

Question 9 (10 marks)

How useful would Sources E and F be for a historian studying the different goals of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson in creating the Treaty of Versailles? **10**

In your answer, consider the perspectives provided by the TWO sources and the reliability of each one.

Source E is an extract from a letter by Charles Seymour from June 1919, demonstrating the American perspective of the Paris Peace conference. The audience is unknown but Seymour is no doubt motivated by his desire to justify the Allies' conditions for peace which erodes some of its reliability. ~~Thus~~

Since this is from the US perspective, which history shows was more lenient towards Germany than Britain and especially France, ~~the~~ its reliability as representing the different goals of the leaders is questionable. Nonetheless, it represents a similar account of the Paris Peace Conference and has been corroborated by other sources ~~on~~ as well as the actual ^{final} agreement, strengthening its reliability.

Thus, because this source is of relatively strong reliability, it would be useful to an extent to an historian studying the different goals of

Question 9 continues on page 6

Question 9 (continued)

Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson. However, this usefulness is limited in the sense that it does not provide direct French and British perspectives on the issue of Peace Negotiations, just the American one.

Source F is an extract from former British PM's Lloyd George's book, The Truth About the Peace Treaties, published in 1938. It presents the British perspective but more specifically, the opinions of ~~the~~ himself which diminishes the reliability of his claims relating to America and France. It is intended for an audience who appreciates World War I and European history or just the career of George. ~~As~~ Since he writes about himself, he aims to paint himself in a positive light and discredit others, 'extraneous demand put forward by French ministers. Again, this erodes the reliability of the source to a certain extent, making it somewhat unreliable. Nevertheless, George's claims ~~are~~ have been validated by similar accounts and the modern world's knowledge of the Paris Peace Conference which has the benefit of hindsight.

Therefore, the reliability of source F is relatively strong.

~~As~~ Since, the reliability of source F is strong, it would be useful to an historian, especially because it provides a different account ~~to that~~ and perspective to that of source E. However, an historian would have to be careful when using ~~this~~ this source, even when used in conjunction with source E, because it does not provide the direct French perspective ~~nor does it~~ present the opinions of the Germans,
 does it

End of Question 9

even though they were excluded from the conference.