

## Question 3

### Section C: International Option

#### The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

#### The League of Nations and the Spanish Civil War

3 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

##### Source A

The youth of Spain fall in thousands in the trenches of freedom as the victims of Fascist aeroplanes and the foreign war material delivered month after month, despite the non-intervention agreement, by those who base their international policy on the systematic breaking of treaties and their international undertakings. Madrid, the capital of a member of the League of Nations, has been reduced to ruins. The women and children of Madrid have been butchered in hundreds by bombing planes under the orders of rebel generals, supplied by states which have, in fact, begun a war, and which are continuing to make war, while statesmen talk of preserving peace. An international war is raging on Spanish soil. The worst thing that could happen to the League of Nations would be to contribute, by its own silence and inaction, to the spread of this war.

*The Spanish Foreign Secretary addressing the League of Nations' Assembly, December 1936.*

##### Source B

Spain is the second victim after Ethiopia of Fascist weapons. Events in Spain presented the Great Powers with a new problem. It was not a war between two countries, but a revolt against a constitutionally elected government. What attitude should the other countries adopt in these circumstances? The Great Powers chose neutrality, non-intervention, an idea which originated in Britain. The League of Nations regards the war in Spain as a civil war. As there is no article in the Covenant to determine the League's attitude in a civil war, the non-intervention agreement was not in conflict with the Covenant. But when Italy sent military planes to Spain, Spain's Foreign Secretary appealed to the League. He pointed out the great danger to peace if it should become the custom for a country to support a rebellion in another country with military forces without any declaration of war. The League demanded evidence, though this was already available. Now, non-intervention was in conflict with the Covenant. In the face of a military attack on one of its members, the League of Nations has no right to declare itself passive. But the League did nothing.

*From an article entitled 'Spain – The Battlefield of Capitalism', by a Danish journalist, 1937.*

## Question 3, continued

### Source C

Statements by TUC delegates:

If the government had agreed to the non-intervention policy in order to prevent a world war, they should ensure that the policy was made absolutely effective. The considerable delay in getting it started had worked to the prejudice of the Spanish government. Italy's policy was one of invasion. Although the Italian government had agreed to non-intervention, they were violating this all the time. As requested by the Spanish government, Britain should use its influence to examine the allegations regarding the nature and extent of Italian involvement. The presence of Italian troops in Spain was sufficient reason for applying the Covenant of the League of Nations. The British government should take strong measures to stop Franco gaining assistance from the Fascist Powers, Italy and Germany. The government should bear in mind that similar actions might take place in the future in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

Statement in reply by Mr. Eden, Foreign Secretary:

It was in Britain's interests to avoid becoming involved in war. Non-intervention was better than a policy of threats, for it was no use saying to a country unless it did a certain thing something would be done to it, if one was not prepared to take that action. Gaining accurate information about the extent of foreign involvement was difficult. Much of the information had proved to be unreliable. The Italian government, through its ambassador, had denied sending men to Spain. Without the non-intervention agreement, many Italians and Germans would undoubtedly have been going to Spain.

*From the minutes of a meeting between the British Foreign Secretary and representatives of the British Trades Union Congress (TUC), March 1937.*

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

- (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed by the Foreign Secretaries of Spain (Source A) and Britain (Source C) regarding the effectiveness of the non-intervention policy adopted by the League of Nations during the Spanish Civil War. [15]
- (b) 'In adopting a policy of non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War, the League of Nations failed to honour its Covenant commitments.' How far do Sources A to C support this view? [25]



## Mark scheme

## Section C: International Option

## The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

## The League of Nations and the Spanish Civil War

## Indicative Content

- (a) **Compare and contrast the views expressed by the Foreign Secretaries of Spain (Source A) and Britain (Source C) regarding the effectiveness of the non-intervention policy adopted by the League of Nations during the Spanish Civil War.** [15]

The Spanish Foreign Secretary (Source A) argues that the non-intervention policy is not working. He claims that, despite agreeing to observe the policy, Fascist governments (Italy and Germany) are ignoring it and sending equipment to the rebel generals fighting against the Spanish government. As a result, the war in Spain is no longer a civil war, but an ‘*international war*’. The British Foreign Secretary (Source C) argues that the non-intervention policy is effective. Without it, he claims, many Italians and Germans would be fighting with the rebels in Spain. The implication is that there are not many Italians and Germans in Spain. He clearly accepts the Italian Ambassador’s denial that Italy has sent men to Spain in defiance of the non-intervention policy.

While differences are clear, similarities might be less obvious. There are two. One is that both Foreign Ministers accept a need to take some kind of action with regard to the Spanish Civil War. They are proposing, however, very different kinds of action: the Spaniard wants more interventionist action led by the League of Nations; the Englishman wants to act to hold the ring, allowing civil conflict while containing the risk of an international European conflict.

The second difference is that both Foreign Secretaries put their national interests, as articulated by their national governments, before any other. The Spanish national interest was to defeat the rebels, which it could not do without international help. The British national interest was to contain the Spanish Civil War and thus prevent another European war by keeping open contacts with Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Source A is by the Spanish Foreign Minister at a public meeting of the League, which he wants to influence. It is bound to be emotional, one-sided and thus unreliable. Source B is by the British Foreign Secretary, a Conservative politician, at a private meeting with a leading domestic institution of the Left. In terms of the effectiveness of non-intervention, both will be one-sided and far from trustworthy.

- (b) **‘In adopting a policy of non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War, the League of Nations failed to honour its Covenant commitments.’ How far do Sources A to C support this view?** [25]

**Context:** When the Spanish Civil War broke out, the League of Nations viewed it as an internal Spanish matter. Under Article 10, the League undertook to respect and preserve ‘the territorial integrity and existing political independence’ of its members. As a result, the League had neither the right nor the responsibility to become involved in a civil war. The non-intervention policy was designed by Britain and France to ensure that the Spanish Civil War remained a purely Spanish affair, provoking no wider conflict. Italy and Germany were among the 24 countries which formally agreed to this policy. The civil war did, however, become a symbol of the wider ideological struggle, fascism against communism.

Despite the non-intervention policy, both sides received support from outside Spain. Individuals volunteered for both sides. Governments supported both sides: Italy and

## Mark scheme, continued

Germany for the Nationalist rebels, the USSR for the government. This took the form of military men and equipment. The Spanish government considered this to be an act of war, arguing that events in Spain were now endangering world peace and consequently concerned the League. As proof of its accusation, the Secretary-General was supplied with photographs and other documents showing German and Italian intervention. The British government claimed that this evidence was unreliable, preferring to believe the denials coming from the Italian and German governments. Note that the policy of non-intervention was developed by Britain and France separately from the League of Nations.

**Analysis:** All three sources contain some evidence in support of the hypothesis. Source A argues that the Spanish Civil War is no longer a civil war. It has become an '*international war*' since Franco's rebels are being given military support by Fascist governments. '*By its own silence and inaction*' the League of Nations is doing nothing to prevent this. The non-intervention policy was not working because Fascist governments were consistently breaking their agreement to support it. The Spanish Foreign Minister is highly critical of the League's failure to take effective action, with the clear implication that it is failing to adhere to its own Covenant.

Source B argues that the League of Nations should have taken action under the Covenant once Italy sent military support to Franco. This was effectively a military invasion of Spain, a member of the League of Nations. The writer dismisses the League's argument that it needed evidence of Italian involvement, claiming that this already existed.

The first part of Source C, from the TUC, argues that Italy's actions were effectively an invasion of Spain. Since a member state of the League of Nations was being attacked by a foreign country, the League should take action under the Covenant, as requested by the Spanish government. Failure to do this would be seen as a weakness and might lead to further aggressive acts, as later occurred against Czechoslovakia.

The sources also contain evidence to challenge the hypothesis. As Source B states, it was appropriate for the League of Nations to adopt a policy of non-intervention towards the Spanish Civil War, at least at first. The Covenant precluded the League from becoming involved in the internal affairs of a member state. Therefore, the League could not take sides in the civil war. The key issue regarding the non-intervention policy, as pointed out by the TUC delegates in Source C, was to '*ensure that the policy was made absolutely effective*'.

The second part of Source C, from the British Foreign Minister, claimed that there was no reliable evidence to suggest that the policy was being ignored by foreign governments, quoting the categorical denial of Italian involvement by the Italian Ambassador. Without such evidence, the League was constrained by its Covenant not to get involved in what was seen as a civil war.

**Evaluation:** **Source A**, a public speech by the Spanish Foreign Minister at a time when the rebels were threatening to take Madrid, was an understandably emotional account of events in Spain. He uses highly emotive language to assert that Spain is being attacked by foreign armies. He is highly critical of the League of Nations's failure to help the Spanish government against foreign aggression. Representing one of the sides in the civil war, his speech could be seen as highly biased. It gives no hard evidence of Italian or German involvement, merely accusations that Franco is being supplied with '*war materials*' by Fascist governments. The British government (as shown by the Foreign Secretary's statement in C) chose not to believe these accusations, preferring to accept the denial by the Italian Ambassador. This cross-referencing further undermines the reliability of Source A – though Source B helps to support the claims of Source A.



## Mark scheme, continued

**Source B**, from an article by a Danish journalist writing in the second year of the war, clearly believes the Spanish Foreign Minister's claims regarding the involvement of Italy and Germany. As a journalist, he may have first-hand experience of such involvement. This interpretation helps undermine the claims made by the British Foreign Minister (Source C).

**Source C** itself contains two separate interpretations of the civil war. In the first part, the TUC delegates represented the Labour movement in Britain, which would be strongly opposed to Fascism. The TUC delegation claims that Italy and Germany are breaking their agreement to uphold the non-intervention policy, thus supporting Sources A and B. It argues that the British government should, through the League of Nations, take effective action against Italy and Germany. The TUC's fears that failure to do this would lead to future aggression, for example in Czechoslovakia, were to prove prophetic.

In the second part of **Source C**, the Foreign Secretary argues that the non-intervention policy is working and questions the reliability of evidence, suggesting otherwise. This could be seen as naïve or disingenuous, as events were soon to prove that Italy and Germany were indeed supplying Franco with military men and equipment. It certainly supported the government's appeasement strategy. As the Foreign Minister makes clear, Britain did not want a major war, something which he saw as inevitable if action were to be taken against Italy and Germany. All three/four sources are unreliable in their different ways. Contextual analysis, however, would argue that the second half of Source C was the least reliable of all.

## Example candidate response – high

Question  
number

3a)

The two sources are quite similar when considering the profession of the two men giving an account of what policy the League of Nations have to follow. This is where the diplomatic tone is considerably evident in portraying the line of Policy that each felt should be followed. The source A by the Spanish Foreign Secretary uses emotive language such as "women and children of Madrid have been butchered" to instigate proper action rather than using the non intervention policy. Serving the same purpose of justifying its course of action, emotive language is seen in source C as the British Foreign Secretary claims "Much of the information was inaccurate". Both sources are therefore in concurrence on the use of similar language and agenda to drive home their point.

The two sources are, however, explicitly different on their stance, source A disputes that the non intervention policy was effective as source C disputes it. Where source A claims "now a side than the League was contributing by "its own silence and inaction, to the spread of this war" whereas source C challenges the claim with "Without the non intervention agreement, many Italians and Germans would undoubtedly have been going to Spain". The reason behind the contention between the sources is the nationalities of the spokesmen. Source A is written by a Spanish diplomat aiming to gain higher support but source B takes a justificatory stance as Britain, the main member of the League had attempted to protect her own interests as "it was not prepared for war".

A major contradiction is also the reliability of the two sources. The source A written at an earlier date than source C appears to be more reliable in showing the



## Example candidate response – high, continued

ineffectiveness. Written as a primary source by the top diplomat of Spain, an accurate account is given of the Spanish Civil War. The men were indeed victims of "Fascist aeroplanes" as both extremists Hitler and Mussolini had signed the Rome Berlin Axis and supported General Franco hence financing the war and the aeroplanes. Source C gives a narrow account focussing on packaging Britain as a pacifist left with no choice. The source claims "The Italian government... had denied sending men to Spain" in a manner that ignores the current situation hence being unreliable in giving account of the effectiveness of its non-intervention policy. The source A disputes this "supplied by states which have in fact, begun a war." The main reason for inaction by Britain was its policy of Appeasement and hoping to avoid war with an aggressor and was therefore selfish and unreliable unlike A that gives an accurate account.

Therefore, although both sources, although addressed to different bodies A, the League of Nations and B the Trades Union Congress, they both serve the purpose of conviction aiming to get the support of the other. In totality however they are contrasts in the effectiveness of the non intervention policy with A claiming it "ignored" the situation and C claiming, Britain banning financial aid to Italy made Italians and Germans halt their wishes. The two sources are also contradictory on reliability with A giving a more accurate account instead of justifying using incorrect information like C.



## Example candidate response – high, continued

Question number	
3 b)	<p>The overall sentiment followed by sources A-C is that yes, indeed the League of Nations failed to order its commitment through "its own silence and inaction" and its lack of putting into effect article 18 that <del>etc</del> called for collective security. In this source A agrees, the TVC in source C agrees that there was "sufficient reason for applying the Covenant" <del>and</del> Although source C in respect to the Foreign Secretary disputes this, it is a biased and one sided point of view that source B analyses in detail claiming "the League of Nations had no right to declare itself passive."</p>
	<p>Source A originates from the Spanish Foreign Secretary at the helm of the Spanish Civil War given to the League of Nations with the sole purpose of promoting justified action as stated in the covenant. Source A is highly useful as it is descriptive in nature giving an account on the death with the use of emotive language such as "while the statements talk of preserving peace" Although the nature of the source is one given to instigate action and tends to be an exaggeration, the irony reflects the current situation. The League of Nations had missed as stated in source C an opportunity to "apply the Covenant" as there was sufficient reason. Fascism was a menace and the main reason both Mussolini and Hitler supported General Franco a dictator despite the "constitutionally elected government". In essence the League had been formed as a response against future aggression. Despite the limitation of the source being biased as it appeals for help, one must look beyond the exaggeration and realise indeed the league practiced "inaction" through the policy of non intervention, going against Article 18 that stated sanctions would be applied and</p>



## Example candidate response – high, continued

then collective security

Source B is in overall agreement with the fact that the League did abuse its power and act on self interest instead. The source is given by a subjective third party a Danish journalist who unlike the other sources is not associated directly to either of the countries. The source does a good job and serves its role as a mediator on the two sources recognising both standpoints and eventually taking a stance inclined to source A. Similar to source A that "non intervention was in conflict with the covenant". A had claimed that it was "inaction" as B recognises the passive stance. Written on the same year as source C, it disputes the fact that "Much of the information provided was unreliable" claiming that the League had "demanded evidence though it was already available." The source C is presenting the non evidential claims as a curve ball of self interest. The source is very detailed in that it draws from both sources B and C to judge the actual state and is hence the most reliable. The source could be seen as slightly subjective as it presents the view of only one individual and is a secondary source but being written at the heat of the Spanish Civil War, it is credible as a mediating and informative third party eye on the fact that the League and more so Britain failed to honour its Covenant agreements.

Source C features two points of view the first and most significant in giving account the attitudes of the Trade Union Congress. The source is very keen on presenting the attitudes towards Britain by a group that represents the masses. It argues that indeed Italy had a domineering presence in international



## Example candidate response – high, continued

affairs and ought to be punished" Italy's policy was one of invasion" The policy of non intervention is based by the body that organises it was not even followed. Although both Germany and Italy had given their support, both Hitler and Mussolini were "violating this all the time." Additionally, written in hindsight the source is an appeal for action by its government against "the second victim after Ethiopia of Fascist weapons". The source is highly convincing in its nature as it infers to the state of situation and urges Britain to "use its influence". If the people of Britain disputed the non intervention in reality, who would. The source is ultimately credible in showing that it was a breach of the Covenant stating "the British government should take strong actions". This is military action and sanctions instead of a passive line of appeasement that went against the main aim of the covenant, to prevent future war

Source D is extremely limited and produces no evidence whatsoever to justify that the League was committed to its covenant. Written by the Foreign Secretary it is propagandist removing fault from Britain. The purpose is distorting the image as it claimed it "was not prepared to take action". This already shows that the honour of collective security was not being used to stop what source B terms an "international affair". It is also very limited as it gives no evidence that the "information proved to be unreliable" when source A claims the death of "the youth of Spain that [fall] in thousands of trenches. It is useful however in showing why the policy was used as Britain had the self



## Example candidate response – high, continued

interest of not sending its troops or intervening to save its political vigour in the nation. Nevertheless it is biased in nature not providing evidence of aggression. Therefore source A, B and the TUC in source C agree that the Covenant's aim of preventing war using sanction and collective action. Source D is too biased and subjective and also is used for propaganda to package the non-intervention policy in good light. Source C shows it failed as "Italy's policy was of invasion" and "they were violating this all the time. If the British public did not believe in it, it shows the opposition to other policies was unjustified and a breach on the Covenant. Therefore the League of Nations failed."

## Examiner comment – high

**Part a**

The candidate approaches the question by focusing on comparing and contrasting the sources. The first paragraph looks at language, and although this is of some use, it does not really address the question, which is about the 'effectiveness of the non-intervention policy'. The response moves on to clearly show some differences in content and this is awarded marks accordingly. The candidate is also able to show similarities in content between the sources and so is given a mark at Level 3. The answer attempts some evaluation but this is not valid and so is not credited. For a higher mark, the answer needed to evaluate the sources in terms of their nature, origin and purpose and use this evaluation to compare them.

**Mark awarded for part a = 9 out of 15**

**Part b**

The response focuses on the sources and the assertion from the start and points out that Source C consists of two different opinions, i.e. Eden and the TUC. The candidate goes on to link the sources to the assertion effectively, showing where there is support and challenge, and to offer points of evaluation which assess the weight which can be given to each source. Although this evaluation is not always precisely focused, it is enough to place the answer well into Level 4. The answer offers a good conclusion which recaps the ideas covered. To improve, this conclusion needed to include more focused judgement of how far the sources support the assertion; this could have been done by weighing up the sources according to their content and provenance.

**Mark awarded for part b = 19 out of 25**

**Total marks awarded = 28 out of 40**

## Example candidate response – middle

Question number	
3(a)	<p>It is evident that sources A and C share more points in comparison than contrasting, in regards to the effectiveness of the non-intervention policy adopted by the League of Nations during the Spanish Civil War.</p>
	<p>Both Foreign Secretary of Spain (source A) and TIC delegate (source C) agree on the point that the <del>idea</del> <del>for</del> the non-intervention policy is ineffective as it impact will only lead to war. Evidence from the source state 'The worst thing that could happen to the League of Nations would be to contribute, by its own silence and inaction, to the spread of this war' (source A), whilst source C states 'similar actions might take place in the future in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.' This implies that the non-intervention policy is ineffective as it aimed to impact ensure the league intervention did not stifle peace as it was seen as domestic one. However, the sources point out the crucial fact that the policy is indeed ineffective as it instead led to the escalation of the war and displayed the weakness of the League to intervene in a member nation affair as seen in the future, paved the way for Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia and Poland and therefore the sources agree about the non-intervention policy adopted!</p>



## Example candidate response – middle, continued

by the League was in fact ~~useless~~ ineffective. Both sources also point out the need for the League to act against the aggressor states feeling the need for their own national interests and that with Spain being a member nation, it is imperative that the League intervene. Evidence from the sources state 'those who bore the international policy on the systematic breaking of treaties and other international undertakings' (source A), whilst source B states 'sufficient reason for applying the covenant of the League' (source B). This implies, as the sources have stated, that in order for the League to be ineffective, the non-intervention policy must be disregarded and instead, collective measures such as the sanction and collective security under Article 16 of the Covenant must be applied. This strengthens the argument that the non-intervention policy of the League is ineffective as it also undermines its role as a peace keeping organisation.

However, the sources depict differences in their statements regarding the effectiveness of the non-intervention policy. Britain (source C), believes that the non-intervention policy is indeed effective as 'threat', as implied, would only create an upsurge that they were not prepared to take action upon.

## Example candidate response – middle, continued

evidence from the source states. 'Non-intervention  
 was a better policy than threats' (Source C)  
 whilst evidence from Source A states 'The  
 worst thing that could happen to the League,  
 would be to contribute, by its own  
 silence and inaction to the spread of the  
 war'. Both these statements oppose each  
 other's view on Britain (Source C), acting  
 on its interests to not oppose Italy,  
 a possible ally against Germany, and not  
 further aggrivate Germany, would fulfil the  
 non-intervention policy effectively as it  
 serves their national interest. However,  
 Spanish foreign secretary (Source A) disregards  
 this claim as unjust the non-intervention  
 is ineffective as it will lead to the  
 outbreak of dispute and conflict.

Source A is reliable as it was written at the time of  
 the incident and by the Spanish foreign  
 secretary addressing the League. This  
 therefore gives a first hand account  
 of the situation. Source C is reliable as it explains the opposing  
 news in Britain in regards to the  
 policy and due to the fact it was  
 written in 1937, it gives the basis of  
 the British. Both sources are useful in  
 their views on explaining if the non-intervention  
 policy is effective or not. However, ~~Source~~  
~~A is based~~ Source C (Mr. Eden) is biased  
 in his claim that the Italians are not



## Example candidate response – middle, continued

sending in troops whilst source C clearly states the involvement of the Fascist troops.

In conclusion, both sources to a large extent agree that the non-intervention policy is in fact ineffective.

- (b) The League of Nations was established on the basis of the Covenant signed by member nations with which it was to uphold to ensure its aims such as preserving peace were upheld. To a significant extent, the League of Nations failed to honour its Covenant commitments, as sources A to C strongly support this view.

The non-intervention policy, as stated in source C, only served British national interests. This justly undermines the League as its effectiveness to deal with conflict will be weakened by a great nation interest which has proved time and time again as was seen in Abyssinia, to inevitably lead to the failure of the League. As stated in source B, 'the non-intervention policy was not in conflict with the Covenant' however, the invasion of the Fascists into Spain 'was in conflict with the Covenant' in regards to non-intervention. As source C states 'the presence of Italian troops in Spain was sufficient reason for applying the Covenant of the League of Nations' implies that as the Covenant

## Example candidate response – middle, continued

stated in the event of aggression, collective security should be in effect. The League's policy adoption of Non-intervention therefore ensured its failure to honour its covenant commitment especially due to the fact, as source A states, 'Madrid, the capital of a member of the League of Nations', is entitled to the protection and promise the League's covenant offers its members in circumstances of aggression against a member state.

The sources also support the view that in adopting a policy of non-intervention in the Spanish civil war, the League of Nations failed due to the fact the sources imply that, with the adoption of this policy, war and the influx of aggression states is inevitable. As source C states, with agreement to source A, 'similar actions might take place in the future in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere'. As the source has stated, the aggression of Germany in acquiring Czechoslovakia and Poland in the latter years clearly implies that only if the League acted against the non-intervention policy, would the League have kept its covenant as protecting and preserving peace as the failure to effectively honour its commitment, led to the second world war.



## Example candidate response – middle, continued

However, the statement in reply by Mr. Eden, Foreign Secretary (source C), shows the differing opinion of the British in regards to the non-intervention policy. Whilst the League delegates argue that the ~~policy~~ League should intervene by holding to its covenant, the foreign secretary states, 'Non-intervention was better than a policy of threats'. This implies that the League did not in fact fail to honour its commitment but instead succeeded in the policy of non-intervention created more peace than instability as it says 'Without the non-intervention agreement, many Italians and Germans would undoubtedly have been going to Spain'. However, in comparison with the article (source B), it clearly states that 'non-intervention was in conflict with the Covenant'. The League therefore failed to honour its commitments to the covenant due to the interests of Britain, possibly in referring Italy as an ally against Germany and all the while, appearing Germany to build up armaments in ready for an inevitable war.

In conclusion, as source A states, 'The worst thing that could happen to the League of Nations would be to contribute, by its own silence and inaction to the spread of the war'. This goes to show, with reference to both source C and

Example candidate response – middle, continued

B that the League failed to honour its  
Covenant commitments, blatantly said  
by Britain (source c).

Examiner comment – middle

**Part a**

This answer shows both strengths and weaknesses, which place it in the middle of the mark scheme. The first part of the answer is confused about which part of Source C is relevant to the question. Although the question asks about the views of Foreign Secretaries, the candidate uses material from the TUC minutes which is not valid for this question. Therefore, the first part of the response, which deals with similarities, is not credited with any marks. However, the second part of the answer identifies differences and successfully explains material expressing the view of Eden. This means the answer is given a mark at the top of Level 2. To improve, the answer needed to look more closely at the sources.

**Mark awarded for part a = 6 out of 15**

**Part b**

The candidate takes a clear and structured approach to the question and shows understanding of the sources and the assertion. The candidate uses the first part of the answer to deal with the sources supporting the assertion and explains these links clearly. The response then moves on to consider where the sources challenge the assertion and explains this well. As a result, the answer is given a mark at the top of Level 3 for analysis and links to the question. To improve, the answer needed to evaluate the sources in terms of their nature, origin and purpose, and then use this evaluation to support or challenge the assertion further.

**Mark awarded for part b = 14 out of 25**

**Total marks awarded = 20 out of 40**



## Example candidate response – low

a) The foreign secretaries of Spain (Source A) and Britain (Source C) have similar views on the policy of non-intervention that the League adopted during the Spanish Civil War.

Firstly, both Source A and C agree that considering the fact that the League of Nations goes by a covenant and therefore has obligations such as to make all attempts to secure prospects for peace. The policy of non-intervention is shouldn't be adapted by the League - Source A emphasizes that the Spanish Civil War is 'an international war' not a 'civil a civil war' therefore the League should have intervened, the source goes on to stress that 'Madrid, capital of a member of the League', 'has been reduced to ruins'. This conveys that the League's policy of non-intervention did not benefit the League nor its members in any way, and for the very reason that the League is a member it was the League's responsibility to get involved in the Spanish Civil War. Source C supports this view in a way as it mentions that the moment Italian troops invaded Spain the League 'was sufficient reason for applying the covenant'. This conveys that for any other reason the League might have had to decide to adopt the non-intervention policy, the sole reason that they should have reconsidered this is that according to their covenant, it was their responsibility to intervene and handle the matter.

Source A and Source B both agree with the view that the League's reluctance/hesitation to make up their mind on whether to intervene a

## Example candidate response – low, continued

war only made matters worse in Spain. Source A states that 'The worst thing the League would be to contribute - silence and inaction, to spread the war'. This statement implies that the League's indecisiveness heightened the situation in Spain, as when 'statesmen talk of preserving peace', 'women and children have been butchered'. Source A to an extent blames the League for the war. It uses emotive language to instigate a sense of empathy and regret from the Assembly, the connotations of the adjective 'butchered' outline how brutal and casual the war was to say of make the League feel guilt for non-intervention.

Source C shares the view of source A that non-intervention made things worse in Spain. Source C states 'The considerable delay - watched to the prejudice of the government'.

However, source C and A have contrasting views. Source C is of the opinion that the League's non-intervention policy was effective as it prevented the Spanish Civil War from becoming an even bigger scandal. Source C states that 'Without the non-intervention - Italians and Germans - would have - going to Spain'. This shows the justification of the League's non-intervention policy. However the source is questionable as Britain may have been attempting to sugar coat the League's failure in preserving peace. This contrasts with source A as source A ~~states~~ implies that the League was wrong in choosing to adopt the non-intervention policy as it only 'spread-war'. It emphasizes that



## Example candidate response – low, continued

The League should have supported Spain as intererred as their non-intervention led to its people being 'butchered'. In conclusion, both sources agree that it was the League's responsibility to interere, however source C states that it was for its own good while source A strongly takes the stand that they should have intererred.

- 6) In adopting a policy of non-intervention in the Spanish civil war, the League of Nations failed to honour its covenant commitments. To an <sup>great</sup> extent I agree with this view as the covenant of the League states that in the event of a violation of another country member nations should condemn its actions, however when Italy had troops in Spain the League did nothing at all which ~~const~~ violates the policy of collective security. One of the League's primary aims is to ensure peace, therefore in the Spanish civil war it was naturally expected that the League would interere for the sake of ensuring peace. The fact that Spain was a member of the League, yet the League did not interere was a clear breach of commitment to its members, by non-intervening in this Spanish civil war, the League was giving off a message that it would no longer make attempts to secure prospects for future peace. By this very action it showed that the League was failing in its very solid purpose which was to ensure peace and avoid war. The fact that the League made no actions, such as military sanctions or economic

## Example candidate response – low, continued

Sactions or to the very least moral disapproval, was evidence of the league's weakness in its structure and organisation, the fact that they publicly admitted to adopting the policy of non-intervention would only give aggressor nations such as Germany, and Japan a reason to defy the league with the knowledge that the league was not even willing to support its own member state in a war such as this.

Secondly, the primary reason that Spain appealed to the League of Nations for help, yet the league still persisted with the policy of non-intervention was a clear failure to honor its covenant commitments. However to a certain extent the league could not have been blamed for deciding to adopt the policy of non-intervention, as source B illustrates that the covenant of the league did not state that ~~the league~~ the league should intervene in the events of a civil war, therefore is 'not in conflict with the covenant'. However this ignored the fact that Spain actually appealed to the league for assistance, therefore it was a failure on the part of the league.

However, the league did not entirely fail to honor its covenant commitments as source B suggests that when the league demanded evidence in order to help the ~~league~~ Spain, no evidence was presented therefore the league cannot entirely be blamed for adopting the policy of non-intervention.



## Example candidate response – low, continued

To conclude, as Spain was a member of the league 'the league of nations has no right to declare itself passive', yet the league still persisted with this policy even though they were breaking their commitments as stated in its covenant therefore this was a failure on the league's part to decide to adopt the policy of 'non-intervention' at a crucial time of war - as Madrid's 'women and children' were being 'butchered in hundreds'.

## Examiner comment – low

**Part a**

The response begins with an analysis of Source A which is accurate but does not focus on comparing or contrasting it with the other sources. This part of the answer refers to the wrong part of Source C (i.e. the TUC minutes) so does not offer a valid comparison with Source A. The response is awarded marks for the second part where it successfully identifies and explains differences between the content of the two sources. This places the answer at the top of Level 2. To improve, the answer needed to use the correct section of each source to identify and explain similarities.

**Mark awarded for part a = 7 out of 15**

**Part b**

Throughout this answer the candidate struggles to make clear links between the sources, the assertion given in the question and their own knowledge. The beginning of the answer discusses the issues surrounding the policy of intervention but contains little reference to the sources; this cannot be credited beyond Level 1 in the mark scheme. Later in the answer, Source B is judged as showing support of the assertion and so the mark is placed at Level 2. The candidate could have improved this answer by making clearer links between the sources and the assertion, and explaining which sources support and/or challenge.

**Mark awarded for part b = 8 out of 25**

**Total marks awarded = 15 out of 40**