get involved was also motivated by its fear that war with Italy would have an impact on the international community. Source D disagrees with this, believing that 'Laval's main foreign policy aim was to maintain an alliance with Italy' instead of upholding the League's rules and protecting the diplomatic ties between nations.

Examiner's comment

6 marks. Good linkage between the sources and a range of similarities and differences are discussed with explicit reference to the sources.

Sample answer

Question 3

Source D is an extract from a book called *Africa in War and Peace* by an author who was in Africa during the crisis and served in the British Army in Africa during the Second World War. The purpose of source D is to analyse Africa during times of war and peace.

The source's origin is valuable in studying the Abyssinian crisis. As the writer was in Africa during the crisis, he understands how Africa and Abyssinia responded to it, and had access to many contemporary opinions and facts about the crisis. Also, as he wrote the book in 2004, he has access to a wide variety of sources published after the crisis, and so can use both a contemporary understanding and revelations later on to give a thorough analysis of the crisis. The purpose of the source, to inform a wider audience about Africa, also makes it valuable. To make it credible it would have been edited and fact checked, or else it would not have been published so it should be historically accurate, making it a valuable source to study.

However, the origin also means that source D has some limitations. As the author was in Africa at the time and served in Africa during the Second World War, it is possible that he mostly sympathizes with Abyssinia rather than with the other countries involved in the crisis, and so his critique of the role of other countries might be marred by this. Also, he was not actually in Abyssinia at the time, but in another part of Africa.

The purpose of source D also gives it some limitations. As the crisis is viewed through the lens of Africa, it is possible that it does not have deep analysis or understanding of the actions of the countries inside Europe, such as Italy, and so could be seen as not giving a complete analysis

of the crisis. Also, the book's topic is large and unfocused, as it covers on an entire continent and a wide time frame, and is not concentrating on the Abyssinia crisis. This means it will be less useful for finding about this crisis in detail.

The origin of source E is of a speech given by the leader of Abyssinia, Haile Selassie, to the League of Nations towards the end of the crisis. The purpose is to give Selassie's opinion of the League actions during the crisis to the League.

The origin of source E has several values. It firstly is a speech given by the leader of Abyssinia – he is heavily involved in the crisis and has a great knowledge of the events of the crisis. It also is given just before the crisis ends, and so contemporary knowledge and understanding of the event back up Selassie's points. It is also given at the League of Nations, an international organization, and has to be good to convince the other members of Selassie's opinion.

The purpose of source D also makes it valuable. Selassie is representing his nation, which is under attack by Italy, and he has to be convincing and have good knowledge in order to get support for his country.

However, the origin of the speech also has limitations. As it is given by the leader of one of the countries directly involved in the crisis, it of course is going to be heavily slanted in favour of that country rather than giving an objective overview and opinion of the event.

The purpose also has its limitations. As there is a motive to the speech, to convince the audience that Haile Selassie's view are right, he uses only comments that support his viewpoint so that he sounds more convincing, giving a less objective view of the event.

Examiner's comment

6 marks. Value and limitation of both sources are considered with good reference to the origin and purpose of the sources.

Sample answer

Question 4

The League failed to act enough to prevent Italy from taking Abyssinia, in part due to the difficulty of applying its policy of collective security. This could be seen as due to the context of British foreign policy, of Italy's determination, or the fact

that the League did not have a strong enough mandate to utilize collective security.

Source B states that British foreign policy meant that Britain, a major player of the League, could not act enough and so it was difficult to utilize

collective security. Source B states that 'the great gravity of the European situation, including the danger that Mussolini might make a "mad dog" attack on the British fleet', meant Britain was hesitant to act, and so collective security could not be utilized effectively.

Source D also agrees that the complications of British foreign policy meant it could not act to support collective security. More specifically, it states: 'In 1935 Laval's main foreign policy aim was to maintain an alliance with Italy, so it was more important to have Mussolini as an ally against Hitler than to defend Haile Selassie.' Thus British self-interest in foreign policy meant it could not jeopardize its relationship with Italy to act in the context of collective security. Mussolini was an ideal ally against Hitler, who had walked out of the Geneva disarmament conference in 1933 and in 1934 stated that he was going to rearm Germany. Mussolini had blocked Hitler's attempt at Anschluss in 1934, and through this had shown himself to be a good ally to Britain against Hitler. As Britain feared Nazi Germany under Hitler, who had also left the League in 1933, it was more likely to act to preserve ties with Italy (with which Britain formed the Stresa front against Hitler in 1935) than to act in collective security. As key members

acted in self-interest rather than in collective security, nations could not rely on each other to isolate an aggressor and so it was impossible for collective security to truly work.

However, it could also be seen that Italy did not care how the League acted, and so collective security was not viable in the first place. Source C believes that Mussolini would have gone to war 'without the League', and so did not care about how it acted. The Great Depression that had started in 1929 had economically weakened fascist Italy, and Mussolini, whose Italy had suffered, had to go to war to get a foreign policy victory regardless of the League.

Another important point is that the weakness of the League's collective security also made it hard to take effective action. Source A states that the League calls upon 'effective military, naval or air force' from 'members of the League'. However, as no country would really willingly give up its military to an international organization, the idea of collective security could not work.

In conclusion, British foreign policy was the biggest reason, as it was a major player of the League, and its reluctance to act doomed the idea of collective security.

Examiner's comment

7 marks. All sources used effectively, apart from source E, which is not mentioned. Own knowledge is also incorporated though it could be extended more in some places. The answer is structured well and answers the question.

Prescribed subject 2

Sample answer

Question 1 part a

It appears from source A that the UN Partition Plan of 1947 wanted Jerusalem to be in an internationally administered zone 'corpus separatum'. There would be an Arab state and a Jewish state, each independent of each other.

Examiner's comment

2 marks. There are two valid points, but the student has not offered three clear points here.

Sample answer

Question 1 part b

The reactions to the plan were divided. The pro-Jewish state Zionists were pleased with the plan, but the Arab peoples were not happy with it at all. Both sides committed barbaric acts during this time.

Examiner's comment

1 mark; for 2 marks the second point needs detailed development.