# 2010 History

# Advanced Higher

# Finalised Marking Instructions

**General Instructions**

Markers are particularly asked to note the following points:

- SQA encourages positive marking. Markers should look to reward what the candidate has written, rather than penalise what the candidate has not
- the full range of marks is available to candidates. Award full marks to a response which is as good as can reasonably be expected from a candidate at this stage
- markers are reminded that they must not write comments on scripts. Markers can put the code letters in the margins (I, P, WCD, H etc) to show how they have awarded marks
- markers should write comments as fully as they can in the appropriate spaces on the Ex supplement of each candidate
- markers must be consistent. It is vital that a marker marks to the same standard throughout the diet.

**All** markers will have their marking reviewed on an ongoing basis during the Central Marking diet. Scripts will be selected at random from each marker's allocation. These will be reviewed by the Examining team. By doing this 'marker check' procedure, the Examining team guarantees the equality of the marking standard across the 11 fields, and ensures that, for example an A in *Renaissance* is the same value as an A in *Britain at War*. Until scripts/markers have been standardised, marks awarded should be regarded as provisional, and written in pencil on Ex Supplements and/or scripts.

In all cases, personal and confidential feedback from the Principal Assessor and the Examining team will be available to markers, and markers will be able to adjust their standard appropriately.

Marking should not commence until after the final briefing by the Principal Assessor and your team leader.

**You should not mark papers from your own centre.** If a packet contains scripts of a candidate you know or who is from a centre in which you have an interest (whether this has been previously declared or not), pass the packet to another marker.

Open each envelope and:

Check the particulars in the grid of the Mark Sheet against those on the envelope label.

Check that the candidates whose scripts are enclosed are those whose names are listed on the Mark Sheet.

**Marking Part 1: The essays**

To obtain a pass, there **must** be some reference to historiography, even be it ever so humble. If the candidate is unable to show that they have referred to or quoted from historians, or considered historical schools of thought, then they are not meeting the basic requirements of the marks scheme for a pass. Full guidance on the intention of each essay, and possible format and relevant content of candidates' answers is given in the detailed marking instructions for each field.

The set of **generic criteria** for each grade level follows, and markers must carefully consider the overall merits of each essay against that list.

The following descriptions provide guidance on the features of essays categorised as meriting the ranking D, C, B, A, A+ and A++. Many essays will exhibit some but not all of the features listed, others will be stronger in one area than another. Features of a C essay may well appear in an essay which overall merits a B or A pass. **With the exception of 'Historical interpretations', the criteria should NOT be thought of as hurdles, all of which must be crossed before a grade boundary is reached**. Markers should reward what the candidate has tried to argue rather than penalise what may have been omitted. Remember, a candidate's arguments and evidence may differ substantially from the marks scheme, but the candidate should still be given whatever credit they deserve.

# Advanced Higher History Script – Grade Criteria

| | D (10-12) | C (13-14) | B (15-17) | A (18-19) | A+ (20-22) | A++ (23+) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Structure** | The structure is weak with a poorly organised presentation of the arguments. | The structure displays a basic organisation but this may be loose. | The structure is readily apparent. | Clearly structured (not necessarily divided up into separate sections). | A well defined structure displaying a very confident grasp of the demands of the question. | Structured so that the argument convincingly builds and develops throughout. |
| **Introduction and Conclusion** | The introduction and conclusion are ineffective. | The introduction and conclusion are functional. | The introduction is a competent presentation of the issues; it comes to a suitable, largely summative, conclusion. | There is a perceptive presentation of the issues; the conclusion arises logically from the evidence and arguments in the main body and attempts synthesis. | There is a fluent and insightful presentation of the issues; the conclusion gives a robust overview/synthesis and a qualitative judgement of factors. | There is a fluent and insightful presentation of the issues; the conclusion gives a robust overview/ synthesis and a qualitative judgement of factors. |
| **Relevance of Information and Approach** | Considerable elements of the factual content and approach relate loosely to the title. | Factual content and approach broadly relate to the title. | Factual content and approach is largely focused on the title. | Factual content and approach are focused on the title. | Factual content and approach are clear and consistent with the title. | Factual content and approach are clear and consistent with the title. |
| **Degree of Analysis** | There is much narrative and description rather than analysis. | There is an attempt to answer the question and analyse the issues involved; possibly not deep or sustained. | There is a firm grasp of the aims of the question and the candidate tackles it with a fairly sustained analysis. | There is an assured and consistent control of the arguments and issues. | There is a very assured and consistent control of all the arguments and issues, and a focused approach to the question. | There is detailed and effective analysis which advances the argument and considers various possible implications of the question, going beyond the most obvious ones. |
| **Historical sources/ interpretations** | There is no discernible reference to historical works. | There is limited but perceptible reference to historians' interpretations. | There is an awareness of historians' interpretations. | There is an awareness of historians' interpretations and arguments. | There is a sound knowledge and understanding of historians' interpretations. | There is an engagement with current historiography. |
| **Thoroughness** | The treatment of the issue shows an elementary knowledge of the issue but has major omissions. | The treatment of the issue shows sufficient knowledge which reflects a basic understanding of the issue. | The treatment of the issue shows an awareness of the width and depth of the knowledge required for a study of the issue. | The treatment of the issue is based on a fair quantity of research demonstrating width and depth of knowledge. | The treatment of the issue is based on wide research and demonstrates a considerable width and depth of knowledge. | The treatment of the issue is clearly based on a wide range of serious reading and demonstrates a considerable width and depth of knowledge. |
| **Clarity of Expression** | There is a weak sense of expression. | Expression is generally clear and accurate. | Expression is clear and accurate | Expression is clear and accurate with a vocabulary appropriate to the topic. | Expression is clear, accurate and fluent, with a vocabulary appropriate to the topic. | Expression shows sustained fluency, clarity and sophistication. |

**Further general advice to markers – Essays**

**Even though all markers will mark positively and reward what is there in the essay, they may still ask themselves if there are any criteria where, if it has not been met, the candidate must fail.**

**Factors which do lead to an essay failing:**

1. **Total misunderstanding of the title.** The essay is set as a particular title, and therefore there **is** a particular issue to be addressed. An essay where the candidate has missed completely the point of the question is almost certain to fail.

   Similarly, a candidate may seem to 'turn' a question to fit a prepared response. While some aspects may be able to be credited, the marker must be convinced that the response adequately and actively addresses the question set for a pass to be awarded.

   In a question which contains an isolated factor, this factor must receive due attention. A response which ignores the isolated factor must fail.

2. **Extreme brevity.** A very short essay of around only 2-3 sides would have to be astonishingly well argued to get a pass. It is highly unlikely that there will be sufficient depth and breadth of argument to convince a marker it had covered enough of the markable criteria to pass.

3. **Lack of historiography.** The need for historiography in essays is clearly set out in the Grade Descriptions in the Course Arrangements. Essays without recognition of different historical interpretations **must therefore fail**. There is a fairly open definition of 'historical interpretations' as the minimum expected pass standard. What is expected at Advanced Higher level is that **there are signs of the candidates' reading, and therefore some awareness that there are different views on an issue**.

   If a candidate were to introduce a new paragraph with a phrase such as 'Naturally, other historians have argued …' or 'There is another school of thought on this matter …' that will suffice for meeting the C standard. If they start (accurately) quoting historians by name or refer to particular schools of thought, or give quotes from historians and changing views over time, that clearly takes the essay into B and A territory <u>on this aspect of the marking</u>.

**Factors which are NOT in themselves fatal to the candidates chances:**

1. **Structure.** This may be poor and the candidate rambles their way through their piece. However, it may still be that enough other insightful and relevant aspects are explored in enough depth to persuade the marker that the candidate should be awarded a pass at some level. A sense of structure often 'appears' during the essay so a candidate shouldn't be penalised or down-graded just because nothing much seems to have been laid out in the introduction.

2. **Accuracy.** Several minor inaccuracies, or indeed, a few fairly major ones, will not in themselves be sufficient to fail a response. It may be that the marker becomes increasingly convinced that the candidate is not in full control of their evidence, and that may deter the granting of an A pass, but it does not automatically lead to a fail.

3. **Relevance.** While relevance is important, it is not the sole criterion on which a response is judged. It is a question of degree; responses should be marked positively. A pass at the C level can be gained by an essay with enough relevance to convince the marker of its overall virtue; an A pass can be granted even despite the odd lapse or digression.

4.   **Thoroughness.** This aspect of <u>width of detail</u> is clearly a major discriminating factor in determining a grade. It is NOT a pass-fail factor. If a candidate misses out what a marker thinks is a key factor, but comprehensively discusses a lot of other key factors, the A pass can still be awarded. While the candidate may seem to be presenting a very ill-balanced and distorted view of the width of relevant issues in the chosen title, that selectivity is the candidate's privilege. Therefore the marker should mark the essay for what argument it does contain and not for the degree to which it conforms to the view of the marker.

Equally, in terms of <u>depth of detail</u>, many essays are a very good review, albeit sometimes superficial, of a lot of the issues that are relevant. Candidates who follow this approach, which may appear light on analysis or evidence, may still have done enough to merit a pass or even slightly more.

5.   **Use of language.** Candidates' linguistic skills vary. Essays can often be clumsily expressed in fairly poor English, but still contain many of the admirable criteria that merit high reward. Equally, there can be fluent and stylish pieces that flatter to deceive when the marker gets beyond the language and studies the other criteria.

6.   **Conclusion.** This is an important aspect of the essay; it pulls it all together and shows the marker how the candidate has marshalled their facts and arguments. A good conclusion is often decisive in pulling the essay into the next higher marks band, and a weak conclusion will certainly hinder the chances of getting an A. However, the lack of a conclusion in itself is not a factor leading to an automatic fail.

**Marking Part 2: The source questions**

The examination paper now has 3 standardised stems on the source questions.

**The 'how fully' question (12 marks)**

The candidate should establish the view of the source and interpret what that view is, with an opportunity to earn up to 3 marks by discriminatory thinking about which points of the source are relevant to the question. If they select these points, by either quoting them, paraphrasing them or referring to them, then they must be given credit.

The candidate can then earn the remaining marks by the quality and depth of the immediate and/or wider contextual recall that they provide in their overall interpretation of the source's comprehensiveness.

There is no mandatory provenance comment for this question. Therefore there is no allocation of marks put against it. However, candidates may still make some perfectly relevant and appropriate provenance comments which help locate it within its historical context or help define the background and/or authorship of the writer in a way that genuinely helps answer the set question. That should be rewarded but it has to be something more precise and focused than the candidate offering a formulaic 'the value of a secondary source is a modern interpretation etc …'. Contextualised provenance comment is given credit under the 'historiography' marks that are awarded. This style of marking should be encouraged.

**The 'how useful' question (12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source. Candidates may offer this in slightly formulaic form at the lowest level but that will not necessarily merit the full 3 marks.

The candidate can then earn marks (as in the 'how fully' question above), for establishing the view, interpreting the sources and accurately supporting that evaluation with comment from the source.

A combination of provenance comment and interpretation can earn up to a maximum of 5 marks. The candidate can earn the remaining marks from the quality and depth of the immediate and/or wider contextual recall provided in the overall interpretation of the source's value. Markers will award marks particularly in the upper ranges for historiographical issues that the candidate raises.

**The 'two-source' question (16 marks)**

Candidates should apply the same techniques to the 'two-source' question, as they do to the other two.

One of the two sources may be a primary source. It is likely that the candidate will include provenance comment. This should be rewarded in the same way as if the candidate has answered the question as a single-source 'how useful' question. Marking of both sources will give the candidate a chance to earn 'interpretation' marks as in the section above.

The candidate can therefore possibly earn as many as 7 marks out of the 16 before earning the marks that come from providing the wider contextual recall which will help to complete the process that is demanded by the question, (this always asks them to consider the views in the two sources and weigh up their merits against each other and a range of possible other views that may be supportable).

**Marking Scripts and Recording Marks**

1. In everything that you record on a script, make your intentions absolutely clear for the benefit of SQA staff and any others who may refer to the script later.

2. Mark and value every answer and enter the marks awarded in red, at the end of the answer in the right margin, as indicated in the Detailed Marking Instructions. Occasionally a candidate may skip one or two pages in the script by mistake and proceed to answer questions further on in the script. You should be satisfied that in each case all the answers have been marked.

3. Where supplementary items are enclosed inside answer books, indicate clearly, on each item, that it has been considered and include any marks awarded in the answer book against the candidate's answer to the same/related question.

4. If the paper is one on which options are given, ensure that the candidate does not receive credit for answering more than the prescribed number of questions. If the prescribed number has been exceeded, mark all of the answers and select for inclusion in the total the highest marks gained by the candidate consistent with the rubrics of the paper. **Cross through the answers which are not included in the total.** Draw attention on the outside of the script, **not on the Mark Sheet**, to the fact that the candidate has exceeded the prescribed number of questions. If a candidate answers more than one of the options in a question, cross out the option which gains the lower mark and exclude this from the total.

5. If you refer a candidate's script to the Principal Assessor, put a brief explanation in the "For Official Use" section on the front cover of the script concerned. You should pass such packets to the Principal Assessor for further action.

6. The total mark for a paper should be entered in the Total box on the front cover of the answer book. (The total mark must be given as a whole number). Markers must check their additions carefully, by summing marks from the first to the last page of the script and then from the last to the first page. The transcription of marks, within booklets and to the Mark Sheets, should also be checked.

It is helpful to the Examining team if all markers of the scripts write something like the marks breakdown illustrated below, on the outside **BACK** page of the candidate's answer booklet, to show how they have assembled their overall mark. This makes it easier to check that the addition is correct.

   **EXAMPLE**

|              |       |       |
|--------------|-------|-------|
| Essay 3      | 16    |       |
| Essay 5      | 14    |       |
|              | ___   |       |
|              | 30    |       |
| Source Q1    | 8     |       |
| Source Q2    | 6     |       |
| Source Q3    | 13    |       |
|              |       | ___   |
|              | Total | 27    |
|              | ___   |       |
|              | Total | 57    |

It is vitally important that marks should be entered accurately on the mark sheet(s). The final mark for the question paper should be entered as above.

**Ex Supplement**

To assist standardisation and to inform decisions on any appeals, markers should complete an Ex Supplement for each candidate.  Brief comments explaining marking decisions are most helpful to examiners.

Comments should not be written on the candidate's answer booklet.

A supply of Ex Supplements will be available in the central marking venue.  They should be handed in to SQA administrative staff along with the final envelopes of marked scripts.

**Special Assessment Arrangements**

**Transcriptions**

You may have been allocated scripts where a candidate has been given permission to have his/her script transcribed.  You should mark the candidate's original work and refer only to the transcription where necessary.  Diagrammatical material should not be transcribed.  If this has been done the transcribed diagrams should be disregarded.

All marks should be shown on the candidate's scripts and the packet should be processed in the normal way.

**Suspected Malpractice**

Some candidates' responses may contain similarities which suggest that there may have been copying.  If it appears that this is likely to be the result of the teaching method by which the candidates have been prepared for the examination, there is no need for attention to be drawn to the case.

If however, 2 or more scripts contain the same errors, or other similarities which suggest possible malpractice, a short report with the relevant details should be prepared on a separate sheet of paper.  All scripts, including the suspect scripts, should then be marked in the normal way.  Please involve the Principal Assessor and team leader for a discussion of suspect scripts.

**Marker Report**

This is an important mechanism in our procedures for quality assurance.  Comments on candidate performance and the workings of the marking scheme contribute towards the Principal Assessor's report.  **This report should be completed before leaving the Central Marking venue.**

**Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**To what extent did religion, ritual and superstition shape Iron Age society up to 300 AD?**

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to come to a conclusion about the forces which shaped Iron Age society up to 300 AD. The evidence for religion, ritual and superstition and their role in shaping society will be discussed. The candidate would benefit from discussing other types of evidence and other factors/forces which shaped Iron Age society, for example, the extent to which warrior values, symbols of power, hierarchy and the economy influenced society.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Points suggesting religion, ritual and superstition shaped Iron Age society**

- *"For the Iron Age Celts, religion, ritual and superstition would have permeated all aspects of life, from building a house or ploughing a field to making a journey or exchanging gifts"* (Ian Armit).
- Probably used ritual to mark important points in the agricultural/farming year.
- Scant evidence, often based on analogy with Gaul, Ireland & Southern England.
- Likely had numerous Gods, some of which would have been linked to rivers, lakes and mountains.
- Assumed to be Druids (anything else would have been mentioned by classical writers).
- Discussion of house cosmology – ritual pits dug into wheelhouse floors, pits filled with animal bones & artefacts (Sollas in North Uist contained 3 sheep, dismembered to fit, cremated animal remains, pottery; Hornish Point in South Uist – quartered body of young boy about 12 yrs old).
- House cosmology – Roundhouse doors orientated uniformly to the east or southeast, to face the rising sun?
- Examples of religious/ritual artefacts – Ballachulish figure, Granite three-headed figure.
- Examples of hoards as ritual deposits (Duddingston Loch, Edinburgh).
- Examples of sacrifice (Eildon Hill North – horse under rampart, Torrs Pony cap – may have been mask for 'a pantomime horse' in religious ceremony).
- Examples of cults – 'Cult of the Head' – skull perforated for display at Hillhead Broch or Lochend in East Lothian – 7 absent skulls from communal burial.
- Examples of burials – scattering of high status burials (cist burials from Moredun, Edinburgh, Chariot burial from Newtongrange).

**Points suggesting other factors shaped Iron Age society**

**Agrarian society/Practical subsistence needs**

- Need a place to cook, eat, sleep, work and shelter.
- Chose to settle in fertile areas.
- Worked arable and pastoral mixed economy – found quern stones, grain, bones.
- Produced a surplus – stored in souterrains.
- Managed the land – complex field systems (Leuchars in Fife, Orchard Rig in Peeblesshire).
- Supported specialist craftsmen.

**Warrior Values**

- Need to reflect military prowess to ensure tribal and intertribal standing.
- Shaped by 'heroic', lordly practices of warfare, feasting and drinking.
- Manufactured warrior paraphernalia to reinforce values – scabbards, swords, chariot burial.
- Warfare, feuding and raiding probably rife, especially on tribal fringes.

**The need to display identity, power and maintain social hierarchy**

- Need to use personal ornament and settlements to create and maintain social order.
- Valued expressions of personal status – upsurge in prestige objects (helmets, torcs, collars, war trumpets, horse gear, swords, scabbards).
- Upper classes consciously distinguished themselves from lower rank (clothing, speech, aristocratic pursuits – eg hunting).
- Settlements built to maintain and reflect social hierarchy (Gurness, Eildon Hill North).

**Tribal interaction**

- Need to exert tribal identity.
- Shaped by contact with Rome – brief exposure to Rome's military presence, cultural influences, political systems, material goods.
- Fragmented insular communities became increasingly aware of and involved with continental fashions in art and metalwork.
- Feuding and raiding between tribes would necessitate a degree of defensive capabilities.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Richard Hingley**: *The Making Of Scotland – Settlement and Sacrifice*, talks of the extent to which ritual influenced life, esp. house cosmology and burials.
- **Ian Armit**: *Historic Scotland – Celtic Scotland*, argues that religion is all permeating and influenced all aspects of daily life in the Iron Age.
- **Graham and Anna Ritchie**: *Scotland - Archaeology and Early History*
- **Ian Armit**: *Towers In The North – The Brochs Of Scotland,* highlights some ritual finds associated with brochs but emphasises complex & diverse nature of Iron Age influences.
- **Alistair Moffat**: *Before Scotland* – suggests Iron Age society was steeped in religion, ritual & superstition.

**Question 2**

**How far is it true to say that Roman failure to conquer Northern Britain was due to the opposition of the native tribes?**

The aim of this essay is for the candidate to examine the reasons for Rome's failure to conquer Northern Britain. The title allows for a discussion of the significance of Rome's failure to crush native opposition. The specific cause specified in the title should definitely be considered but the candidate may legitimately challenge the terms of the question and bring to bear other reasons such as nature of native social structure, geography, or the lack of real economic incentive & Roman will. The essay should reach a conclusion as to the most important reason for Rome's failure to conquer the North.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Points discussing degree to which Roman failure was due to opposition from natives**

- Several classical accounts document the warlike nature of the Highlanders (Dio describes that they stood their ground with determination whilst Herodian talks of fearsome and dangerous fighters).
- In both Agricola's and Severus' campaigns the natives' guerrilla warfare tactics meant Roman control was shaky whilst Hadrian recorded that "the Britons could not be kept under Roman control".
- On several occasions during the Roman interlude the natives invaded areas under Roman control, laying waste to frontier areas.
- Barbarian conspiracy (367) to attack reveals that Northern tribes could put aside differences and work together to face their common enemy.
- "Northern tribes were troublesome – not unconquerable" Breeze.
- No positive evidence can be deduced that the Caledonians were particularly warlike, nor indeed that they were ever successful in their wars with Rome. Until the end of Roman Britain the provincial army was successful both in defeating each invasion of the empire and in preventing the Picts from conquering the tribes of the Southern Uplands or settling the immediate vicinity of the frontier.

**Points suggesting other reasons for Rome's failure**

**Lack of economic incentive**

- Scotland lacked the easily available precious metal resources that places like Wales offered.
- Low potential tax revenues.
- Considerable expenditure in keeping an army in the North.
- Strabo, writing during Augustus' reign wrote "no…advantages would arise by taking over and holding the country..."
- Appian, former secretary to the emperor wrote in mid 2nd century, "they rule the most important part of it – more than half – and have no need of the rest; in fact the part they have, brings in little money". He also talks of "profitless tribes of barbarians".
- Romans may have forwarded 'lack of economic incentive' as an excuse for not conquering – rarely used it as a reason for conquest.

**Impact of natives' social infrastructure**

- Lack of a developed market economy caused logistical difficulties – lack of local market mechanisms made army difficult to supply.
- Groenman-van Waateringe suggests "successful permanent Roman occupation only possible in those regions where the Romans were confronted with a well-organised proto-urban or urban structure…".
- The North lacked the local administrative, legal and law enforcement systems which Rome usually used to administer provinces – Rome couldn't do their usual – rule by bending governing classes to imperial will.
- Too difficult to coerce a society made up of extended family groupings & too difficult to attack a society which lacked an identifiable seat of power.
- However, there were comparatively sophisticated tribes in the north, and they were capable of producing a surplus.
- There were some 'proto-urban' native sites which Rome could have utilized had they wished to.

**Lack of Roman will**

- Control repeatedly disintegrated on account of external imperial concerns.
- Changes of Emperor impacted upon Rome's commitment to control and occupy the North, eg Titus, full of military honours orders a halt to advance in the North whilst Antonius Pius, devoid of military honours orders advance and control.
- North Britain was of peripheral interest and forces could be withdrawn with least injury to Rome's vital interests.
- B. Dobson suggests Rome wanted to retain the North only because of their "Roman will to retain what had been won".

**External events**

- AD 85, Flavian pulled back as a result of "the dangerous crisis on the Danube" – all of Legio II Adiutrix pulled out.
- Death of Severus thwarted 3$^{rd}$ century attempts at control – Caracalla returned to Rome.
- Breeze argues two serious attempts to conquer and control – (Agricola and Severus) failed because problems elsewhere.

**Topography of the North**

- Highlands too daunting.
- Dense forestation made communication difficult.
- Highlands no more difficult than other successfully controlled terrain – Yugoslavia, Eastern Turkey, Alps.
- Rome "could have dealt with the Scottish Highlands if it had wished". (Breeze)
- They managed to control the Southern Uplands and Pennines, both of which would have been well suited to guerrilla warfare.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **David Breeze**: *Why did the Romans fail to conquer Scotland? PSAS, 1988* – discusses pool of reasons from topographic to economic incentives, concludes that geographical isolation & wider imperial concerns curtailed Rome's progress in the North.
- **David Breeze**: *Roman Scotland*, more concise synopsis of above.
- **D W Woolliscroft**: *Why the Romans failed to conquer Scotland* – argues that the benefits of conquering Scotland were not worth the additional dangers of being there.
- **G Maxwell**: *The Romans in Scotland,* wider imperial concerns meant Rome never wholly committed in the North.
- **I Richmond**: *Roman and Native in Northern Britain*, suggests occupation was "no ephemeral experiment…undertaken with determination and force" but simply defeated by strength of natives.

**Question 3**

**To what extent was St Columba's contribution to early Christianity one of reinforcement rather than conversion?**

The aim of this essay is to analyse the contribution of Saint Columba and assess his role in the Christianisation of north Britain. The title allows Columba's contribution in 'reinforcing' Christianity rather than introducing the religion to be discussed. The candidate could bring to bear other individuals and other factors which reinforced Christianity. The essay should reach a conclusion on the role of Saint Columba in terms of conversion or reinforcement.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Points discussing the evidence that St Columba 'reinforced' Christianity**

- On one hand, Columba has been perceived, by some, as a missionary extraordinary to the Picts, as the father of Scottish Christianity (Adomnan).
- No doubt that he made a lasting impression on Scotland and assisted some (the Northern Picts) to attain Christianity.
- On the other hand, when it comes to converting sections of Scotland to Christianity, Columba was a "Johnny come lately. Columba did not bring Christianity to Scotland…Christianity was already here."
- The traditional view that Columba brought Christianity to Scotland is "quite patently errant nonsense" – rather, he died having reinforced it not having brought it. (B Paterson)
- "Little evidence for Columba's active missionary efforts: his journeys into Pictland were geared towards getting protection for his monks working in Pictish territory and produced only small crops of conversions." (Crawford & Clancy)
- There is no evidence of either a Kingly or a mass conversion of the Picts under Columba's direction.
- Arguably, the real breakthrough in the conversion of the Picts came later, with Maelrubai of Applecross. (A Smyth)

**St Columba was reinforcing St Ninian's work**

- Traditional story suggests Ninian set up 'White House', Candida Casa, at Whithorn in Galloway in 397AD. The local chief Tuduvallus accepted Ninian and his congregation thus fostering conditions for the spread of the faith.
- Bede tells us that Ninian converted the Southern Picts ("the Southern Picts themselves… had long embraced the faith of the truth, by the preaching of the Word by St Ninian").
- Ninian reportedly set up (c.150!) churches across central Scotland, up the East Coast and as far north as Orkney and Shetland.
- Ninian was likely active across a wide area, hence the variety and confusion of the variations in his name – important to more than just one community.
- "Ninian existed, was significantly earlier than Columba, and was a very important and influential man."
- Legend suggests that St Columba had actually been at Candida Casa and had copied books brought by Ninian from Gaul – evidently reinforcing Ninian's work.
- Ninian established, for Columba to reinforce, a significant Christian presence in Scotland, Columba allegedly arrived in among the 'apostate Picts' with Ninian's gospel – highlights role of Ninian.

**St Columba was reinforcing other individuals' work**

- Saint Colmac and Saint Brendan, Senana, Oran, Finian of Moville and Kieran of Clonmacnois – "the devoted labours of scores of missionaries meant that much of Scotland was firmly Christianised before Columba ever set foot on Iona".

**St Columba was reinforcing Rome's foundations**

- By late 4th century Christianity in place in the land between Rome's two northern frontiers, sending to the civic community at Carlisle a request for a bishop to come to Whithorn.
- Long before Columba there existed 'paruchia' or administrative areas divided into the rule of bishops.
- There was a well established Christian 'flock' under Roman rule.

**Points discussing the view that St Columba did not just reinforce Christianity**

**St Columba did much more than reinforce Christianity**

- Columba did much more than reinforce the faith since Ninian's role has been exaggerated as a result of the resurgence of the cult of St Ninian in the 12th century (perpetuated by Aelred of Rievaulx).
- Christianity made its first mark in western Scotland with the arrival of St Columba in 563AD.
- He established Iona, the most important early Christian monastery in the North, becoming a centre of artistic excellence and learning, playing a key role in converting Northumbria and gaining supremacy of the Pictish church.
- He established other monasteries (including Hinba and Cell Diuni on Loch Awe).
- Claimed by some to be the 'Apostle of the Picts' – suggests more than reinforcing faith.
- Adomnan tells us that Columba did visit King Bridei's Pictish court and did make 'expeditions' into Pictland.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Sally Foster**: *Picts, Gaels and Scots* – emphasis placed on Columba's role as Father of Christianity, responsible for conversion of Picts.
- **A Smyth**: *Warlords and Holymen, Scotland AD80-1000* – "it would be unwise to assume a mass conversion of even the north-western Picts took place within Columba's lifetime…first breakthrough came quite independently of the Columban enterprise…"
- **B Paterson**: *Saint Wars – Ninian vs. Columba*, Paterson suggests that Columba was "a Johnny come lately", simply reinforcing the missionaries work of his predecessors, including Ninian.
- **G Barrow**: *Impact of the Monk, ed. Gordon Menzies, In Search of Scotland* – Columba was reinforcing an existing faith but he brought a new 'monastic' tradition and enthusiasm for monastic life.

**Question 4**

**How far does the evidence support the view that the Viking invaders overwhelmed the Picts?**

The aim of this essay is to analyse the debate relating to the Vikings' impact on the Picts. Candidates should discuss the evidence that the Picts were overwhelmed. Ideally, this essay would also consider evidence to suggest that the Vikings did not overwhelm the native Picts and discuss the extent to which the Norsemen peacefully settled and integrated with the Picts. The essay should reach a conclusion on the accuracy of the theory that Picts were overwhelmed.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Points discussing the view that the Vikings overwhelmed the Picts**

- Wainwright asserts the Picts "were overwhelmed politically, linguistically, culturally and socially".
- Vikings established lasting control over northern and western Pictland; these places became wholly Scandinavian lands.
- Brian Smith's 'genocide theory' suggests that Vikings overwhelmed some Picts. The invaders took what they wanted, either slaughtering, enslaving or driving away the indigenous Pictish population on the Scottish islands.
- Analogies drawn between Vikings' impact on the islanders and 19th century English impact on Tasmanian Aboriginals (J Stewart) – "wiped out to the last man".
- **Linguistically overwhelmed** – the apparent lack of pre-Norse place names in Orkney corroborates the idea that the Norse 'overwhelmed' the native Orcadians.
- **Politically overwhelmed** – Vikings overwhelmed rulers of Pictland and impacted upon emerging political structures of Alba.
- Mainland Picts fell victim to Viking raids – attacked royal and coastal forts (Burghead & Fortriu).
- Danes ravaged Pictland as far as Clunie and Dunkeld during Kenneth mac Alpin's reign, raided Fortrui in 864, laid waste to Pictland during Domnall mac Caustantin's reign and plundered Alba in 903.
- Vikings directly responsible for the Picts' power vacuum which allowed Kenneth mac Alpin to establish the medieval kingdom of the Scots.
- **Culturally overwhelmed** – evidence of some changes in material culture – introduction of steatite vessels & flax suggests a change if not subjugation.
- **Socially overwhelmed** – suggestions forwarded that the Picts were "overwhelmed by and submerged beneath the sheer weight of the Scandinavian settlement". (Wainwright)
- Some settlements reveal break in continuity – rectangular houses replace round houses (Udal on North Uist – native settlement entirely replaced by Scandinavian one).
- **Not overwhelmed** – no evidence for mass graves, no shattered sculpture, no evidence for 'genocide'.
- Southern Pictland survived comparatively intact (a Gaelic kingdom constructed upon Pictish framework).
- "Vikings seemed to have recognised the strength of native culture and to have responded with an instinctive need to dominate rather than obliterate" (A Ritchie)

**Points suggesting that the Vikings did not overwhelm the Picts**

**Evidence for cultural/religious integration, which suggests that the Picts were not overwhelmed**

- Carved stones reflect cultural integration – eg Bressay sculpture stone in Shetland shows ogham and Pictish symbols – islanders had a foot in both the native and Viking camp.
- Vikings converted to Christianity and contributed to religious expression (hogbacks represent Viking contribution to Christian sculpture).
- Vikings established Christian chapels on earlier Pictish chapel sites, suggesting Viking invaders did not overwhelm Picts and their Christian beliefs.
- Church prospered in Northern Isles (St Magnus Cathedral)
- Notably, Pictish church not overwhelmed since Pictish St Andrews remained head of church.
- Northern Isles folk tales still show their Pictish origins – "indicates the strength of the hand that rocks the cradle".

**Evidence for social integration, which suggests that the Picts were not overwhelmed**

- Native Pictish material repeatedly found in Norse houses suggests a degree of active social interchange between Picts and Vikings (eg houses from Buckquoy, Brough of Birsay and Pool in Orkney)
- There was a process of peaceful colonisation rather than overwhelming military conquest.
- Evidence of interaction and intermarriage – at least one King of Alba boasted a Norse name.
- DNA Research at Oxford Uni suggests intermarriage since in modern Orkney and Northern Isles, there is an abundance of Y-chromosomes commonly found in Russia & Scandinavia but there is continuity in the female chromosomes – suggesting Viking men married native women.
- Pictish familial social organisation would have been familiar to the Vikings and endured.
- Vikings rebuilt on Pictish sites as they were taking over existing patterns of land ownership and administration (Birsay, Orkney – house plots on Brough retained).

**Evidence of political survival, which suggests that the Picts were not overwhelmed**

- Political hierarchy of Vikings and Picts was similar (kings, chiefs, farm workers, slaves) – evidence of continuity rather than change in hierarchical system and thus not overwhelmed.
- Arguably Pictish political systems and centres endure albeit as a Picto-Scottish kingdom.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.
These may include reference to:**

- **Brian Smith**: *Pict and Viking: settlement or slaughter? www.orkneyjar.com* – re-evaluates idea of peaceful integration, concluding that natives were overwhelmed and slaughtered in Northern Isles.
- **Brian Smith**: *The Picts and the Martyrs, Did Vikings kill the native population of Orkney and Shetland? www.orkneyjar.com* – goes as far as suggesting genocide in the Northern Isles.
- **F T Wainwright**: *Picts and Scots*, in The Northern Isles suggests that the Picts were submerged by the weight of the Norse invasion and colonisation.
- **A Ritchie**: *Viking Scotland*, advocates peaceful integration, largely based on fieldwork from Orkneys.
- **Nick Aitchison**: *The Picts and Scots at War*, highlights consequences of the Picts' defeat at Fortrui in terms of overwhelming existing political system.
- **Lloyd & Jenny Laing**: *The Picts and the Scots*, highlights extensive degree of Norse domination in the Northern Isles and north Scottish mainland, though acknowledges "Vikings may have borrowed ideas from Picts and Scots".

**Question 5**

**How far had the social and cultural distinctions between the peoples of Northern Britain disappeared by 1000 AD?**

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to come to a conclusion about the extent of social and cultural divisions in early medieval Scotland. The evidence for and extent of social and cultural divisions would have to be discussed. The candidate could bring to bear other relevant divisions, such as religious and they could discuss the counter argument that the north was increasingly united in the 10$^{th}$ century. The essay should reach a conclusion as the extent to which social and cultural distinctions had or had not disappeared.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Points discussing social distinction**

**Minimal social distinction**

- Shared common Celtic background of Scots and Picts.
- Shared warrior values, prestige based social organisation.
- Shared tribal attitudes.
- Shared subsistence methods.
- Shared social values – status rested on kindred and land.
- A new common practice/style of kingship was developing – power legitimised by the church and extended through the support of the church and the political elite (mormaers and thanes).
- United system of control emerging – 'Mormaers' used as a common term for leading magnates fighting alongside Scottish kings & used practically to extend central royal authority over remote parts of Scotland.

**Continued social distinctions**

- Significant degree of social fragmentation existed due to undeveloped infrastructure of the North – Highlands and Islands remained remote and poor road system prohibited interaction.
- Unstable geographic frontiers.

**Points discussing cultural distinctions**

**Minimal cultural distinctions**

- Linguistic divisions between P and Q Gaelic speakers may have begun even before the 9$^{th}$ century political changes – see increasing gaelicization of Scotland (Foster).
- Increasing gaelicization of toponomy – decline of 'pit' place-names.
- Increasing gaelicization of art – rapid loss of Pictish symbols.
- Gaelic names given to Picts.
- Intermarriage between different kingdoms.
- "what continued was….an oral culture which continued to sing the praises of the warlord and chief of the kindred."  M Lynch
- All the societies of Northern Britain were intensely hierarchical, a person's identity was dependent on gender, age, wealth, family ties & the possession of a craft or specialised learning.
- United by fact that almost everyone was engaged in farming their local environment.
- United by the importance attributed to conflict – military action, fortified residences, military equipment war horses – reflects common warrior values.

**Continued cultural distinctions**

- Linguistic divisions – Orkney, Shetland, Caithness, Galloway and Western Isles spoke Old Norse whilst pockets of old Pictish kingdoms spoke Pictish languages. Anglo-Saxon spoken in the southeast, Cumbric spoken by the Britons, and Scots had own language other than in court. In part united by written language of Latin.
- There was a distinct settled Scandinavian cultural zone in the North Isles as well as the north and west of Scotland.
- Different house styles endured – Black House in Western Isles, long houses in Northern Isles.
- Different forms of land tenure (udal tenure on family land in the northern isles).

**Points discussing religious distinctions**

**Minimal religious distinctions**

- All peoples of Northern Britain were or were becoming Christianised.
- Saintly missionaries had converted Southern and Northern Picts. Angles had been converted.
- Viking conversion well underway by 10th century.
- Synod of Whitby had resolved ecumenical differences between the Roman and Celtic church.
- Common religious & administrative centre focused on St Andrews.
- United in use of Christianity to secure Kingship.
- United by spread of continental artistic influences – common religious art and symbolism.
- A A M Duncan asserts, "the kings of Scotia and Scotland stamped united upon the four or five disparate peoples north of the Tweed and Solway".

**Continued religious distinctions**

- Irish/Celtic cultural zone on Iona endured after the establishment of new eastern Christian centres.
- Still hints of paganism – evidence of 10th century Vikings retaining polytheism.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Sally Foster**: *Picts, Gaels and Scots* – Picts identity was subsumed …they had become Scots, but the new peoples of Alba shared common culture, land organisation and faith.
- **A A M Duncan**: *Scotland, The Making of the Kingdom* – highlights disappearance of distinct Pictish identity and culture, subsumed into Scots.
- **A Smyth**: *Warlords and Holymen, Scotland AD80–1000* – suggests some fragile religious unity amidst political changes but cultural divisions remained between those in south-western Scotland, the eastern spine and the north.
- **F Watson**: *Scotland from Prehistory to the Present,* highlights the role played by the church in diminishing distinctions but suggests that for ordinary people life remained the same irrespective of cultural and social distinctions, priorities remained the same: farming and meeting the family's basic needs.
- **M Lynch**: *Scotland, A New History* – highlights the extent to which cultural and social distinctions endured despite some political integration.

**Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A as evidence of the Picts' warrior values?** (12 marks)

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source A** in understanding Pictish warrior values in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments will earn credit. These may include:

- Example of a Class II Pictish symbol stone.
- Class II stones feature symbols carved in relief on rectangular, shaped slabs.
- Usually found in the north-east of Scotland, with clusters found along the eastern coasts and into the Highlands.
- Thought to date from the eighth and ninth century – a time when the Picts were converting to Christianity.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Sculptural representation of warfare and warrior values.
- Aberlemno II depicts Pictish cavalry and infantry engaged in typical warrior pursuits.
- Depicts specialist arms and equipment (mounted warrior – horse, bridle gear and sword).
- Depicts opening cavalry and infantry charge – combat ready stance with shields ready and warriors holding spears in underarm grip.
- Depicts two opposing forces (Picts and Northumbrians) – figures on left are Pictish, similar hairstyles and clothes to other Pictish stones whilst helmeted figures on the right are Angle (helmets with nose-guards – like Coppergate).

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Likely to be a depiction of scenes from Battle of Nechtansmere, 685, between Picts and Northumbrians which took place less than ten miles from Aberlemno.
- The Northumbrian King Ecgfrid and his warriors invaded northwards, but were defeated by the Pictish leader Brude mac Bili.
- The single Northumbrian warrior could portray Northumbrian Ecgfrid/th
- Represents one of many documented battles between Picts and Scots, Vikings and Northumbrians (Fortrui, Nechtansmere).
- Could be a Pictish commemoration of their battle triumph.

**Points from recall which offer wider contextualisation of the evidence in the source**

- Aitchison argues that warfare was a common secular activity for Picts, reinforcing Kingship and power.
- Warfare took place with full Church support – provided divine legitimisation for Kings (relics of St Columba were carried into battle by the Scots).
- Warfare and warrior values – a key part of society, enabling Picts to control resources, usually territory and/or power.
- Warrior values also evident in Pictish settlements such as the fort at Burghead – extensive fortification with ditches, ramparts and defensive walls.
- Warrior values reflected in other symbol stones – cauldrons, goblets, and swords, hunting scenes all evident on class 1 and class 2 stones – indicative of warrior values.
- The Senchus fer nAlban suggests a well-ordered military system amongst the Scots and it is assumed that Picts had a comparable method of levying military service – evident from their ability to raise large armies and navies.
- Picts had "*comitatus*" – retinues of mounted 'professional' warriors, the social and military elite (evident on Sueno Stone, Forres).
- Hoard evidence, such as St Ninian's hoard, reveal ornate weaponry indicative of warrior values (silver sword pommels, gilded silver with blue glass eyes chapes/protective mountings for the tips of swords).

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Sally Foster**: *Picts, Gaels and Scots* – Picts were sea-battlers, battlers on land, equipped with spears, axes, shields and swords and had highly mobile armies – fundamental component of Pictish society.
- **A Smyth**: *Warlords and Holymen, Scotland AD80-1000* – emphasises the existence of a warrior elite, even as early as AD 83 when Tacitus refers to Calgacus, *The Swordsman*.
- **N Aitchison**: *The Picts and the Scots at War* – highlights the Picts military prowess and sophistication.
- **A Ritchie**: *Picts* – stones reflect diversity of Pictish cultural – warrior values, Christian values.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is helpful as evidence of Pictish warrior values.

**Question 2**

**How fully does Source B reflect the realities of Agricola's campaign against the North Britons?**
**(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for the ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider contextual recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the value of **Source B** in providing a full understanding of the realities of Governor Julius Agricola's northern campaigns:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include reference to:

- Outdated but traditional version of Scottish history.
- Previously seen as definitive account of Scottish history.
- Takes Tacitus' claims absolutely for granted – based wholly on *The Agricola* – like a great deal of historiography over past 50 years.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Agricola was able to easily defeat the North Britons due to their lack of unity.
- Inter tribal warfare enabled Agricola to defeat one tribe at a time.
- The Romans were militarily superior to the natives in the North.
- Agricola quickly progressed through and conquered the south of Scotland.
- Agricola defeated the Caledonians after a successful pitched battle and was then recalled to Rome.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualize those in the source**

- North Briton was divided – Ptolemy's map reveals 16 separate tribes and archaeologically, evidence of tribal interaction or tribal unity is very limited.
- Romans were experts in pitched battle, with body armour, extensive weapons and rehearsed manoeuvres – a marked contrast to the natives who were better suited to guerilla warfare.
- Tacitus records that over 10,000 natives were slaughtered at Mons Graupius, in contrast to 360 Roman losses.
- D Breeze regards the battle against the Caledonians (Mons Graupius, AD 84) as "the pinnacle of Agricola's achievements".
- Allegedly, after Mons Graupius, Agricola sealed victory by instructing a fleet to sail around the north coast, asserting authority across the North.
- Agricola's campaign was cut short since Emperor Domitian recalled him in 86 AD – "all Britain was taken and then immediately thrown away".

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualization of the views in the source**

- B. Hoffman suggests that forts including Annetwall Street in Carlisle, Camelon and Newstead predate Agricola's appointment as governor and subsequent expansion – casts doubt over his quick conquest of the south.
- Military installations further north on the Gask Ridge also indicate a pre-Agricolan date – suggests that Agricola was building on the work of his predecessors, Cerealis and Frontinius.
- Pliny the Elder & Statius mention campaigns against the Caledonians which took place before 73AD – suggest a prolonged Flavian invasion, which Agricola entered in the later stages.
- The battle against the Caledonians, Mons Graupius has been referred to both as "the pinnacle of Agricola's achievements" (D Breeze) and "little more than a skirmish, if it actually happened at all" (D Woolliscroft) – to date, there is no meaningful archaeological evidence to suggest that the battle took place.
- It is suggested that Agricola was not in fact a great military campaigner, pushing into *terra incognito*, rather he had a "career of wall-to-wall administration" and had been appointed to consolidate predecessors' gains in the north.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **David Breeze**: *Roman Scotland* – accepts the traditional version of Agricola's push north, relying largely on Tacitus' word.
- **D W Woolliscroft**: *Agricola, He Came, He Saw.  But did he conquer?* – calls for a total re-evaluation of the realities of Agricola's campaign in the north.  Questions Agricola's achievements relative to predecessors.
- **D W Woolliscroft**: *Why the Romans failed to conquer Scotland* – again, emphasis on re-evaluation of the evidence and chronology for  Rome's early occupation, doubting traditional version of events.
- **B Hoffman**: *Archaeology vs. Tacitus' Agricola, A 1ˢᵗ century worst case scenario.*  Questions whether Tacitus was actually lying and thus folly to base understanding of Agricola on such a text.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the degree to which a consideration of **Source B** provides a full understanding of the realities of Governor Julius Agricola's northern campaigns.

**Question 3**

**How much do Sources C and D reveal about differing interpretations on the role played by Kenneth mac Alpin in ninth century North Britain?** **16 marks**

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the views in **Sources C** and **D** on the role of Kenneth mac Alpin in 9th century North Britain, and evaluates them in terms of:

**Source C**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit.

- From the *Chronicle of the Kings of Alba*, also known as the *(Old) Scottish Chronicle*.
- Covers the periods from Kenneth mac Alpin (d.858) until Kenneth II (r.971–995).
- Records the events under regnal years rather than calendar years, imprecise about dates concerned.
- Put together in the early thirteenth century but originally written in the eleventh century, shortly after Kenneth II's reign.
- Composed in Latin by a succession of anonymous scribes.
- Contains many errant if not fictitious place names but is the only native source of information.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Kenneth mac Alpin ruled Pictland for 16 years.
- Kenneth took the throne in Dal Riata, Kingdom of the Scots, before destroying the Picts.
- Kenneth attempted to expand his control into the Lothians and as far south as the Tweed/Melrose.
- As an influential Christian king Kenneth moved the relics of St Columba to Dunkeld.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- There are a dearth of contemporary sources to explain Kenneth's rise to prominence and role in creating a united 'Alba'.
- The idea of Kenneth destroying Picts and becoming the one king of Scotland is substantiated in some contemporary texts, for example, the Prophecy of Berchan, written in the 14th century describes Kenneth as the first "king who ruled in the east".
- Legend has it that Kenneth committed "The treachery of Scone" in 849, in which he duped then slaughtered "all of the nobles of the Picts", before establishing a Scottish kingdom in the east.
- Kenneth reputedly made at least 6 invasions into the Lothians in a bid to expand the Scottish kingdom.
- Idea of Kenneth as 'all conquering' king is flawed since he had defeats towards the end of his reign.

**Source D**

**Provenance**: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. Accurate comment on Smyth will be credited as historiography.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Kenneth did not play a revolutionary role in the development of medieval Scotland.
- He was not the first Scottish king to rule over Scots and Picts.
- His elevated position in history is a result of the fact that he did establish a dynasty of rulers of Alba who claimed descent from him.
- He was like many other medieval warlords, of obscure origin, fighting his way to power.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- By the 8th century Pictish kings were already sporting Gaelic names and Scottish blood – there had been a gradual process of amalgamation of Picts and Scots.
- Not only did 8th century Pictish kings have royal blood, they had been ruling the kingdom of the Picts and Scots simultaneously.
- Kenneth may have hailed from a Pictish mother, adding legitimacy to his alleged attempt to conquer and control the Picts or alternatively he may have had cloudier origins in the Gaelic west.
- Kenneth's place in history rests on the fact that he established the 'mac Alpins' as the dominant dynasty that has subsequently come to be recognised as the first kings of Scots.

**Points which offer a more critical contextualization of the view in the sources**

- Sally Foster argues that the Picts and the term 'Pictland' were not destroyed and they prevailed after the accession of Kenneth mac Alpin.
- Ian Walker argues there had been a gradual process of amalgamation between the Gaels and the Picts – it was not Kenneth's revolutionary actions which brought Scots and Picts together.
- Stephen Driscoll suggests that Kenneth's annexation of Pictland was more a result of Viking pressure than it was a result of successful conquest.
- The English Huntington Chronicle informs Hume opinion – it suggests Kenneth's conquest be at a time when the Vikings had slaughtered the Picts and that Kenneth "was the first of the Scots to obtain monarchy of the whole of Albania, which is now called Scotia".
- It can be argued that Kenneth did not destroy the Picts; rather there was a Pictish power vacuum, created by the Vikings in 839, which led to coming together of Picts and Gaels.
- The Vikings impelled the Gaels to move east – Kenneth was peripheral in the Gaelicisation of the Picts.
- The Dal Riata house of Fergus, son of Eochaid, prior to Kenneth, ruled in the east over Picts and Gaels (though A Woolf argues that this was a Pictish dynasty which had extended its power over the Gaels).

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **A Smyth**: *Warlords and Holymen, Scotland AD 80–1000* – developments in Scottish politics and identity were not down to Kenneth but to a range of longer-term forces, including Vikings.
- **S Foster**: *Picts, Scots and Gaels* – "*sought and ultimately obtained the prize of Pictland*" but owes his reputation to the fact, that could only be recognised later, that he was the founder of the first Scottish royal dynasty…establishing a family line.
- **I Walker**: *Lords of Alba, The Making of Scotland* – Kenneth did not establish a Gaelic speaking Scottish kingdom, this was the result of an evolutionary process.
- **S Driscoll**: *Alba, The Gaelic Kingdom of Scotland, AD 800–1124* – suggests that the idea that Kenneth led a coming together of the Scots and Picts, comparable to a union of the crowns is a popular myth.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, offering a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on the role played by Kenneth mac Alpin in 9th century Northern Britain.

**Scottish Independence (1286–1329)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**"King Alexander III's success in consolidating the power of the Scottish monarchy has been greatly exaggerated." How valid is this view?**

The candidate is required to make a balanced judgement about whether or not King Alexander III's success in consolidating the power of the Scottish monarchy has been greatly exaggerated. Candidates may either arrive at their own evaluations based on a study of the primary evidence, or they may seek to analyse the views and arguments of historians on this subject.

**Evidence that King Alexander's success in consolidating the power of the Scottish monarchy has been exaggerated**

- King Alexander III's death in 1286, without either a clear heir or a tailzie exposed the weakness of the MacMalcolm dynasty and encouraged King Edward I's intervention in Scottish politics.
- Faction was never far from the surface during King Alexander III's reign.
- The Bruce family, loyal vassals of King Edward I remained in opposition to the Comyn led government.
- The Comyn domination of the government revealed the reality that King Alexander III never really overcame the problem of faction which dogged his Minority; the Comyns, as victors over the Durwards and Bissets in the 1250s wielded the real power.
- King Alexander did not extend royal authority as far as has been sometimes claimed; much of the west of Scotland and the Western Isles remained only nominally part of the kingdom.
- Whilst King Alexander famously refused to pay homage for his kingdom in 1278, the circumstances of his Minority, leading to intervention by King Henry II meant that English and Scottish affairs had become more intertwined than at any time since the Treaty of Northampton in 1244.
  – King Alexander's marriage to King Edward's sister only heightened the English sense that they had a right to a say in the Scottish kingdom.
- The institutions of Scottish government remained less well developed than those in England; a Scottish 'state' was even less evident by the 1280s than it was in England.
  – There was no 'bench of judges' comparable to that in England; there was not even any provision for legal training in the country. The justiciars (made of senior earls) remained the most senior legal advisers in the country.
  – The great offices of state were not as well developed as in England.
  – There was not yet any real equivalent to the English parliament.
- King Alexander III's successes may have been exaggerated by later Brucean propagandists, who wished to see his reign as a 'Golden Age' which would be restored by King Robert, whom they viewed as Alexander's rightful successor.

**Evidence that King Alexander's success in consolidating the power of the Scottish monarchy has not been exaggerated**

- Faction diminished once King Alexander attained his majority in the late 1260s.
- Peace with Norway in 1266 led to the annexation of the Western Isles.
- Improved relations with England created conditions which led to greater economic stability and prosperity.
- King Alexander III was careful to balance rival factions, although the Comyns remained the dominant noble family.
- The offices of state were developed so that the royal household took on more of the functions of government, rather than merely administering the King's feudal interests.
  – The Chamberlain
  – The Chancellor
  – The role of the Chancery and the increased use of writs and breves
- The division of the sheriffdom of Perth to create a new sheriffdom in Argyll was a concerted attempt to extend royal authority into the west.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**Geoffrey Barrow**
- argues that a Scottish 'Community of the Realm' was emerging by the 1250s and was strengthened during Alexander III's reign
- argues that the acquisition of the Western Isles and peace with England increased economic prosperity.

**A A M Duncan**
- is more cautious about the emergence of a 'Community of the Realm', seeing continuing faction.

**Alan Young**
- emphasises the crucial role of the Comyns in the period.

**Norman Reid**
- has argued that many of the perceptions of the reign come from later 'Brucean' propaganda
- he accepts however, that the reign saw considerable advances in royal authority, though it may not deserve to be remembered as a 'Golden Age'
- has written on the great increase in coinage in circulation, as well as the securing of feudal ideas throughout the kingdom.

**Question 2**

**How important are William Wallace's social origins as a factor in explaining the ultimate failure of his resistance to the English?**

The candidate is required to make a balanced judgement about how important William Wallace's social origins are in explaining the ultimate failure of his rebellion. Some candidates may wish to argue that he was a 'commoner of low birth', whilst others will take more current research into consideration which has proven that he was not of particularly low rank as a member of a knightly family.

**Evidence which shows that William Wallace's social origins are important in explaining the ultimate failure of his resistance to the English**

- Wallace's status as a commoner meant that he did not have access to feudal retinues.
  – This meant that his army was largely one of footmen; he was generally unable to raise cavalry.
- The Scottish nobles were often unwilling to support him militarily.
  – Lack of cavalry at Stirling Bridge in 1297.
  – Nobles were not present in great numbers at Falkirk in 1298 and fled early in the battle.
- Wallace's guardianship was only tolerated so long as he was militarily successful.
  – Lack of noble support contributed to his resignation as Guardian in 1298.
- Wallace was only ever viewed as a 'common criminal' by the English authorities, rather than as a legitimate representative of the Scottish kingdom. This made a political settlement impossible.
- Wallace was viewed as impeding rather than helping to resolve the conflict with England by many of the Scottish nobility.
- Wallace may have been betrayed to the English by members of the Scottish nobility.

**Evidence which shows that other factors are more important in explaining the ultimate failure of William Wallace's rebellion**

- Wallace's success may have been heavily dependent on the contribution of Andrew Murray.
- The role of Murray at Stirling Bridge may have been underestimated, whilst Wallace was defeated at Falkirk, where Murray was not present.
- Wallace's defeat at Falkirk could be seen as a result of misjudgements on his part.
- He seems to have been overconfident in being prepared to meet King Edward I's army in pitched battle; abandoning guerrilla tactics.
- Wallace's raids on the north of England were largely ineffective.
- The delegations sent to Paris and Rome, of which Wallace might have been a part, were in the end unsuccessful in preventing the English concluding a separate peace with the French.
- Wallace's rebellion was always unlikely to succeed given the strength and determination of King Edward I.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**Chris Brown**
- argues that William Wallace was not of low social status; this is a myth largely constructed by later pro-Bruce chroniclers and perpetuated since Victorian times
- argues that Wallace's army was, in fact, not much different from those raised by normal means by Scottish kings.

**Geoffrey Barrow**
- argues that Wallace often had at least the tacit support of the nobility
  – the presence of cavalry at the raid on Scone
- however, his low social status meant that military success was the only justification for his guardianship.

**Andrew Fisher**
- has argued that Wallace's rebellion was largely independent of support from the nobles who were hostile to him due to his status as a commoner
- has argued that the ultimate failure of the rebellion was due to lack of support from the nobility.

**Fiona Watson**
- has also questioned the unity of the Scottish political and military leadership in the period, seeing this a factor which undermined Wallace's leadership.

**Question 3**

**To what extent had King Edward I achieved his military and political aims in Scotland by 1305?**

The candidate is required to make a balanced judgement about the extent to which King Edward I had achieved his military and political aims in Scotland by 1305. Candidates may focus more on either the political or the military aims, but they should consider both aspects of the question.

**Evidence which supports the view that King Edward I had achieved his military and political aims in Scotland by 1305**

**Military aims**

- Stirling Castle was finally retaken in 1303.
- The Comyns had surrendered at Strathord in 1304.
- Military resistance from the Bruces ended with the defection of the earl of Carrick to the English side in 1302.
- The execution of William Wallace ended the guerrilla resistance which had been taking place in southern Scotland since at least 1301.

**Political aims**

- Robert the Bruce's defection to the English meant that the Bruce family had returned to its traditional allegiance to the English crown.
- The surrender of the Comyns in 1304 marked the capitulation of the Scottish political community.
- The Ordinance of Scotland allowed King Edward to define the nature of English lordship in precise terms.
- Scotland was reduced in status to that of a 'land'.
- Real political power was to rest with King Edward and his Council.
- Scotland was to be governed by a lieutenant, John of Brittany.
- The separate peace which had been concluded with France allowed King Edward to concentrate his military effort on Scotland.

**Evidence which supports the view that King Edward I had not achieved his military and political aims in Scotland by 1305**

**Military aims**

- The leniency of the terms of the surrender at Strathord suggests that the military power of the Comyns had not been broken.
- The Scottish had never been comprehensively or conclusively defeated militarily.
- As late as 1303 the Scots inflicted a serious blow on a party of English knights at Roslin.
- King Edward's writ was only really enforceable in the south east of the country; the capitulation to the English appears to have been largely superficial in the rest of the country.
- King Edward faced great practical and financial difficulties in garrisoning the country.

**Political aims**

- The surrender at Strathord did little to dent the supremacy of the Comyns in Scottish politics.
  - Indeed, it can be argued that King Edward was implicitly accepting that he could not govern Scotland without them.
- The Ordinance of Scotland can be seen as a belated attempt by Edward to offer concessions to the Scots, recognising that the full subjugation which he had been seeking (and which he had imposed on Wales) was not possible.
- The Ordinance alienated Robert the Bruce, earl of Carrick, who was not given a prominent role in Scottish government.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**Michael Prestwich**
- has argued that King Edward I's strategy towards the Scots was flawed and inconsistent; his 'victory' of 1305 was superficial.

**Fiona Watson**
- has shown that King Edward had not achieved control of Scotland in any real practical sense; Scotland proved difficult to garrison north of the Forth, and almost impossible north of the Tay.

**Geoffrey Barrow**
- has described King Edward's victory in 1305 as total; he goes so far as to describe the Ordinance as 'lenient and statesmanlike'.

**Colm MacNamee**
- has argued that the settlement served only to alienate Robert Bruce, Earl of Carrick from the English king to whom he had pledged loyalty in 1302.

**Alan Young**
- suggests that the Comyns negotiated in 1304 and 1305 from a position of relative strength.

**Question 4**

**"A well judged policy of moderation and leniency." How accurate is this description of King Robert's tactics in dealing with his Scottish opponents between 1306 and 1320?**

Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate whether King Robert's tactics in dealing with his Scottish opponents between 1306 and 1320 can be accurately described as a "well judged policy of moderation and leniency" in order to arrive at a balanced conclusion.

**Evidence that King Robert's tactics in dealing with his Scottish enemies can be accurately described as "a well judged policy of moderation and leniency".**

- Bruce was quick to bring former enemies to his peace in order to strengthen his position after 1306.
- The Earl of Ross (1308).
- The Cambuskenneth parliament (1314) gave nobles the opportunity to make clear their allegiance to the King, whilst disinheriting those who refused.
- King Robert would allow legitimate successors to inherit land, even where a previous landholder had been an implacable opponent, eg the Earldom of Strathearn.
- King Robert was prepared to pay considerable sums to magnates in the West for their military support in his struggle after 1306.
- The composition of the Scottish 'ruling class' was little altered by the wars of the early C14th.

**Evidence that King Robert's tactics in dealing with his Scottish enemies cannot be accurately described as "a well judged policy of moderation and leniency".**

- Opposition in Galloway was crushed with great force by Thomas Bruce in 1307–08.
- King Robert's victory at Oldmeldrum.
- The herschip of Buchan.
- The dismantling of the earldom of Buchan and its reallocation as lordships to King Robert's supporters.
- The 'disinherited' remained a political problem for King Robert through his reign and beyond.
- Umfraville left Scotland in apparent disgust at the severity of the punishments meted out to those involved in the 'De Soules' plot.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**Geoffrey Barrow**
- argues that Robert's policies towards his enemies were largely moderate and conservative
- emphasises King Robert's unwillingness to significantly recast the Scottish ruling class
- highlights his eagerness to abide by feudal law with regard to landholding
- argues that the policy was largely successful.

**Michael Penman**
- argues that Robert was often willing to use great force to subjugate his Scottish enemies
- argues that Robert greatly feared internal division
- argues that Robert's kingship was never accepted as legitimate by a great section of the nobility.

**Caroline Bingham**
- has argued that King Robert's 'moderate' tactics were largely successful in winning a majority of the Scots nobility to his side.

**Alan Young**
- argues that Bruce used great violence in subduing the Comyn threat
- argues that many nobles in the south east opposed King Robert, and that his writ did not run there for a long time as a result.

**Question 5**

**How important was the role of King Robert's "loyal lieutenants" in governing Scotland between 1320 and 1328?**

Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the role of King Robert's "loyal lieutenants" between 1320 and 1328 in order to arrive at a balanced conclusion. Candidates may refer to the role of Thomas Randolph, Earl of Moray, James Douglas and James Stewart, the Earl Marischal, Keith, Hay and other leading nobles. They may also refer to leading churchmen such as Abbot Bernard of Arbroath. Candidates may wish to achieve balance by arguing that other institutions such as parliament, the Church or the monarchy itself also had significant roles to play in governing Scotland.

**Evidence which supports the view that King Robert's "loyal lieutenants" played an important role in governing Scotland between 1320 and 1328**

- Bruce's loyal lieutenants were given considerable powers in the lands which they were granted.
  - Moray was created as a regality in 1324, and Randolph was also given responsibility for the new regality of the Isle of Man.
  - Hugh, Earl of Ross was the greatest of Bruce's supporters in the north after Moray and was given considerable authority in the region.
  - Sir Robert Keith the marischal was given the greatest share of the old Comyn lands in Buchan.
  - Other major officers were located in the north east, such as Gilbert Hay the constable.
  - Bruce appointed his allies to reassert the powers of the sheriffdoms.
  - Sir Robert Lauder was made justiciar of Lothian in 1321, and led the truce negotiations 1320 and 1323.
  - The MacDonalds and MacRuaraidhs were given considerable authority in the west.
- Thomas Randolph and James Stewart had their positions as guardians, in the event of a crisis in the succession, renewed in the tailzies of 1326.
- Randolph was empowered to negotiate with the French in 1326.
- Both Lauder and John Menteith, Earl of Lennox were frequent witnesses to the King's Charters.

**Evidence which supports the view that other significant individuals or institutions played an important role in governing Scotland between 1320 and 1328**

- Parliament remained the supreme court of secular justice.
  - The 'Black Parliament' gave judgement on the de Soules conspirators.
- Parliament's influence grew during the period.
  - After 1320 burgesses were in regular attendance.
  - Parliament was required to pass the tailzies of 1326.
  - Parliament was required to ratify the truces and the Treaty of Edinburgh in 1328.
- Bernard of Arbroath was promoted to be Bishop of Sodor and Man in 1328.
- Kings were still expected to dominate the administration of justice through parliament.
- The king seems still to have dominated the legislative process; acts such as that to stop the spread of sheep scab in 1320 originated in the royal household.
- The King was still expected "to live of his own" and King Robert's reign saw the reassertion of traditional feudal obligations in the 1320s.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**Ranald Nicholson**
- has argued that King Robert depended on his loyal lieutenants to reassert royal authority in the regions, but this only had the effect of enhancing the prestige both of the monarchy and of the King himself
- has also argued that government became increasingly dependent on the relationship between Crown, nobles and the rest of the 'political community'.

**Geoffrey Barrow**
- has commented on the very wide ranging powers given to Randolph in particular
- has also noted the importance which King Robert attached to trying to minimise the risk of faction re-emerging amongst those nobles who were loyal to him
- has also written extensively of the vital role of the Chancery under Abbot Bernard of Arbroath in supporting the work of government
- claims that government remained firmly, however, in the hands of King Robert throughout his reign.

**Norman Reid**
- has suggested that King Robert balanced the powers of his own monarchy with the aspirations of the nobility very successfully.

**Alexander Grant**
- has noted the increased role of parliament in the period, seeing it as a major 'constitutional development'.

**Scottish Independence (1286–1329)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A for understanding the problems which faced King John during his reign?**
$\hspace{6cm}$ **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source A** in understanding the problems which faced King John during his reign in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Fordoun was a Scottish chronicler writing in support of the Bruce/Stewart dynasty; it is reasonable to expect his work to emphasise King John's weakness in order to enforce King Robert's later claims of legitimacy.
- Fordoun's work shows clear evidence of being based on (now lost) primary accounts, increasing its reliability.
- Fordoun's chronicle is a largely complete narrative, which can often be verified by reference to other sources.
- Many of Fordoun's chronicle entries are brief – this extract is from one of the longer ones.
- Fordoun's is one of the few relatively reliable accounts from the 'Scottish' perspective.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- King John was summoned to the English parliament to answer in the Macduff case.
- King John was not allowed to speak through a representative; he was asked to speak in person.
- King John suffered many insults to his kingly rank and dignity.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Macduff claimed that he had been denied the right to inherit his lands by King John and that he had been imprisoned for a time.
- Macduff was appealing to King Edward for justice, as King Edward was feudal overlord of Scotland.
- Kings (as the living embodiment of the law) were not expected to appear as witnesses in court cases; thus by summoning King John to London, King Edward was exercising his lordship in a very provocative way.
- King John's initial refusal to appear in person, followed by his subsequent capitulation had become a pattern in his behaviour towards King Edward; the same had happened when he had been asked to renew his homage earlier.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- King John was also summoned to appear in a number of other cases; notably those of Roger Bartholomew and John de Mazun.
- King John was to pay homage to King Edward no less than three times during the course of his short reign.
- King Edward also demanded military service from the Scots in his war against the French; another insult to John's kingly rank.
- King John also faced difficulties from his own nobility during the course of his reign.
  - The Council of 12 effectively removed power from John's hands in 1295.
  - This may have been a response to his perceived weakness in dealing with King Edward, and his demand for military service in particular.
- King Edward's invasion of Scotland in 1296 resulted in Balliol's complete capitulation.
  - The surrender at Stracathro.
  - King John was stripped of the symbols of his kingly rank, giving rise, much later, to the epithet 'Toom Tabard'.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**'The traditional' view**
- King John Balliol was a weak king, 'a lamb amongst wolves' (Rishanger) who had nobody but himself to blame for his difficulties. This, now largely discredited interpretation also views Balliol as a 'usurper'; in the middle ages, the 'Bruce' chroniclers saw his problem as evidence of divine displeasure.

**Michael Penman**
- accepts that Balliol was a weak king, but is sceptical about some of the stronger claims made by the later chroniclers.

**Ranald Nicholson**
- claims that King John set out to be 'no less a king than his predecessors'.

**Geoffrey Barrow**
- argues that King John's reign bears comparison with that of King Alexander III, but that his situation was made intolerable by the intervention of King Edward I
- This view is shared by **Michael Prestwich**.

**Fiona Watson**
- has done much to rehabilitate King John's reputation.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful for understanding the problems which faced King John during his reign.

**Question 2**

**How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of King Robert's seizure of the throne in 1306?** (16 marks)

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources B** and **C** on King Robert's seizure of the throne, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Source B**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: Comments on Ranald Nicholson may earn credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Robert the Bruce murdered Comyn in cold blood, committing treason and sacrilege.
- He had no choice following the murder but to put any plan he had for seizing the throne into effect.
- Robert the Bruce's eventual success should not disguise the fact that his seizure of power took place in dismal circumstances.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Bruce may have suspected Comyn of betraying him to King Edward.
- Whilst Bruce struck the first blow, Comyn may have been 'finished off' by Bruce's men.
- The justiciars were meeting in Dumfries at the same time; this may be evidence that Bruce was planning an imminent seizure of the Crown regardless of the outcome of the meeting with Comyn.
- The death of Comyn meant that he faced immediate reprisals from the English, meaning that he had to move quickly to make himself king.
- Less than 3 months after the death of Comyn, King Robert was a 'vagrant fugitive', on the run after the Battle of Methven.

**Source C**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Geoffrey Barrow is a leading historian of the period, who has argued that Robert the Bruce's vacillating allegiances before 1306 disguise the fact that he was driven by an underlying 'patriotism'.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Robert the Bruce's plan to seize the throne may date back to the Secret Band with Bishop Lamberton of 1304.
- Lamberton slipped away from Berwick in order to be present at Robert the Bruce's coronation, in a move which appears to have been pre-planned.
- The English knew of Bruce's intention to be crowned.
- Bruce made a formal demand to have his kingship recognised by the English.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- King Edward had always been sceptical about Robert the Bruce's defection to his side in 1302.
- The Secret Band was a vague agreement, by which Lamberton and Bruce agreed only to give each other help against 'common enemies'.
- Lamberton can be seen as a member of the 'patriotic' faction; he had been appointed by Wallace to the see of St Andrews.
- Scone was the ancient site of the coronation of Scottish kings…this would help 'legitimise' Robert.
- Lamberton's presence at the coronation was vital if Bruce was to have his kingship viewed as legitimate.
  – Several nobles attended.
  – The attendance of the aunt of the Earl of Fife was essential to ensure legitimacy.

**Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Robert the Bruce was absolved of the murder of Comyn by Bishop Wishart.
- Wishart also gave Bruce the coronation robes, which were in his care.
- The coronation ceremony was clearly carefully planned in order to ensure he was seen as legitimate.
- The coronation followed ancient precedent.
- This included the Gaelic precedent of the public reading of the new king's lineage.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**Colm MacNamee**
- argues that whilst the murder was not premeditated, the bid for the throne was.

**Caroline Bingham**
- argues that Bruce was haunted by the murder of Comyn, and that the meeting had been to make proposals which had been designed to win Comyn's support for a bid for the throne.

**Alan Young**
- argues that the manner of Bruce's seizure of the throne left him in a far weaker position than he had intended.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on King Robert's seizure of the throne in 1306.

**Question 3**

**How fully does Source D explain King Robert's military strategy and tactics in the war against the English in the years after the Battle of Bannockburn?** (12 marks)

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source D** as an adequate explanation of King Robert's military strategy and tactics in the war against the English in the years after the Battle of Bannockburn in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- The Lanercost Chronicle is a well informed contemporary source. The Lanercost Priory lay on the main western route into Scotland and was a favourite stopping place for both King Edward I and King Edward II. The chronicler clearly had access to important figures in the English government.
- Lanercost shows a very strong anti-Scottish bias; due to its location it was subject to raiding by the Scots a number of times during the wars of the early C14th.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- The source demonstrates King Robert's use of a traditional route of attack into England, which was invaded by way of Carlisle, raiding much of the local area.
- The Abbot of Furness paid a ransom to avoid raiding in future, but the Abbot's ransom did not protect the Abbey from being raided by King Robert.
- The source illustrates tactics commonly used by the Scots: the burning and looting in many parts, though they spared the Priory of the Black Monks (Augustinians) and the preaching friars (Dominicans).
- Robert was supported by his key lieutenants: the Earl of Moray and James Douglas joined the raids, burning and looting as far as Preston.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- King Robert led regular raids into England in a bid to force King Edward II to recognise both the independence of the Scottish kingdom and his own kingship.
- In 1321, King Robert had joined a rebellion led by the Earl of Lancaster aimed at King Edward II.
- In 1322, King Robert raided as far as Yorkshire, defeating King Edward II at Old Byland.
- King Robert had levied ransoms from raided lands since as early as 1311.
- By 1319, Northumbria had been so comprehensively raided that it could contribute nothing to the English exchequer.
- By the early 1320s, most of the raids were being led by King Robert's lieutenants, such as the Earl of Moray and James Douglas.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- King Robert had repelled an English invasion in 1319, before pursuing the English deep into England. King Edward II was lucky to avoid capture.
- In general, King Robert reverted to his tactic of avoiding pitched battle.
- Berwick fell to the Scots in 1319.
- Bruce continued to operate against castles, taking them by stealth, esp. in the south-east.
- The aim was to disrupt supply lines to English castles to isolate them.
- A new military front was opened in Ireland in 1315.
- The raids on England contributed to the conclusion of a series of truces in the 1320s.
- Military operations, which had ceased in 1323, due to the truce, recommenced immediately after the death of King Edward II.
- A major raid was launched on the day of the coronation of King Edward III.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

**Colm MacNamee**
- has written extensively of the severe impact of King Robert's raids on the north of England.

**Graham Bell**
- has written an account of the Battle of Old Byland, arguing that it was more significant in some ways than the battle of Bannockburn.

**Geoffrey Barrow**
- argues that King Robert's tactics in the period were very effective.

**Michael Penman**
- has argued that King Robert's successes in the period are a reflection of the weakness of King Edward II's position, and his poor relations with the English nobility.

**Sean Duffy**
- has made a detailed study of the Bruce brothers' campaigns in Ireland.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source D** is helpful in offering a full explanation of King Robert's military strategy and tactics in the war against the English in the years after the Battle of Bannockburn.

**The Renaissance in Italy in the 15th and early 16th centuries**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**How important was the part played by the guilds in promoting the arts in Florence in the fifteenth century?**

The aim of the essay is to enable candidates to assess the importance of the Florentine guilds as promoters of the arts in the fifteenth century relative to other patrons.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

- Guilds were associations of employers not workers, of masters not men. Their members constituted an urban elite. It was guild membership which provided the entrance to political life.
- City life in Florence in the fifteenth century was dominated by seven major guilds: the cloth-importers, judges and notaries, bankers, furriers, doctors and pharmacists, silk manufacturers, and the wool guild (the "Arte della Lana").
- There were also fourteen minor guilds of the butchers, tanners, armourers, smiths, drapers, masons and carpenters.
- The city church of Orsanmichele has fourteen niches on its exterior, containing life-size statues of the saints in bronze or marble. Each niche was adopted by one of the city's guilds, and each guild commissioned a major sculptor to create a figure sufficiently magnificent to bring them glory.
- The guilds dominated the city politically and economically. Probably 60% of the Florentine poor worked in trades which were regulated by guilds. The wool guild was the most powerful. The manufacture of woollen cloth employed maybe 30,000 people.

**What was the part played by the guilds in promoting the arts?**

- In 1425 the wool guild was shocked when two statues in niches of Orsanmichele were perceived to be more magnificent than the wool guild statue. (One was a statue of St George by Donatello for the Armourers Guild. The other was a statue for the Bankers' Guild by Ghiberti, encouraged by Cosimo de Medici.) So a bronze statue of St Stephen, the patron saint of the wool guild, was commissioned from Ghiberti, one of the leading sculptors of the day.
- The guilds were major patrons of the arts. They decorated their guildhalls. The cloth guild took special responsibility for the Baptistery of Florence Cathedral and in 1401 sponsored a competition for a design for a pair of bronze doors depicting stories from the Bible. Not to be out-done, in 1418 the Wool Guild, which looked after the Cathedral itself, announced a competition for a design for a cupola or dome. The competition was won by Brunelleschi.
- Brunelleschi also designed and built the Hospital of the Innocenti, this time for the Silk Guild, who in 1420 asked him to build a hospital for orphans and unwanted babies.
- The competition of 1401 for the bronze panels on the Baptistery doors was funded by the Guild of Goldsmiths. It was won by Lorenzo Ghiberti, who spent two decades completing the 28 panels.

**What made this contribution important?**

- The guild commissions were very conspicuous, deliberately so, and brought art to a wide audience. This was art as a statement of the prestige and importance of the patrons.
- The competition between guilds ensured the best artists were commissioned to produce their best work, raising artistic achievement to new heights.
- The scale of work commissioned by the guilds was far greater than could be commissioned by the political elite of Florence.

**What or who else promoted the arts in Florence in the fifteenth century?**

- The guilds were not the only people to promote the arts in Florence. The Medici family were notable patrons of many artists, including Fra Filippo Lippi, Benozzo Gonzoli, Sandro Botticelli, as well as the architect Michelozzo Michelozzi.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Peter Burke**: created a taxonomy of Italy's 'creative elite'. He divided all patronage up into just two categories, Medicean and non-Medicean. So clearly the Medici were major patrons of the arts.
- **Lauro Martines**: sees the guilds as a declining influence in the second half of the fifteenth century. "The guilds would never again have political clout. Their civic activity, as expressed in their support of the period's great architectural and sculptural commissions, was their swan-song." Princely rule by the Medici saw off the power and influence of the guilds.
- **Richard Mackenney**: stresses the importance of competition between the Florentine guilds in obtaining the finest artists and paying for their best work. Art was promoted by competition between corporate sponsors.

**Question 2**

**Which factors best explain the striking impact that the work of Brunelleschi, Masaccio and Donatello had on their contemporaries?**

The aim of this essay is to give candidates the opportunity to explain why it was that contemporaries were so struck by the work of the artists Brunelleschi, Masaccio and Donatello, and to offer a judgment as to which factors best explain this impact.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

- Echoes of the classical past: Brunelleschi's Hospital of the Innocenti struck people with its elegant newness and its echoes of the classical past. The pointed arches of the Middle Ages were replaced by semi-circular ones. The windows had triangular pediments above them. Donatello also produced the first large-scale equestrian monument since Roman times, the so-called Gattemelata. It was inspired by the ancient Roman equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius.
- Astonishing scale: Brunelleschi's dome on Florence cathedral was an astonishing achievement, the first such dome since antiquity and on a breath-taking scale.
- Perspective: Masaccio made use of the newly understood concept of mathematically calculated perspective as espoused by Brunelleschi. This was not actually a scientific breakthrough, it being explained in the 11th century by the Arab mathematician Alhazen. The Renaissance artists did not invent the science of perspective, but they did use it. One of the earliest applications of the rules of perspective is Masaccio's fresco "The Trinity", created for the church of Santa Maria Novella. Masaccio placed his vision of the triune god-head within a classically inspired barrel vault like the apse of a Brunelleschi church. At the very centre of the Trinity is the face of God, where all lines of recession converge.
- Style: Masaccio also produced a striking set of frescos for the Brancacci Chapel in the Carmelite church of Santa Maria del Carmine. The most striking of these is "The Tribute Money". The setting is minimalist: red earth, green sea, grey mountains, city walls. Nothing in the picture seems to have been added for extraneous effect. Masaccio's painting was self-consciously different from the style of painting being practised elsewhere in Florence at the time. There is a powerful strain of austerity running through his work.
- Donatello's work exhibits a fervent asceticism, notably in a series of prophets he carved for the campanile of the cathedral between 1415 and 1435. He turned his back on the convention of depicting the saints and prophets as heavenly courtiers. His figures are gaunt religious fanatics, for example his Mary Magdalene.
- Eroticism: A mysterious, self-consciously erotic energy characterizes Donatello's famous bronze David. It was one of the first free-standing naked figures to have been created since antiquity. David, the giant-killer, was a symbol of Florence the giant-killing republic. The work is sexually suggestive.
- Violence: Donatello's "Judith and Holofernes" is intensely violent.
- The personality of the artist may also have been a factor behind the impact of the work. Donatello, for instance, according to Vasari, possessed a fiery temper and famously pushed a new bust off the battlements, shattering it, rather than accept a low price for the bust from a Genoese merchant.

**Evidence that Brunelleschi, Masaccio and Donatello had a striking impact on contemporaries**

- Leon Alberti said of Brunelleschi's dome, "such an enormous construction towering above the skies, vast enough to cover the entire Tuscan population with its shadow… Surely a feat of engineering… unimaginable among the ancients".
- Vasari in 1550 wrote that Brunelleschi's genius "was so lofty that it might well be said he had been sent to us by heaven to give a new form of architecture which had been going astray for hundreds of years". Brunelleschi "left behind him the greatest, tallest, and most beautiful structure of all those built in modern times as well as in antiquity".
- Vasari wrote of Donatello that his work "possessed so much grace and excellence and such a fine sense of design that they were considered to be more like the distinguished works of the ancient Greeks and Romans than those of any other artist who has ever existed".
- Vasari wrote of Brunelleschi, Donatello and Masaccio that they "stimulated and excited with their beautiful works the minds of those who succeeded them to such an extent that the work in those arts was brought back to the greatness and perfection we witness in our own time".
- Antonio Manetti wrote in his biography of Brunelleschi that in his entry to the competition for the Baptistery at Florence he flaunted difficulties. All the judges were "astonished at the difficulties he had set himself".

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.**
**These may include reference to:**

- **Andrew Graham-Dixon**: writes of the astonishing feat of the construction of the dome to the Florentine cathedral without a forest of scaffolding. The dome is not intimate but monumental, an unavoidable presence in the city. It rivals the Pantheon in Rome in magnificence.
- **George Holmes**: describes Donatello's "David" as one of the most revolutionary and puzzling works of the Renaissance. The face and figure are remarkably sensual, with a somewhat feminine physical beauty, rather than the fortitude which is a more common characteristic of David.
- **Richard Mackenney**: describes Masaccio's "Trinity" as epoch-making, displaying a new mastery of pictorial space.

**Question 3**

**How strong was opposition to the Medici regime in Florence from 1434 to 1498?**

The aim of this essay is to give candidates the opportunity to review and analyse the evidence on the strength of opposition to the Medici regime from 1434 to 1498. Implicit in this is an analysis of the strength of the Medici regime itself and its ability to withstand sustained opposition.

**Candidates may use examples of opposition such as:**

- The Pazzi Conspiracy of 1478. The Pazzi were one of the oldest families of Florence but their wealth and status had declined. They planned and attempted to assassinate Lorenzo de' Medici and his brother Guiliano in Florence Cathedral at the close of high mass and then seize power during the ensuing confusion. Guiliano was killed, but a wounded Lorenzo escaped to rally support and eventually execute over 70 conspirators. The Medici hold upon the city was now stronger than it had ever been. Pope Sixtus IV had been involved in the conspiracy. He hated Lorenzo for thwarting his political ambitions in central Italy. After the failure of the conspiracy Sixtus excommunicated Lorenzo and placed Florence under papal interdict. Lorenzo's rule had become increasingly princely in character and in this way awoken opposition.
- Opposition in 1494 from Savonarola, the Dominican friar. He denounced the Medici as tyrants for destroying the traditional liberties of the Florentines. The Medici fled into exile, not to return until 1512. Savonarola called for a moral reformation in Florence. Following Lorenzo de' Medici's death in 1492 Piero de' Medici, his inexperienced son, mishandled the crisis surrounding the French invasion and was driven from power, bringing to an end 60 years of Medici domination. The power-vacuum was filled by Savonarola, who ruled from the pulpit and gained control of the Signoria.
- Aristocratic opposition to the Medici regime took various forms, the most innocuous being the muted grumblings and resentments voiced privately, and the votes recorded in council meetings against those measures designed to strengthen the authority of the ruling group. In 1449 and again in 1455 strong resistance to the regime's electoral controls and its commissions with special powers forced the government to abandon temporarily these instruments for maintaining Medici control of the state.

**How strong was this opposition?**

- The Medici managed to manipulate the constitution of Florence in such a way as to ensure their supporters dominated the various committees and councils. Clearly that control was not absolute but nonetheless it was very strong and examples of co-ordinated opposition are few and far between.
- The speed and ruthlessness with which the Pazzi Conspiracy was put down suggests that, whilst the regime had its enemies, it was able to hunt them down and eliminate them. Rather than expose the weakness of the Medici regime the Pazzi Conspiracy served to strengthen it.
- The rule of the Medici was to a large extent dependent upon the character of the man at the head of the family. Piero II was young and inexperienced when he faced the crisis of the French invasion. Lorenzo had had considerable diplomatic experience. Piero soon found himself out of his depth.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to**:

- **Gene Brucker**: sees the Pazzi Conspiracy as evidence not of strong opposition to the Medici regime but as evidence of the strength of that regime. He cites the thoroughness with which the rebels were hunted down, including bringing one of the accused back from exile in Constantinople. He also shows how the citizens of Florence chose at this moment of crisis not to take advantage of the vulnerability of the Medici but to remain loyal to it. The cries in the streets, he says, were not "Populo e liberta!" but "Palle!", a reference to the Medici coat of arms.
- **Lauro Martines**: takes a different view, claiming that the Pazzi Conspiracy nearly succeeded in eliminating Lorenzo and Medici rule. After the conspiracy there was an attempt to disarm the population of Florence, evidence that the regime lived in fear of a repetition of the crisis.
- **Ralph Roeder**: describes the Pazzi Conspiracy as formidable in its folly. After it, to prevent its recurrence, Lorenzo surrounded himself with an armed guard and adopted those precautions which his enemies denounced as tyranny. After the conspiracy Lorenzo became "the most masterful".

**Question 4**

**To what extent did the Venetian Republic live up to its reputation for prosperity and political stability?**

The aim of this question is to allow candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of the Venetian Republic and to evaluate the extent to which it deserves its reputation for prosperity and political stability. Candidates will be expected to explain where that reputation came from.

**Candidates may bring in evidence such as:**

**Where does the reputation of Venice as prosperous and politically stable come from?**

- Venice was widely regarded as having the finest constitution in the world. This "Myth of Venice" was encouraged by the city. The reality was less edifying.
- Trade lay at the heart of the Venetian empire. A network of trade routes stretched through the Greek islands to Egypt and the Orient, to Constantinople and the Black Sea ports. Venetian ships brought grain and salt, fruit and cheap wine from the Mediterranean, as well as more exotic goods from the East – spices and silk, cotton, drugs and jewels. From Venetian warehouses the goods were re-exported throughout Europe.

**Was Venice as prosperous as is made out?**

- The Portuguese discovery of a sea route to India caused a degree of panic but did not significantly affect Venice's trade with the East.
- The prosperity of Venice was threatened by the expansion of the Ottoman Empire, from around 1414. This culminated in the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and a Turkish advance towards Vienna in 1460s and 1470s. However, Venetian trade proved remarkably resilient, and in 1489 Cyprus was added to the empire.
- The Venetian Republic was dependent upon its European trade routes, notably the Alpine passes to reach markets in Austria and Germany. The expansion of the Milanese Empire under Giangaleazzo Visconti posed a threat and so the Venetians began to build up the territory surrounding the city – the terra firma. Cities such as Vicenza, Verona and Padua came under Venetian rule.
- Venice was very cosmopolitan. The crowded wharves of the Rialto and Riva degli Schiavoni saw Gentile and Jew, Moslem and Greek, haggling over rich cargoes from the Orient. The Germans possessed a vast warehouse – decorated by frescoes by Giorgione – on the Grand Canal; the Turks another. Venice possessed the earliest ghetto in Europe, and the Armenians freely practised their religion. Venice was the greatest market of the Western world.
- Venetian banks avoided loans to non-Venetians and acted essentially as an adjunct to Venetian mercantile activity.

**Was Venice as politically stable as is made out?**

- Its geographical position, between the sea and terra firma, made it impregnable to either army or navy.
- This contributed to its political and economic stability.
- Power was restricted to the patrician families, numbering about 150, who dominated the Great Council. This ruling group was closed to new entrants, a situation known as the "serrata". To avoid the resentment and frustration caused by this closed system, the Venetian republic created a second rank of privilege – the Citizenry, who dominated the civil service. This meant that Venetian government was more broadly based than any other major Italian state. The Great Council elected the Doge, the Senate and the Council Of Ten.
- There was discord within the Patriciate between the old (or 'long') families and the new (or 'short') families. Families whose right to sit in the Great Council dated only from the 1380s.
- The Doge was elected for life but could be deposed. He had to operate within strict constitutional limits. If he overstepped these he could be removed (as Francesco Foscari was in 1457). When elected, a doge's political powers were curtailed as his ceremonial grandeur was increased.
- Real power lay with the Dieci. This Council of Ten imposed severe punishments upon those who threatened the stability of the Republic.
- While the members of the noble caste constituted all the political class of Venice, in fact a narrow group of a few hundred experts were recycled through the main government councils. The appearance of republican government was carefully preserved, though in reality there was a trend towards oligarchy.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Guido Ruggiero**: shows that the chief rigours of the law were reserved for those who were seen to threaten the safety and stability of the state. When that happened, be he rich or poor, he was shown little mercy. The violence of the crime was frequently outdone by the violence of the punishment.
- **Robert Hole**: shows that Venetian traders managed to co-exist remarkably successfully with the Turkish invaders in the eastern Mediterranean. "The city's economic interest dictated that they did not behave in a provocative way. Venice continued to prosper."
- **John Najemy**: writes of how Venice, alone among the republics, was a closed and hereditary nobility whose members constituted the Great Council and had the exclusive right to hold major executive offices. This engendered an enviable political stability in the city and beyond that, in the Venetian empire.

**Question 5**

**"Weak governments and city-state rivalry." Are these the best explanations of the ease with which Charles VIII of France invaded Italy in 1494?**

The aim of this question is to give the candidate the opportunity to explain why it was that the French king Charles VIII faced so little opposition when he invaded Italy in 1494, and to evaluate the relative importance of the factors, paying special attention to weak governments and rivalry between the city-states of Italy.

**Candidates may bring in evidence such as:**

**Reasons for the invasion**

- In 1494 Ludovico Sforza, Duke of Milan, invited Charles VIII of France to invade Italy. Charles aspired to be King of Naples, having a good claim to that throne. He wanted to end the domination on Naples by the house of Aragon since 1442. He dreamt of using Naples as a base from which to launch a crusade against the Turks to recapture Constantinople.
- Ludovico Sforza's aim was to punish his enemy, Ferrante II, the Aragonese king of Naples.

**Explanations of the ease of the invasion**

**Weak governments**

- In Florence in 1492 Lorenzo de' Medici had died. He was succeeded by his inexperienced son, Piero. Piero's handling of the invasion was incompetent and for this reason he swiftly fell from power. Piero de' Medici had promised 200,000 ducats as a loan to Charles to finance the war effort because he was concerned about the volume of Florentine trade with France. Charles entered Florence as a conqueror. Piero fell from power, bringing to an end 60 years of Medici domination.
- Savonarola went on to dominate the city, claiming that the French were a scourge sent by God to punish the Florentines for their debauched lifestyle and their lame acceptance of Medicean tyranny.

**City-state rivalry**

- Ludovico had encouraged Charles to invade so naturally did nothing to oppose it. The Alpine passes controlled by Milan were open to the French. His rivalry with the House of Aragon ensured that Charles was warmly greeted in Milanese territory.
- Pisa was given its freedom from Florence by the French, leaving Florence open to invasion and exposing vital trade routes to attack.
- The Venetians refused to take sides and so did nothing to impede the invasion. Having recently been at war with both Milan and Naples, Venice felt the best response was not to intervene.

**Other factors**

- Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia) met Charles in the Vatican Gardens and had no option but to offer him the crown of Naples because he lacked a credible defender. Federigo da Montefeltro was dead.
- The Renaissance ideal of the soldier-scholar did not prove able to withstand the threat of French arms. It was more posturing than reality. Italian self-confidence was dented by the ease with which the French king was able to move through Italy.
- The idea of Italy as peaceful and stable in the forty years before Charles' invasion is largely a myth created by Guicciardini. Italy had long been divided and thus incapable of a coordinated response to invasion. There is no reason to think that earlier attempts at invasion would have been met by stronger resistance.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference:**

- **Lauro Martines**: writes that Charles VIII entered Naples "with the ease of an ambassador". Political collapse had preceded him. He continues that most of the lands under the direct and indirect rule of the papacy knew no steady, stable, or effective enough government. The major exception, Ferrara, had turned for survival to French support and sponsorship.
- **Robert Hole** claims that the immediate consequences of the invasion were slight, but that it set a precedent and other foreign invasions followed in the next thirty years, culminating in the Sack of Rome in 1527 by the imperial forces of Emperor Charles V.
- **Gene Brucker**: claims that the loss of Pisa was "a bitter blow to Florentine pride and a grave threat to the economy, which slumped as a result of the disturbances. Moreover, the loss of the coastal fortresses weakened Florence's defences, and intensified the feelings of vulnerability and insecurity which had been aroused by the French invasion". He goes on to show that the psychological impact of these events upon the city of Florence was deep and permanent. "The Florentines did not recover their self-confidence. Never again … did they see themselves as the masters of their destiny." The invasion shattered the Florentine belief that the prosperity and peace they had enjoyed were the consequences of their virtue and intelligence.
- **Alison Brown**: writes of "a ubiquitous crisis of confidence in the humanist culture that had created and nourished the distinctive identities of the independent city-states".
- **Guicciardini**: described 1494 as "a most unhappy year for Italy, and truly the beginning of years of wretchedness".
- **Machiavelli** and **Castiglione**: struggled to come to terms with the shame and to explain the disaster. Castiglione felt the Italians had shown a "lack of valour on the battlefield".

**The Renaissance in Italy in the 15<sup>th</sup> and early 16<sup>th</sup> centuries**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How fully does Source A illustrate the values of Renaissance humanists?**          **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source A** as an adequate explanation of the values held by Renaissance humanists in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit.  These may include:
Accurate comment on CE Quillen may be credited in historiography.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Acceptance by those in powerful positions that a knowledge and understanding of classical languages and literature was the best preparation for the life of a citizen.
- Humanism bit by bit became the dominant culture in Florence.
- The Medici were important supporters of humanists.
- Neo-Platonism became increasingly important.
- Humanist ideas provided an attractive alternative to the traditional Christian view that worldliness was wrong.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Patricians who accepted that a classical education was the best preparation for the civic life, include Leonardo Bruni and Coluccio Salutati, both being Chancellors of Florence, and Leon Battista Alberti.
- The Medici supported artists such as Donatello, Benozzo Gozzoli and Botticelli, book collectors such as Vespasiano da Bisticci, and architects such as Brunelleschi.
- In 1434 Cosimo de' Medici assumed unofficial control of the government of Florence.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- Neo-Platonism stemmed from Marsiglio Ficino's translation of Plato's work into Latin.  Pico della Mirandola drew from Plato the belief that human beings had dual natures which combined body and soul, material and spiritual.
- Humanists discovered anew the importance of the city for human existence.  Many challenged the notion dominant throughout the Middle Ages that the "contemplative life" in a monastery was superior to the active life of the merchant, artisan and statesman.
- Salutati rejected the traditional Christian rejection of worldliness.  He wrote that "If you provide for and serve and strive for your family…and your state, you cannot fail to raise your heart to heavenly things and praise God".

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.
These may include reference to:**

- **Hans Baron's**: thesis on Civic Humanism in *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*. He saw humanism as a response to the threat to Florentine republican liberty from the imperialist aggression of the Duke of Milan, Giangaleazzo Visconti.
- **Lauro Martines**: puts forward the view that right through the fifteenth century humanists had to defend their programme of study against the charge of its spreading pagan ideals and undermining Christianity.
- **Kenneth Bartlett**: describes humanism as "the central cultural and educational expression of the Renaissance". He sees humanism as firstly secular and secondly as practical. As such it was useful in politics and the world of trade. He cites diplomatic correspondence of peace and war, the documents of trade and finance, and the moral example of the ancients and how to apply it. For anyone desiring a leading position in the state, humanism proved to be an excellent training.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the values held by Renaissance humanists.

**Question 2**

**How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of the role of women during the Italian Renaissance?** **(16 marks)**

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources B** and **C** on the role of women in Renaissance Italy and offers a structured evaluation of the two interpretations in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit.  These may include: Accurate comment on Margaret King may be credited in historiography.

**Source B**

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- In the fifteenth century, for the first time, some people accepted that women could be educated.
- Women began to demand a greater role.
- The possession of the faculty of reason was vital to the women's claim.
- Some women claimed to be at least as worthy as men.
- The new claims called into question fundamental questions about the role of women in marriage.
- Feminism was present in Renaissance Italy.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- 'Educated' women included Isotta Nogarola of Verona, Laura Cereta of Brescia, Cecilia Gonzaga, Vittoria Colonna and Cassandra Fedele of Venice.
- Bruni's letter "De studiis et literis", written in 1424, is the first major statement in the Renaissance we have on the issue of women and education.  In a misogynist age that greatly limited women's opportunities, it is remarkable for the assumption that a woman's natural ability was sufficient for advanced humanist studies.  She should study the best ancient authors, both secular and sacred, and the discipline of grammar, moral philosophy, poetry, and history.  The one humanist discipline that it would be futile for women to study is rhetoric, since she is a woman "who is never in the forum".
- Lauro Quirini of Venice (c1420–1479) studied philosophy at the University of Padua.  He wrote a letter to Isotta Nogarola from Verona.  Implicit in this letter is the assumption that women, as much as men, can read and understand the most complex ideas.

**Source C**

**Provenance**: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Barbaro was a Venetian humanist who studied at the University of Padua. In 1415 he visited the Medici in Florence, meeting Leonardo Bruni and Nicolo Nicoli.
- Barbaro wrote a piece on wifely duties for the marriage of Cosimo de Medici's brother, Lorenzo.
- In 1449 Barbaro was appointed President of the Venetian Senate and Procurator of St Mark in 1454.
- Barbaro's treatise was popular in Italy at the time, where it was admired as much for its learning and style as for its content.
- The treatise is heavily dependent upon ancient Latin and Greek sources.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- A woman must love her husband, lead a modest life and manage the home efficiently.
- Obedience to her husband is a wife's most important duty.
- A woman cannot expect obedience from her children if she herself is not obedient to her husband.
- A wife should never disagree with her husband.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Barbaro puts forward the traditional view of the role of women in society as subordinate. Males were more highly valued. The role of women was constrained by childbirth and rearing, and the preaching of the church. It was very hard for women to participate in the public sphere.

**Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- The traditional social role assigned to women was that of loyal wife and devoted mother. She was to nurse the sick and manage the household. Marriage served the interests of the male householder.
- The phenomenon of female humanism in the Italian Renaissance is strictly limited. Barely a dozen women could properly be identified as humanists, and some of these have left scant written record, or none at all.
- Barbaro's view is consistent with that of Leon Battista Alberti in his treatise *On the family*. Alberti believed that women had limited abilities.
- The role of women beyond the home extended to becoming courtesans, in effect the highest stratum of prostitutes. These were women of elevated social skills – witty conversationalists, fine musicians, splendidly dressed and housed – who served well-to-do males, often celibate clerics.
- Many women became nuns of necessity, lacking a dowry, or through a calling.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Kenneth Bartlett**: tells us that Barbaro felt that marriage is a Christian state, and a dignified one worthy of a good man. Still, it is also the vehicle for the maintenance of noble lineages and through them the vitality of the republic. Marriage, then, is not just the union of two people but of two families to produce heirs who will serve the state, and in this important function, both father and mother had central roles to play.
- **Margaret King and Joan Kelly**: describe the Renaissance as a misogynist age, arguing that women were disempowered since their lives were reduced to the home.
- Conversely **Burckhardt**: discusses the role of women in Renaissance society in terms of "perfect equality", with emancipation "a matter of course".

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent a consideration of the two sources illustrates differing interpretations of the role of women during the Italian Renaissance.

**Question 3**

**How useful is Source D as evidence of the power and prestige of the princely courts during the Italian Renaissance?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. This may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source D** as evidence of the power and prestige of the princely courts during the Italian Renaissance in terms of:

**Provenance:**

- Federigo da Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, 1422–1482, was a highly successful mercenary captain, employed in turn by the papacy, Venice and Florence.
- Under Federigo the previous backwater of Urbino became a centre of humanist study and artistic activity.
- The fact that the painter may be either the Flemish master Justus of Ghent or the Spaniard Pedro Berruguete is indicative of the blending of international influences in the court of Urbino.
- The painting is intended to portray Federigo as a successful man in a wide range of roles. As such it was propaganda.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Federigo, Duke of Urbino is presented as magnificent in his splendid ducal robes, with his ducal coronet highly visible.
- Power was dependent upon heirs, and Federigo is shown with his young son, Guidobaldo, who is also magnificently attired and holding a sceptre.
- Federigo is shown as a man of action, a man of war, dressed in his armour, with his helmet to the fore, and both his sword and lance prominent.
- Federigo is shown in his library as an educated scholar, reading a manuscript. He is keen to show himself as part of the humanist movement, balancing the active and the contemplative life, between arms and letters, between the soldier and the scholar.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- In Urbino Federigo built up a great library of manuscripts.
- Federigo employed artists such as the young Raphael and Piero della Francesca.
- Castiglione's *The Book of the Courtier* is set in Urbino in 1507 when Guidobaldo was duke.
- Candidates may recognise that he sports the Order of the Garter, given to him by King Henry VII of England.
- Federigo had lost an eye to a sword blow and so was always shown in profile, hiding the right eye.
- Federigo was raised from a count to a duke by Pope Sixtus IV, in partial reward for agreeing to marry off one of his daughters to a nephew of the Holy Father.
- Federigo served as a mercenary ("condottiere") to three popes, two kings of Naples, two dukes of Milan and several Italian Leagues.
- The palace in Urbino had a staff of 355 people. Among these were forty-five counts of the duchy, seventeen lesser noblemen and gentlemen, five major secretaries, twenty-two pages, nineteen grooms of the chamber, nineteen waiters at table, thirty-one footmen, five cooks, and fifty stable hands. There were also large numbers of craftsmen, artists and musicians.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- The reality of power was much less attractive than the painting suggests. Federigo was illegitimate and came to power through the murder, perhaps with his own connivance, of his half-brother Oddantonio.
- Federigo used the money he had earned as a condottiere to build a magnificent palace, employing the skills of the architect Luciano Laurana.
- Splendour was a vital aspect of the exercise of princely rule. Other examples would include the Gonzaga in Mantua. Francesco Gonzaga acted as patron to Andrea Mantegna, employing him as court painter. Mantegna's Camera Picta in the ducal palace in Mantua is a brilliant composite portrait of the court of the Gonzaga, displaying the same magnificence for the same public purpose as the portrait of Federigo. Mantegna's "Triumph of Caesar" shows that humanism was a powerful force in the Mantuan court. It is an extraordinary exercise in classical archaeology, with astonishing attention to authenticity in clothing and chariots. Further evidence of humanism as a force in the exercise of power in the court of the Gonzaga includes the appointment of Vittorino to teach the "studia humanitatis" in the Casa Gioiosa. The wife of Francesco Gonzaga, Isabella D'Este, commissioned many important works of art for her studiolo.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Robert Hole**: takes the view that the perfect courtier was hard to find. Historians have focused on Federigo simply because there were so few others who fitted the bill. "He was not typical but exceptional."
- **John Addington Symonds**: sees the princes of the Renaissance as tyrants and maniacs, guilty of "Blood-madness".
- **Richard Mackenney**: suggests that the ostentation of princely magnificence was proportionate to the insecurity of the regime's foundations. De facto assumption of power set a model for usurpation, sometimes by assassination. One is frequently dealing with bastards. The attempt to compensate for illegitimacy by extravagant display often exaggerated and overstated the reality of court life. Courts used spectacle as a theatre of power.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source D** is useful as evidence of the power and prestige of the princely courts during the Italian Renaissance.

**Georgians and Jacobites: (Scotland 1715–1800)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**"The Union was relevant but not, in itself, decisive." How accurate is this judgement on the impact of the Treaty of Union on Scotland's economic development?**

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to weigh up the extent of the Union's impact on the economic development of Scotland. Areas where the Union did have an effect should be balanced against developments which happened independent of the Union so as to reach a balanced conclusion about the view quoted in the question. Candidates whose approach involves a consideration of different time-scales, different classes and different regions will be given due credit.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**The debate as to whether Scotland's economy was in good or bad health prior to the Union**

Bad health

- The 'lean years' of the 1690s.
- The utter failure of the Darien venture.
- The relatively backward state of agriculture.
- The mercantilist orthodoxies of the age put a small nation at disadvantage.

Good health

- The admitted problems of the two decades before the Union were largely caused by conflicts with England eg the Aliens Act.
- Strong traditional links with the Netherlands and the Baltic.
- Glasgow already involved in the trans-Atlantic trade – finding ways of circumventing the Navigation Acts.
- A developed industrial tradition round the Forth (coal and salt).
- Textiles production, particularly linen, was already organised on proto-industrial lines.

**Ways in which the Union clearly stimulated development**

- The opening up of the Atlantic trade with the Caribbean and with the American Colonies. Glasgow and tobacco is the obvious and most important case-study.
- Free access to English markets.
- In the longer term English entrepreneurs played a part in the industrialisation of Scotland.

**Ways in which the Union could be said to have had a negative impact on development**

- Too many of the Scottish aristocracy and lairds began to spend a large proportion of their money in England.
- Taxes on linen were damaging to that industry.
- Taxes in general rose and hampered trade.
- Open competition with English manufactures – notably woollens.

**Reasons for thinking that the Union did not have all that great an effect on economic development**

- The importance of geographical factors on economic development: Glasgow's favourable situation for the Atlantic; the availability of coal; the affects of good and bad agricultural land; the pressure of population growth; fluctuations in prices.
- The Scottish educational system, especially as it was reformed in the course of the eighteenth century, made it as likely, if not more likely, to produce entrepreneurs and technicians as the English system.
- The rapid growth of the later eighteenth century was partly caused by rising prices.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Whatley**: keeps emphasising the variations between decades, regions and sectors, but concludes that "the short term economic impact of the Union appears to have been either neutral or negative".
- **Smout**: "For a generation or more the Union proved as useless a panacea as Darien."
- **Fry**: "To Scots, the Union looked within a distressingly short time to have been a terrible mistake."
- **Devine**: "Union with England presented the Scottish élites with a golden opportunity." But he also concludes that it was not decisive in itself: "Three indigenous factors helped to ensure that the union was turned to national advantage." He means leadership, geology, and education.
- **Sher**: "The Union eventually had a profound impact by opening up England and its empire to Scottish trade and migration."
- **Lynch**: "The Union brought considerable economic risks as well as opportunities, and the risks of exposure to English manufactures still outweighed the benefits."

**Question 2**

**How important was the government's command of the sea to the failure of the 1745 Jacobite rebellion?**

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to analyse and assess the various reasons for the failure of the 1745 Jacobite rebellion and arrive at a balanced conclusion, based on the evidence, of the importance within those reasons of the government's command of the sea.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Ways in which government command of the sea damaged the rebellion**

- The sister ship carrying all the weapons was intercepted when Charles was on his way to the highlands in July.
- The refusal of the most important chiefs of the Western Isles to join the rebellion was because they knew from experience that they were very vulnerable to punitive attacks by the royal navy.
- The decision of the French to call off their cross-Channel invasion in the winter of 1745/6 was partly because of worries about the sea crossing.
- The interception of the money coming from France to the Jacobites at Montrose in 1746 made it impossible to pay the army, which led to widespread desertion and the lack of numbers at Culloden. In fact it can be argued that it precipitated Culloden.
- The notable instances of successful blockade running (eg by the frigate La Fine that brought Drummond and the Royal Ecossais) highlight how difficult it was.
- The use of naval bomb ketches to assist in the defence of Fort William.
- The good service of the two small French units at Culloden shows how valuable it would have been if more had been able to run the blockade.
- Cumberland's army in Aberdeen in the early spring of 1746 could be supplied and reinforced by sea.

**Reasons for thinking that command of the sea was not decisive**

- The Royal Navy had nowhere like the superiority it later developed in the Seven Years or Napoleonic Wars.
- Vernon, in the Channel, doubted whether he could stop a French dash across.
- Byng, in the North Sea, found poor weather made complete blockade impossible.
- Ship for ship (eg the Elizabeth vs the Lion, or the Hazard vs the Sheerness) the French gave a good account of themselves.

**Other reasons for the failure of the rebellion**

- The defects in Charles's leadership, especially over-optimism.
- The relative lack of support in Scotland.
- The decisive lack of support in England.
- The quarrels between the commanders.
- Various decisions which turned out badly: to leave Edinburgh undefended; to garrison Carlisle; to turn back at Derby.
- Specific reasons for the decisive defeat at Culloden.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Duffy**: "Control of the ports of north-eastern Scotland was to become the issue on which the outcome of the whole Jacobite enterprise depended."
- **Lenman**: "the English Channel fleet kept so strict a blockade that even Charles's brother despaired of crossing." He also emphasises the lack of support across the UK.
- **Pittock**: points out that Jacobitism had far more support than the low numbers at Culloden suggest.
- **Kelly**: is scathing about Charles's leadership qualities.
- **Lynch**: agrees that the decision to give up after Culloden was precipitate.
- **Szechi**: stresses the lack of support from France – for which the naval issue is clearly important.
- However, **Reid** argues that the French "displayed very little interest in crossing the sea" – which is not the same as saying that they would not have liked to if not prevented by the Royal Navy.

**Question 3**

**To what extent were the clan chiefs responsible for the changes that took place in the Highlands in the last three decades of the eighteenth century?**

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to analyse and assess the various causes of the changes that took place in the Highlands in the last three decades of the eighteenth century and to come to a balanced conclusion, based on the evidence, of the extent to which the clan chiefs were responsible for these changes.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Reasons for thinking that the chiefs were responsible**

- Renting farms to the highest bidder, not to traditional tacksmen.
- Early clearances to make way for sheep (eg Lochiel).
- The imitation by Highland lairds of the fashionable life-styles of other landowners in the UK.
- Sir John Sinclair, intelligent and committed contemporary commentator, observed: "In no country in Europe are the rights of proprietors so well defined, and so well protected, as in Scotland".

**Reasons for thinking that the government, or government approved agencies, was responsible**

- The after-effects of the punitive legislation that followed the 1745 Jacobite rebellion.
- The ending of Heritable Jurisdictions.
- The setting up of the British Fisheries Society.
- The work of the SSPCK, particularly in spreading elementary education, and discouraging Gaelic.
- The emphasis placed on recruiting highlanders for the army.

**Reasons for thinking that impersonal social and economic changes were responsible**

- The impact of the Napoleonic Wars on prices and on overseas trade stimulated the kelp industry.
- Population growth, that put excessive pressure on the available land.
- Many of the early clearances involved the voluntary emigration of tacksmen seeking a better life in the Americas.  The substantial emigration by this class was on the whole resisted (unsuccessfully) by the chiefs.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Lenman**:  has harsh things to say about the selfishness of the elites.
- **Fry**:  in *Wild Scots* is inclined to prefer irresistible market forces to selfish landowners as causal factors.
- **Whatley**:  shows how the recruitment of Highlanders for the army helped in a 'weeding out' process, helping landlords to get rid of unsatisfactory tenants.
- **Smout**:  is clear that while impersonal trends created the context, it was the landowners who took decisions.
- **Nenadic**:  in *Lairds and Luxury* stresses the importance of the inevitable absorption of Highland landlords into the (expensive) mores of British society.
- **Devine**:  reveals the complexity of the problem in *Clanship to Crofters War*.  On one page he describes "the role of the landed classes" as "fundamental".  On the following page he says that "the sheer force of market pressure was fundamental".
- **Richards**:  in the most recent general book on the Highland Clearances, emphasises that the emigration of the tacksmen in the 1760s and 70s was "in defiance of their increasingly demanding landlords".

**Question 4**

**To what extent did Scotland benefit from the "Dundas Despotism"?**

The aim of this essay is for the candidate to examine the period when Henry Dundas was the dominant influence in Scottish affairs and consider to what extent the country benefited as a result. Intelligent discrimination between social and regional groups, and between different areas of life – social, cultural, economic, political – will improve the essay. The conclusion will be a balanced assessment of the evidence presented.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Points which might suggest that Scotland benefited**

- The use of patronage to turn the Union and the Empire to the benefit of Scots, by providing a more than fair share of government jobs – notably in the East India Company, but also in the West Indies.
- The preservation of political stability after the turmoil of the Jacobite years.
- The even-handed approach to Church and University patronage – avoiding partisan intervention for either Moderates or Evangelicals.
- The interest in regeneration of the Highlands – the Fisheries Society and the Commissioners for Northern Lighthouses, for example.
- The repeal of the laws banning highland dress and culture.
- The stimulation of the economy by the war industries – Carron ironworks, for example.

**Points which suggest Scotland did not benefit**

- The failure to deal with burgh reform.
- The failure to deal with parliamentary reform.
- The outbursts of hostility, with Dundas burned in effigy.
- The firm handling of the crises associated with the Radicalism of the 1790s – or, to put it the other way, the excessive severity of the measures taken against Radicals (eg the notorious Braxfield trials).
- The perception by contemporary Whigs that they were victims of persecution and denied promotion.
- The straight-jacket on elections, so that Scots MPs served Pitt's administration, rather than represented their constituencies.
- The continued and effective use of corrupt methods of political management.
- The harsh treatment of any sort of popular disorder (eg the Tranent Militia Riots, or the Easter Ross sheep drove of 1792).

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

The traditional Whig interpretation, going back to the 1790s, emphasised the hostility to political reform and the persecution of radicals.

- **Fry**: *The Dundas Despotism* has relevant ideas and information throughout. In particular he corrects the Whig picture of a damaging tyranny. More recently, in *Wild Scots*, Fry stresses Dundas' role in the restoration of the annexed Jacobite estates.
- **Whatley**: acknowledges that Dundas was "active in economic reform in the Highlands and responsible for instigating freer trade and improving the efficiency of government".
- **Devine**: "By 1800 Scotland had obtained more than a quarter of all official pensions and one third of state sinecures."
- **Sher**: "It has recently been argued that he deserves more respect as a national leader than he has traditionally received."

**Question 5**

**How valuable are the works of Robert Burns as evidence of the nature of Scottish society and the lives of its people?**

The aim of this essay is for candidates to analyse the works of Robert Burns and come to a conclusion as to how valuable they are as evidence for the life and society of Scotland.  The phrases "life and society" and "works of" are deliberately fairly general.  Candidates should not be penalised for referring only to poems and not to letters, for example, though the opportunity to make use of letters is there, and is likely to improve an essay.  The best essays will not be merely descriptive of what can be learned but evaluative of how much can be learned – and, by implication, what are the limitations of Burns' works as evidence.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**References to the poems and songs** (One could multiply examples) Each one is enhanced by a comment on the context.
Rural life:
- Numerous passing references to agriculture – to potato-bings "snugged up" for the winter, to ploughing, or to hay-making.
- *The Cottars Saturday Night* creates a substantial image.
- Burns experienced rural hardship labouring on his father's farm, and then himself struggled and failed to make Mossgiel profitable.
- Burns' own circumstances where he considered emigration, illustrates Scotland's own connections to the colonies and the slave trade.
The state of religion
- *Holy Willie's Prayer* deals with hypocrisy amongst the elders of the Kirk.
- He talks of "putting his Sunday face on" when hauled before the Kirk session for fornication.
- The background to all this was Jean Armour's pregnancy and the subsequent public reprimands.
Social hierarchy
- In an elegy to Fergusson:
> "O why should truest worth and genius pine
> Beneath the iron grasp of want and woe
> While titled knaves and idiot-greatness shine..."
- *A Man's a Man for a' that*
- Burns in Edinburgh was never free of a sense of social resentment.  The gentry who lionised him could any day ostracize him. *To a Louse* makes its democratic point before he went to Edinburgh.
The environment within which the Enlightenment flourished
- "Thy sons, Edina, social, kind,
With open arms the stranger hail;
Their views enlarged; their liberal mind....."
- Also Burns' songs for the "Crochallan Fencibles" take us into the world of the Edinburgh clubs, where an atmosphere of free discussion flourished.
Contemporary attitudes to women
- "I aince was a maid, I cannot tell when..." and other bawdy songs seem to contrast with his poems and letters to particular women that show respect for them as equals.  In the twenty-first century we may not regard this as problematic in the way previous generations have done.
The state of the Highlands
- "Ruin's wheel has driven o'er us..." in his Jacobite song *Strathallan's Lament*.  He was attracted by the romance of Jacobitism, but had also been on an extensive tour of the Highlands in 1787.

**References to Burns letters**

The letters may be thought of as superior historical evidence to the poems.  Making a list of quotations here would not be helpful.  All relevant references will gain due credit with candidates hopefully showing an ability to use them critically as evidence, with an awareness of context.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Edwin Muir's**: praise of Burns shows how hard it is to use his writings as evidence: "He is a myth evolved by the popular imagination...; we can all shape him to our own likeness for the myth is endlessly adaptable."
- **Donald Low**: has a good deal to say about the way in which *Tam O'Shanter* is closely derived from oral tradition – and so is a clue for our understanding of oral tradition.
- **Catherine Carswell's**: classic biography of the 1930s is criticised by **Thomas Crawford** in his introduction to the Canongate edition: "Her strokes are altogether too bold when it comes to the Scottish background". This is a warning against using a few famous poems to create a simplistic picture of rural poverty and an intolerant Calvinism.
- **Ian McIntyre**: calls Burns' Jacobitism "a sort of poetic fashion-accessory".
- **David Daiches**: also warns against the sentimental mythology surrounding Burns: "It is not Burns' fault if he has been misunderstood and misused." He also points out that Burns was pulled by a range of ideas (what **Gerard Carruthers** calls "cultural minestrone") but he would argue that a lot can be learned from Burns because "He told the truth about man – and woman – at work and at play and in love – and in lust – with a special kind of clarity and intensity".
- **Arthur Herman**: points out that we cannot regard Burns' own life – particularly his acquisition of an excellent education – as typical.
- **Christopher Whatley**: argues that the popularity of Burns' poems is evidence for the growing insolence towards the traditional moral authority of the Kirk.

**Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland (1715–1800)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A as evidence for the state of opinion in Scotland on the eve of the Jacobite rebellion of 1715?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source A** in understanding the state of opinion in Scotland on the eve of the Jacobite rebellion in 1715 in terms of:

**Provenance**

- The Glasgow Town Council was mainly concerned with generating prosperity, which civil war and rebellion would damage.
- Glasgow, in the South-West of Scotland, was in one of the strongly Presbyterian regions of the country, whereas Jacobitism was closely associated with Episcopalianism.
- Glasgow, more than any other Scots burgh, looked to benefit from the Treaty of Union, by expanded trade with England, and trade with the American Colonies.
- The date (August) is early in the rebellion, before Mar raised his standard (September). This letter cannot be dismissed as panic as the Jacobites seemed successful.

**Points from the source**

- An invasion was believed to be threatened.
- The term "Popish", a hostile term, emphasises the Council's Protestantism.
- So does "true religion".
- The rebellion is the work of "faction" – a term of abuse in eighteenth century politics.
- The city is "deeply affected" (suggested by the substantial force offered, for 60 days).

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- There was no invasion, but there was a rebellion, beginning a month later.
- Roman Catholicism was very important to James Edward Stuart, "the Pretender". He insisted on remaining in that faith even though it was politically damaging.
- This source pre-dates the great wealth of the tobacco lords – suggesting that religion may have been more important than trade in generating these anti-Jacobite sentiments.
- Glasgow was close to the heartlands of the Duke of Argyll, the great magnate and clan chief of the Campbells, who was the most dynamic leader of resistance to the rebellion.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source**

Different groups can be identified with different shades of opinion.
- Many Scots peers were disillusioned by the refusal of English peers to treat them as equals at Westminster.
- Episcopalians were strongly Jacobite. They were particularly strong in the north east.
- The east coast burghs were mainly Jacobite. Discontent with the harmful, economic effects of the Union was strong there.
- The old Covenanting areas in Galloway and Dumfries were determinedly anti-Jacobite.
- However many good Presbyterians were outraged by the way the Union parliament had granted toleration to the Episcopal Church.
- The power of the great magnates was such that most ordinary folk followed where they led.
- The bulk of the Campbells followed Argyll's Whig stance, but some septs joined Mar.
- The splits in the house of Atholl (father and son James for the government; three other sons for the Pretender) show the complexities of individual opinions.
- Argyll's well informed opinion was that north of the Forth there were nine Jacobites for every Whig.
- Though there was a good deal of local violence as the rebellion began, showing divided opinion in many communities.
- Few individuals could stay neutral, though Fletcher of Saltoun managed. The Northern Isles were too remote to be involved.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Lenman**: "The Jacobite cause in Scotland had never been healthier." His classic work particularly stresses that it was the Episcopalian north east, not Gaeldom, that was the heart of Jacobitism in 1715.
- **Szechi**: "By 1714 there was pervasive disillusion with the Union." He also has a statistical calculation that about 8% of the adult male population turned out for James and about 2.5% for George.
- **Lynch**: points out the surprising fact that objections to James's Catholicism were more universal in England than in Scotland.
- **Sher**: talks of the "pervasive feelings of national discontent" following the Union.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful for understanding the state of opinion in Scotland on the eve of the Jacobite rebellion in 1715.

**Question 2**

**How fully does Source B explain the changes that took place in schools in Scotland in the eighteenth century?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source B** as an adequate explanation of the changes that took place in Scottish schools in terms of:

**Provenance**: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: accurate comment on William Boyd will be credited as historiography.

**Points from the source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- The old syllabus only prepared children for church ministry and the law, not for "everyday work".
- There was a search for a more 'practical' syllabus – which included English and geography.
- Navigation was reason for teaching more mathematics.
- Preparing pupils for business explains why book-keeping was taught.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Most elementary teaching was not merely preparing children for church ministry but was directly controlled by the Kirk in the parish schools.
- The principles set out by Bonar, in founding Perth Academy, are similarly practical to those seen in Ayr. Practical subjects, particularly the teaching of science to merchants, mechanics and farmers.

**Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the source**

- The fashion for 'gentrification' led more and more of those who could afford it – especially lairds – to seek lessons on social skills (dancing and English accents) for their sons and daughters.
- The many reforms associated with the Enlightenment at Universities (for example the teaching of classes in English, not solely in Latin), permeated down to the schools as graduates became dominies.
- As well as these specific points, there was a massive cultural shift through the century towards a more rational, secular and polite society that affected schooling at all levels.
- By the second half of the century there was a genuine 'reading public' in Scotland. Records of local libraries show a widespread interest in secular subjects – another social pressure for schools to change and keep pace.
- Some educational reformers linked their proposals to the wider regeneration of Scotland – for example the moves to "Improve and Civilize the Highlands". (Bonar)
- Many burghs had more than one school, which enabled parents to shop around, and added the pressures of the market to the motives for change.
- The variety of 'adventure schools' added to this free market pressure.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Smout**: "It is difficult to think of any middle-class calling that was not expanding in numbers and affluence in the half of the century after 1760."
- **Lenman**: "In culture as in politics, the victory of Whiggism was inevitable."
- **Herman:** emphasises the connection between the tobacco lords and the development of education in Glasgow.
- **Withrington**: points out the crucial importance of the availability of decently paid, decently qualified teachers – very lacking early in the century, more widespread by the end.
- **Anderson**: "After 1745 Highland education was promoted with new urgency as an instrument of political loyalty."
- **Lynch**: emphasises the middle class reading public as an agent of change.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source B** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the changes that took place in Scottish schools.

**Question 3**

**How much do Sources C and D reveal about differing interpretations on why Scottish agriculture developed so slowly until the last quarter of the eighteenth century?**                              **(16 marks)**

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources C** and **D** on the slowness of Scottish agriculture to develop, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Source C**

**Provenance**: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit.  These may include: accurate comment on Ramsay of Ochtertyre may include reference to his friendship with Lord Kames (a leading "Improver"), his conversations with Burns, and the fact that he is the prototype for Jonathan Oldbuck, the Antiquary in Scott's novel of the same name.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Many of the improvers' ideas were "crude and fanciful".
- Inappropriate ideas based on other countries.
- Too many improving ideas theoretical, not practical.
- Tenants often obstinate.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- The "husbandry of the English" included enclosing, draining, sophisticated crop rotation, use of clover and selective breeding.
- The improvers were a minority amongst landowners until the end of the century.  The majority regarded their schemes as hare-brained.
- The Levellers Revolt in Galloway in 1724 was the most violent example of tenant resistance to enclosure.
- 'The practice of their neighbours' varied from region to region: poor drainage and sour mosses made 'improvement' impossible.

**Source D**

**Provenance**: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: accurate comment on IRM Mowat will be credited as historiography.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Excessive rents.
- No capital accumulation for investment in improvements.
- Insufficient capital even to stock a farm.
- Accumulated debt.
- Insecurity of tenure made improvement of the land seem not worthwhile.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Rising prices at last made farming profitable in the late century. Contrariwise, low prices held back improvement before that.
- *The Statistical Account* confirms this gloomy view of those parishes where climate and soil were poor.

**Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Some candidates may question the premise of the question and refer to locations or persons which showed agricultural improvement out of step with the prevailing picture, or comment that there were well known improvers but they didn't always have a wide effect (bankruptcy put off others from following them).
- There may be reference to the distinct situation in the highlands post-Culloden as to why that area developed more slowly.
- The early improvers came from a fairly exclusive social strata, with links to London and Edinburgh. Lesser lairds were not likely to be members of these clubs.
- The report by Andrew Wight to the Commissioners for Forfeited Estates (1770s) blamed the conservative and mean-spirited tenantry for lack of progress. This reflected contemporary educated opinion.
- Mechanisation did not really begin till the very last years of the century.
- Consideration of other aspects of technological progress (drainage, fertilisers) and why slow to reach Scotland.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Smout**: "Most tenants avoided imitating the practice of the home farm unless change was positively pushed down their throat."
- **Lynch**: Agriculture in this period demonstrates the power of gradual, as opposed to sudden, change in economic life.
- **Sher**: reminds us of how much there was to do: it was bound to take time to change farming practices.
- **Aitchison and Cassell**: in *The Lowland Clearances* emphasise the massive personal tragedies that improvement involved – "the bleak reality of the Age of Improvement". Of course there was resistance.
- **Whatley**: points out that agricultural progress, though slow, was enough to feed the growing population in the eighteenth century. There was no urgent pressure to improve.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on the slowness of Scottish agriculture to develop until the latter part of the century.

**"The House Divided": USA (1850–1865)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**How important was the Kansas–Nebraska Act in heightening tensions between North and South in the 1850s?**

The aim of this essay is to enable the candidate to identify what the Act did and then establish its relative importance in the 1850s.
NB This is not an essay on *why* the Act was introduced but more on the consequences of introduction.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Heightened tension**

- Northern outrage, created a "hell of a storm".
- Abolitionists able to use as evidence of slave power conspiracy, eg, Theodore Parker.
- Southern counter-attack.
- Allowing popular sovereignty miscalculation as open to sectional abuse for voting.
- Played important part in political realignment; decline of Whigs, rise of Know Nothings/American Party and formation of Republican Party. Heightened sectionalism.
- Popular sovereignty made Kansas focus for tension; both sides attempting to stake political claim.
- 1855 Kansas election problems lead to two rival Governments.
- "Bleeding Kansas" reemphasised slave power conspiracy in North & led to fire-eaters being sanctioned on both sides, eg, Lawrence raid & Pottawatomie Creek.
- Meant other events take on new prominence, eg, "Bleeding Sumner", again linked to Slave Power Conspiracy & Brooks a Southern hero.
- 1856 Presidential Election Buchanan (Democrat) for Kansas–Nebraska & Fremont (Republican) against = more North/South split.
- Became a focus for Lincoln–Douglas debates.

**Not heighten tension**

- Initially kept Southerners happy through repeal of ban on slavery in Nebraska.
- Assisted in the continuation of manifest destiny, settlers gaining land and water rights.
- Allowed for expansion of railways.

**Other Factors**

- 1850 Compromise hiding rather than addressing tension of westward expansion.
- Fugitive Slave Act & Dred Scott judgement.
- Political realignment of the 1850s & blundering generation.
- Role of "fire eaters" on both sides independent of Kansas–Nebraska.
- Economic divisions/rivalries between the sections.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **McPherson:** "Even more important than the Fugitive Slave issue in arousing Northern militancy was the Kansas–Nebraska Act which was passed by Congress in May 1854. Coming at the same time as the Anthony Burns case, this law may have been the most important single event pushing the nation toward civil war."
- **Tulloch:** Kansas–Nebraska erased the stability of Missouri Compromise.
- **Farmer:** Douglas did not predict Northern outrage and so weakened his party, damaged own presidential ambitions and revived North–South rivalry.
- **Craven:** Territorial extension was perceived as vital to continuation of both sides.
- **Holden Reid:** Slavery was central to the sense of cultural divergence between the North and the South. Rise of sectional northern party dedicated to restriction of slavery signaled an end to a desire for compromise.
- **Parish:** Rivalry between North and South exacerbated by imbalance in political power brought about by territorial expansion.

**Question 2**

**To what extent could Lincoln himself be held responsible for the outbreak of the American Civil War?**

The aim of this essay is to allow candidates to identify the role that Lincoln played against the backdrop of the late 1850s & 1860/1. Other contributory reasons should also be identified and linked to the election but candidates should focus on "outbreak" rather than long term causes.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Lincoln**

- Lincoln as a Republican would also be linked to pledge to reverse Dred Scott decision.
- Lincoln/Douglas debates; Lincoln's theme was not just slavery's immorality or the danger of it spreading but the continuing danger of a malignant conspiracy against the North.
- "House divided" speech widened gap between parties.
- 1860 ran on a platform of non-extension of slavery; many in South interpreted this as abolition of slavery. Examples from Southern press "black Republican".
- Did denounce John Brown raid.
- His election was the culmination of decades of sectional tension.
- South had disregarded Northern State Rights over Fugitive Slave Act 1850 so secession logical after constitutional election of Lincoln.
- Did not stand on a secession platform but movement for secession able to gather pace before he came to office.
- Would be a sectional President also as did not win any of the Southern States; South would find it hard to accept as President.
- As far as secessionists were concerned Lincoln was capable of anything. Southern honour was at stake.
- Fort Sumter; Confederates fired first shot, arguably resupplying provoked them.
- Criticism of alleged inactivity between Lincoln's election and inauguration.

**Other**

- Dred Scott decision re-emphasized "slave power conspiracy" concerns and thus Democrat/Republican splits.
- Fall out from Kansas and 1858 Congressional elections.
- Abolitionists, John Brown and Harpers Ferry. Northern approval meant point of no return, many in South pushed for secession before a Republican administration acted aggressively.
- Extremists in the South helped to split Democrats.
- Economic issues in the North.
- Secessionists insisted that the only protection for Southern rights was withdrawal from the Union before Lincoln's inauguration.
- The South Carolina Ordinance consisted of a list of the ways in which the non-slave-holding states had violated the rights of slave-holders.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to**

- **Tulloch**: "It was the coming of the Republican Lincoln to power in 1860 that triggered off secession and a civil war."
- **Gienapp**: Lincoln slow to grasp depth of crisis after election.
- **Craven**: Lincoln deliberately engineered war during Fort Sumter crisis & that slavery became "a symbol and carrier of all sectional differences".
- **Ramsdell**: Lincoln responsible for war.
- **Randall**: Dismissed Ramsdell; Lincoln moderate views.
- **Geyl**: Lincoln showed greater wisdom by his appreciation of the inevitable tragic events.
- **Donald**: Volatile electorate and party leaders without policy or principles.
- **Beard**: Economic problems in the North, possible legislation that would be to detriment of the South.

**Question 3**

**How important was the Battle of Antietam in the course of the American Civil War?**

The aim of this essay is to allow for the battle to be placed in the course and thus the direction of the war and to give candidates the opportunity to explore a chain of events that military success facilitated.

This essay is not about the fighting at the battle itself or indeed others and should be marked accordingly.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

- Importance for Foreign relations of Union with Europe/Britain. Union needed a decisive victory to "convert us all" (Lord Cecil), Antietam did this.
- Importance for Confederate Foreign policy. Many Confederate supporters in the British Government such as Gladstone. Seven days battles & Second Manassas pushing PM Palmerston towards intervention but Antietam defeat put the brakes on this.
- *The Times* started to move away from pro-Confederacy stance after Antietam.
- Stopped the Democrats gaining the House of Representatives in mid-term elections.
- Lincoln had decided upon a Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation in July.
- Seward advised caution, wait for victory or "our last shriek, on the retreat".
- Antietam provided platform for legislation.
- Lee retreated to Virginia & did not gain Maryland volunteers in any number.
- Lee lost 10 000 men and McClellan 14 000 making it one of bloodiest of the war.
- Confederacy failed to get a victory or demoralize the North sufficiently.
- Lincoln was able to replace McClellan as he failed to capitalize on his advantage.
- Candidate may engage in the debate on how it could be considered a 'turning point', and discuss counter-views about the importance of this battle.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views**.
**These may include reference to:**

- **Gallagher**: "complex in execution and impact, the Maryland campaign qualified as a pivotal event of the war."
- **McPherson**: "unquestionably the most important battle in the Civil War in its impact on foreign relations."
- **McPherson**: Was one of the key turning points of the civil war.
- **Hattaway and Jones**: South could have won the war before Fort Donelson and Henry; Antietam postscript.
- **Gienapp**: McClellan fumbled best chance to annihilate Lee; procrastination allowed Lincoln to replace McClellan.
- **Weber**: Marked first time the public saw graphic reality of war through Brady exhibition.
- **Thomas**: Role of C F Adams in London and W L Drayton in Paris ensured good North/Europe relations. Emancipation introduced a moral dimension which could not be ignored. Confederacy's hopes depended on success of its armies. Lack of success prevented European recognition which was essential if Southern armies were to succeed. It was a vicious diplomatic circle.
- **Rowland**: South created wrong type of pressure at wrong time and applied it in a wrong way.
- **Randall & Donald**: War took a new turn as a result of the Proclamation.
- **Quarles**: Blacks entered at time of real shortage, swung in favour of Union.

**Question 4**

**How great an impact did the American Civil War have on civilians in both the North and the South?**

The aim of this essay is to give candidates the opportunity of identifying similarities as well as unique features of the impact of the civil war on both Northern and Southern civilians. Candidates should also highlight continuity with the pre-war period where appropriate.

**Northern Impact**

- Employment tensions black & poor white workers.
- NY draft riots & substitute resentment.
- Economic boom in agriculture – Homestead Act, mechanisation & protectionism.
- Increased demand from armed forces in clothing, armaments etc = boom.
- Suspension of Habeas Corpus & restriction of civil liberties.
- Politics continue as per pre 1861 with free elections.
- Rise in transportation costs/railway monopolies caused tension as did National Banking Act (1863), eg, East Coast business bias.
- Resentment of big government & taxes.
- System of Government remained unchanged.
- Civilian casualties numbered 6% in the North.

**Southern Impact**

- Societal shift in the role of some women maintaining family farms and businesses as result of ¾ white men in the army.
- Change in land use away from cotton (embargo) to agricultural production.
- Impact on slaves.
- Work/ethic of slaves; many slave owning females had to deal with 'restless' slaves.
- Elections held.
- Late 1863 Government claimed half space on all outgoing ships.
- Hyperinflation (retail price index doubled last half of 1862 and re-doubled by March 1863), shortage of food/goods, and poverty (poor white population).
- Martial law/Habeas Corpus suspension 1864.
- High taxation.
- Morale & war weariness.
- Development of unofficial opposition to Davis.
- Religious revivalism.
- Reduction in social & economic differences between the classes.
- Devastation to property, eg, Atlanta.
- High casualty rates in some areas: 18% in the South.
- In some areas of North Carolina, for example, as many as 40% of white women received government support to relieve hunger and deprivation.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.**
**These may include reference to:**

- **Gilpin Faust**: Southern democracy of common suffering & new perspectives on role of women.
- **Cashin**: War disrupted every aspect of civilian life & culture.
- **Gallagher**: Many suffered from war weariness & from separation.
- **Paul Escott**: has described divisions in North Carolina as so extensive as to have constituted an "internal war".
- **Daniel Sutherland**: Far more extensive guerrilla action against civilians across the South than previously thought.
- **Lori Ginzberg**: Older female style of benevolence was replaced by a masculine gospel of charitable efficiency that eclipsed not just female values but women themselves.

**Question 5**

**How significant was the issue of the States' Rights in the defeat of the Confederacy?**

The aim of this essay is to enable the candidate to evaluate the relative value of States' Rights as a reason for Confederate defeat. Other reasons for defeat might also be drawn upon such as leadership, manpower, the economy and size.

N B  An essay that only pays passing reference to States' Rights is not addressing the question and should be marked accordingly.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Yes**

- 100 000 still in State militias in 1862. Stationed in home states rather than in one central army.
- State Governors often responsible, eg, Brown in Georgia. Even when ordered to by State Supreme Court, still used loopholes.
- Sherman's invasion of Georgia in 1864, 10 000 state militia stayed separate from Johnston's army.
- No real identity as a Confederate Nation led to military shortfalls.

**No**

- Brown and Vance (North Carolina) often met State Welfare needs rather than go to central government.
- To avoid confusion over jurisdiction for conscription.
- Confederate Government had popular support from most Southern legislatures.

**Other**

- Economic failings; King Cotton card & foreign diplomacy.
- Political failings of Confederate hierarchy, eg, Davis.
- Confederate legislation, eg, conscription, impressments and taxation meant "rich man's war; poor man's fight".
- Military failings of Confederate hierarchy, eg, Granny Lee and Davis interference.
- Military reversals impact.
- Lack of will for fight – particularly to preserve slavery.
- Slavery as an impediment to Southern success; runaways.
- Collapse of Southern morale.
- Big battalions of the north.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.**
**These may include reference to:**

- **Owsley**: "seeds of death were states' rights"; local defence organizations brought Confederacy down (1925).
- **McPherson**: Internal divisions fatally weakened Confederacy but ultimately external.
- **Donald**: Excess of democracy.
- **Yearns & Beringer**: State contribution outweighed diversion of resources.
- **Stampp**: South felt guilt over Negro slavery and this reduced her commitment to the struggle for independence.
- **Ramsdell**: Collapse of civilian morale.
- **Gallagher**: Not why lost but why fought for so long.
- **Current**: 'God and the mighty battalions'.
- **Glatthaar**: Role of Blacks in eventual Union victory.
- **Jones**: Politico-military dimension.
- **Thomas**: Became a nation during course of war.
- **Grant**: Victory was not pre-determined by resource superiority.
- **Fuller**: Lee lacked overall strategic intelligence.

**"The House Divided" USA (1850–1865)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A as evidence of the treatment of slaves in the ante-bellum period? (12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the value of **Source A** in providing an adequate explanation of the treatment of slaves in the ante-bellum period in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Recollections of an eye witness/former slave.
- Recorded many years after the events.
- No specific date or location mentioned.
- Purpose to highlight poor treatment of slaves.

**Points from the source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Poor diet of bread and corn porridge.
- Poor medical attention.
- No education.
- No resources at Sunday School.
- Restrictions on movements of slaves.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Monotonous diet led to vitamin deficiencies.
- Most lived in a constant state of insecurity; lack of education would empower master.
- Slaves commonly toiled from dawn until dusk to make their owners a profit.
- Master total control over free time of slave.
- Medical attention sometimes good for slave as valuable asset.
- Religion as identity, community and opposition.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- Institution natural/divinely ordained.
- Owners had unlimited power over them.
- Could be sold, separated from their families, punished, sexually exploited and even killed.
- Threat of separation was effectively used as a form of punishment.
- Northern & Abolitionist viewpoints at the time were very different, eg, Hinton Rowan Helper celebrating achievements of Free North.
- Differentiation between field, overseer and house slaves for treatment.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- Most historians are convinced that conditions were harsh and at times intolerable.
- **Stampp**: Cruelty endemic in all slave-holding communities.
- **Elkins**: Slaves psychologically infantilized by the experience.
- **Fogel & Engermann**: Slaves efficient and effective, more than adequate diet.
- **Genovese**: Paternalism at heart, accept planter vision and slaves turn to own advantage.
- **Penningroth**: Relatively widespread slave ownership of property.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful for understanding the treatment of slaves in the ante-bellum period.

**Question 2**

**How fully does Source B explain the extent of the African-American contribution during the American Civil War?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source B** as an explanation of the extent of the African-American contribution during the Civil War in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. This may include reference to: accurate comment on Glatthaar may be included as historiography.

**Points from the source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Arrived when need for their labour in army was greatest.
- Employment in Northern war related occupations.
- Runaways destabilized Southern economy and ability to wage war.
- Many runaways fought for North.
- Contribution to war effort was vital.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Entry date of African-American soldiers in the war at end/key battles already taken place. Many African-Americans still slaves in the South (source Northern focus); go slow on plantations.
- Fresh impetus to a flagging war effort in 1863.
- Added to "overwhelming numbers" of Union troops (180 000) that Lee "yielded" to.
- Non-combatant war work just as important.
- War was not over in 1863; African-American soldiers needed for "movement on all fronts".
- Lincoln believed sight of African-American soldiers would quell the rebellion "if vigorously applied".

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- Service added to African-American pride & possibility of citizenship.
- Exaggeration of role of African-American soldiers by historians.
- Stiffened resolve of many in the South & reinforced views, eg, Fort Pillow massacre.
- Numbers do not convey nature of combat fatalities, eg, 54th at Fort Wagner.
- Fought in 40 major battles.
- Relatively low number of deaths in combat.
- May have been a tendency recently to exaggerate the impact of black soldiers on the outcome of the war. Some 37,000 black soldiers died in the war. However, 30,000 died from illness; the fate of 4000 others is uncertain.
- Even the South itself was considering the recruitment of African Americans.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Farmer**:  Little doubt African-American troops had a positive effect on war effort.
- **Quarles**:  Final two years of war saw significant black contribution.
- **Dawson**: African-American recruitment a revolutionary step.
- **Parish**:  African-Americans gained pride, recognition and self respect as a result of service.
- **Boritt**:  Absence would have foiled Grant's Total War tactics.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source B** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the African–American contribution in the Civil War.

**Question 3**

**How much do Sources C and D reveal about differing interpretations of Davis as a wartime leader?**
**(16 marks)**

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources C** and **D** as interpretations of the effectiveness of Jefferson Davis as a war leader and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Source C**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include reference to:

- Leading historian of the Civil War era; comments could be included as historiography.

**Points from the source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Did not express war aims clearly or manage competing factions.
- Personality made him enemies.
- Poor at delegating appropriately.
- Davis also argued with his premier generals.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Davis criticized by own War Department staff for knowledge and interference.
- Davis' Vice-President Stephens called him "My poor blind and deaf dog".
- Lincoln's management of war aims change in 1862/3 seen as well-timed after Antietam or war aims changed/forced upon him.
- Beauregard & Johnston both blamed Davis for military failure.

**Source D**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include reference to:

- Popular historian of the Civil War era; comments could be included as historiography.

**Points from the source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Davis had military and administrative pedigree.
- Admirable personal characteristics.
- Pragmatic/realistic view of war length.
- Placed in high esteem by Lee.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualize those in the source**

- Proven track record as Mexican war hero and in US Senate was War Secretary.
- Justification of military interference; if advice followed possibly more successful, eg, Bull Run, but did often get it wrong and slowed down advances.
- Did not do enough to deal with problems of length of war, eg, morale & food shortages.
- Lee owed his position to Davis and continued in post after resignation not accepted after Gettysburg.

**Points from recall which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Davis not given good advice from Generals, eg, Lee could have advised a change in Confederate capital.
- Beauregard & Johnston blamed defeat on Davis' inept leadership (both had axes to grind).
- If Davis did have failings, these were also those of Confederacy.
- Inability to bring state governors to heel was costly.
- Managed to establish the Confederacy from scratch and get a reasonable team for doing so.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.**
**These may include reference to:**

- **Potter**: "If the Union and the Confederacy had exchanged presidents with one another, the Confederacy might have won its independence."
- **Katcher**: Davis narrow-minded, vindictive to imagined slights, not prepared to compromise.
- **Gallagher**: Davis did do well, just an absence of capable subordinates.
- **Vandiver**: Many failings but Davis did have "nerve".
- **Eaton**: at many points could argue that it was impossible for Davis to win.
- **Rhodes**: "…far behind Lincoln as a compeller of men."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on the effectiveness of the wartime leadership of Davis.

**Japan: From Medieval to Modern State (1850s–1920)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**How important were the Daimyo in the Tokugawa's governing of Japan?**

The aim of this essay is to evaluate the importance and effectiveness of the Daimyo within the Tokugawa system of government. Credit can be given to discussion of other facets of government, but only when due attention has been paid to the Daimyo.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

- Tokugawa only had direct control over 25% of land. They were therefore dependent upon the loyalty of the Daimyo in the remainder of the land.
- Daimyo categorized according to their previous history of loyalty.
  - Feudai had traditionally been supporters of the Tokugawa and were given strategically most important land in centre of Japan around Edo and Tokyo.
  - Tozama had not traditionally been loyal, and were given land of less importance and kept a close eye on by Feudai.
- If Daimyo governed domains effectively and collected taxes, they received little direct interference from Shogun.
- Dependent upon Daimyo to enforce their rule.
- Dependent upon a system of loyalty. Shogun kept an eye on this through Alternate Attendance.
- According to alternate attendance (sankin kotai), Daimyo were required to spend alternate years at Shogun's power base at Edo.
- When they were not there, they had to leave their family as hostage.
- Cost of keeping two residences and travelling between them ate up half Daimyo's revenue.
- Means of preventing Daimyo of spending too long in their domains to organise standing army.
- Permitted Tokugawa to maintain ascendancy over other powerful lords who were potential competitors.
- Especially useful to keep eye on Tozama lords.
- Elaborate lists of rule shaped behaviour and dress.
- Daimyo's marriage had to have Shogun's approval.
- Expected to pay for and carry out costly public works schemes.
- System of loyalty breaking down by mid 19$^{th}$ century, weakening Tokugawa's government – eg Tempo Reforms.
- Daimyo of Choshu and Satsuma clans united in opposition to Tokugawa – one of reasons for downfall.

**Other important means of government**

- Caste structure underpinned Tokugawa government.
- Details of caste structure.
- Important role of samurai – their unique right to carry swords and execute individuals.
- Role of Neo Confucianism in dictating loyalty and good order from people who were supposed to know their place in society.
- In villages, headmen appointed to be responsible for good behaviour.
- When trouble arose, Samurai magistrates made judgments.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **J. Hunter**: "The Tokugawa confirmed their hold on power by a complex structure of physical, political and economic controls over the several hundred local lords whose domains made up the rest of the country, the samurai class who constituted their followers and the populace who resided within their territories."
- **Tipton**: "It (the Tokugawa) delegated administration of the rest of the country to the daimyo, who governed and obtained income from their domains more or less as they pleased as long as they did not display disloyalty to the shogunate."
- **Waswo**: "Some 260 great lords, or daimyo, swore an oath of allegiance to the shogun. In return…within his domain, the daimyo enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy, with powers to collect taxes, regulate commerce, and dispense justice."
- **Beasley**: "All daimyo were in some degree free from Edo's interference. Within the boundaries of his domain…the lord was absolute master."
- **W G Beasley**: "This system of 'alternate attendance' was fundamental to the maintenance of political authority. Its cost was a regular burden on a lord's finances."

**Question 2**

**How much of a threat to the Tokugawa regime were the actions of the nationalist thinkers, such as those in the Sonno Joi movement?**

The aim of this question is to encourage candidates to explain and evaluate the threat posed by the nationalist thinkers to the Tokugawa regime in the mid-nineteenth century, such as the Sonno Joi movement. Candidates must fully evaluate the role of these nationalist thinkers, and draw some sort of conclusion about the threat they posed. It may be relevant to draw relative comparisons with other threats to the regime, but only once those highlighted in the question have been fully evaluated.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Nationalist thinkers**

- Details of nationalist thinking with reference especially to individuals such as Shozan – 'Eastern ethics, western science' and how this encouraged a sense of national pride and devotion to the emperor. Motoori Noringa, one of founders of School of National Learning, who at first reacted against worship of Chinese thought – searching for pure Japanese culture.
- Role of nationalists in the aftermath of Unequal Treaties – uniting nationalist anger which produced violent outbreaks which the Bakufu could not contain.
- The humiliation of the Unequal Treaties caused many Japanese to think nationally in terms of their country rather than their domain.
- The nationalistic role of the Sonno Joi movement of 'revere the emperor; expel the barbarian', illustrating many now looking to the emperor rather than the Bakufu for leadership.
- Connection with Shinto Revivalism.
- Men of spirit, or shishi, formed a loyalist movement and terrorized Kyoto under the banner of 'sonno joi'.
- Role of individuals such as Yoshida Shoin.
- Some nationalist thinkers went on to become leading members of Meiji government in early years, such as Takamori.

**Other threats that nationalist thinkers could be compared with**

- Weakening of caste structure – one of Tokugawa's main forms of social control.
- Inherent weakness of decentralized government – direct control of only 25% of land.
- Failure of Tempo reforms illustrated they did not have administrative power to enforce their policies.
- Peasants not necessarily content to remain on the land and increasingly reluctant to confine their activities to food growing and diversifying into other kinds of activity.
- Changing position of merchants – supposed to be the lowest caste, yet their wealth was increasing; they were essential to Daimyo for rice marketing and providing loans, and helped to run Shogun's finances.
- Samurai selling privileges to merchants.
- Incursion from foreign powers = increased resentment of the Bakufu.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Gordon**: "…They (nationalist thinkers) formed part of a climate of opinion that made great upheaval and change – on behalf of a national entity that transcended the Tokugawa system – more likely and easier to achieve."
- **Tipton**: "…The conventional depiction of the Meiji Restoration as a relatively bloodless coup overlooks the violence that preceded it during the years of the shishi terror."
- **Storry**: "A school of thought aggressively nationalist in tone."
- **Storry**: "Tokugawa system of government might have continued essentially unchanged had it not been for the forcible opening of the closed door."
- **Bolitho**: "open deteriorations in relations between the Daimyo domains and the Tokugawa government."

**Question 3**

**How significant an impact did the Emperor Meiji make upon politics and society after the Restoration of 1868?**

The aim of this question is to gather details and viewpoints on the political and social impact of the emperor after his restoration in 1868, and make an assessment as to whether he had real power or was just a figurehead.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Impact on politics**

- Meiji Restoration supposed to be restoring emperor to the centre of Japanese society and politics.
- Emperor very important as a source of political legitimacy for Meiji leadership.
- Charter Oath made in his name.
- All political edicts and constitution delivered in his name.
- Many powers reserved for the emperor, including declaration of war, conclusion of treaties, and supreme command of the armed forces.
- Emperor had extensive ordinance rights and could in theory adjourn the Diet.
- He was encouraged to make public appearances in different parts of the country.
- Constitution formally established emperor's divine status.

**Limitations of impact**

- But, emperor more useful as a symbol, to be used against opponents, if he were detached from politics.
- When making political decisions, if the councillors as a whole agreed, it was submitted to the throne for approval; when they did not, the emperor's senior political advisors – not his personal ones – must try to achieve agreement.  Only if this failed was the emperor directly approached.
- Emperor came before his people, not principally as a ruler, but as a symbol of imperial lineage.

**Impact on society**

- Meiji leaders used divine status of emperor to induce unquestioning loyalty to the human ministers who spoke in their sovereign's name.
- Emperor formed the basis of the family state, which promulgated loyalty at all levels of society.
- Hozumi Yatsuka "to be obedient to the family head is to be obedient to the spirits of the ancestors and since the present emperor sits on the throne in place of the imperial ancestors", obedience to him was obedience to them.
- Emphasis on Shinto religion and shrines after 1868.
- To respect gods and revere emperor, underpinned the need to love one's country and obey rules of moral behaviour, which shaped many laws and rescripts introduced in emperor's name.
- Imperial Rescript to soldiers and sailors (1885) – emphasis on obligation to emperor.
- Education Rescript (1890) – stress on virtues of loyalty and filial piety.
- Text books had to be official publications – expounding an 'absolutist interpretation of the emperor's position in society, derived from Confucianism'.
- Copies of emperor's portrait in every classroom – ritual reverence.

**Limitations of impact**

- All edicts and rescripts affecting society were issued in his name, but actually written by Meiji leaders, so his direct impact on society is arguably limited.
- The Emperor could do nothing to limit the extensive copying of western social etiquette that was encouraged by the Meiji leaders, especially up to 1890.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **J. Hunter**: "Japan's post-1868 rulers utilized this nationalistic focus (of the Restoration) and claimed throughout to exercise power in the name of the emperor."
- **Beasley**: "Emperor's function was not to rule, but to define and preserve by his superior authority the framework within which the government worked."
- **Beasley**: "The emperor was a figurehead; but his role was to preside over the transformation of Japan…giving countenance and legitimacy to the men who evolved the appropriate policies."
- **Jansen**: "Restoration leaders kept the court at the centre of national identity and that emphasis diffused amidst the population as a means of control."

**Question 4**

**How important was the Tripartite Intervention of 1895 in bringing about war between Japan and Russia?**

In this question the candidate is being asked to reflect upon the role the Tripartite Intervention played in creating humiliation and anti-Russian sentiment, and can be seen as a contributing factor in the outbreak of war with Russia in 1904.  It is relevant to mention other causes once the identified factor has been analysed in depth.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Role of Tripartite Intervention**

- Profound humiliation caused by Tripartite Intervention of 1895.
- Russia had joined forces with France and Germany, to force Japan to hand back their first foothold on the Asian mainland, the Liaotung peninsula, granted to them after their defeat of China.
- Threat of military force meant Japan had to submit; did get an increase in indemnity.
- Russia saw Japanese control of peninsula as a threat to her own route through China.
- Japan maintained peninsula needed for their defence of Korea.
- Savage reminder that Japan still in a position of weakness.
- Indemnity used to fund expanded rearmament programme to prevent any such humiliation happening again.
- Russia further compounded ill-feeling by taking out 25 year lease of peninsula.
- Desire to revenge humiliation.

**Other causes of war**

- Growing concern about Russia's incursion into Asia.
- Threat to Korea and its important strategic location.
- Russian loans to Korea and Russian military missions there.
- Trans-Siberian railway.
- Growing nationalism.
- Russia exploited Boxer Rebellion to seize territory in Manchuria in 1900.
- Alliance with Britain (1902) – both opposed to further Russian advance.
- Russian refusal to withdraw troops from Manchuria.
- War declared 10 Feb 1905.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Hunter**:  "As Japan's strengths grew so did her ambitions on the Asian mainland and her ability to advance them."
- **Jansen**:  "…no amount of payment could make up for the sense of outrage and humiliation that was left by the Tripartite Intervention."
- **Beasley**:  "In the field of foreign affairs Korea continued to be a problem area, since the events of 1895 had substituted Russia for China as Japan's competitor there."
- **Benson and Matsumara**:  "The Alliance (with Britain) encouraged the Japanese to take a firmer line with Tsarist Russia, which had refused to withdraw its troops from Manchuria following the end of the Boxer Rebellion."

**Question 5**

**What factors best explain the economic development that occurred in Japan between 1868 and 1920?**

The aim of this essay is to explore the multifaceted explanations surrounding Japan's success in industrialisation in a relatively short period of time. Credit can also be given to any counter-argument introduced by the candidate.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

- Details of the Tokugawa legacy, providing a sound basis for industrial development.
- The effects of the Unequal Treaties in promoting industrial development – Japan's desire to be accepted as equal.
- The international environment led to Japan expanding and adopting the new industrial technologies which helped her catch up.
- Iwakura Mission.
- Cultural borrowing like shipbuilding, iron and steel mills, banking and commerce, textiles (positive impact of silkworm disease in Europe).
- Using foreign experts then dismissing them once Japan confident to continue.
- Highly developed agriculture with inter-regional trade and good communication infra-structure to build upon.
- Role of state in process and policies they implemented.
- Zaibatsu.
- Military reform and connection with industrial expansion.
- Japan had an abundance of human labour who were well educated and loyal.
- Government having limited reliance on foreign loans took firm control over expenditure – partial funding of large scale private enterprises and support for Zaibatsu.
- Improvements in infrastructure.
- Role of WW1 – gained foothold in Asian market.
- Ending of imports from west forced development, especially in chemical industry.
- Japan reversed balance of payments deficit during the war years.
- But agriculture still important.
- Until late 1920s agriculture accounted for over 25% of net domestic production.
- As late as 1930 50% of population still dependent on agriculture.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Hane**: "The industry that developed rapidly from the early Meiji years and remained a key component of the economy was textile manufacture…by 1904 it had become the world's largest producer with a 31% share."
- **Macpherson**: "While it is true that development depended on the actions of individual industrialists, peasants and factory workers responding to material incentives, they operated in an environment conditioned by the nation state pursuing the goals of economic greatness, and, therefore, of a strong army and industrial growth."
- **Maddison**: "There was a heavy emphasis on education and the creation of a situation in which the rate of investment ultimately became very high."
- **Hane**: "Modernisation would depend heavily upon the adoption of western science, technology and industrialisation."

**Japan: From Medieval to Modern State (1850s–1920)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A as evidence of the developing relationship between Japan and the outside world in the 1850s?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source A** as evidence of the developing relationship between Japan and the outside world in the 1850s in terms of:

**Provenance:**

- Written by American President.
- Letter was carried by Perry to Japan.
- Letter was delivered to Emperor during Perry's first visit with the Black Ships in 1853.
- Purpose of letter useful, as it highlights some of America's intentions.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Fact letter is delivered highlights the developing relationship between Japan and the outside world.
- Relationship been dictated by America, whose intentions are shaped by trade, and fact American steamships can now travel to Japan relatively quickly.
- Argues that if relations were established between the countries, both would benefit.
- Highlights the different resources that both have and could trade if relationship were established.
- Shows awareness of policy of isolation, but believes time has come to abandon this and develop relationships with the outside world.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- This letter was presented by Perry to the Emperor during his first visit.
- Written at a time of expanding empires and navies, and America had been exasperated by Japanese policy of isolation.
- They were keen to exploit the natural resources of Japan and were forcing a relationship upon Japan.
- Letter was reinforced by the threat of force. US would be back within the year with more military resources and expected a positive demand to their requests.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- Policy of isolation under Tokugawa had limited early developments with Japan and outside world.
- Source does not mention all the desires of America with regards to forcing a relationship upon Japan. American ships involved in whaling industry and wanted to use Japanese ports for refuelling, protection for shipwrecked American sailors, Japanese ports opened up to them and beneficial trading tariffs.
- Extraterritoriality not mentioned.
- 'Unequal' nature of demands not mentioned.
- Letter and Perry's visit led to signing of first Unequal Treaty.
- Other nations, such as Britain, Russia, France and Holland all followed suit.
- America was not the only country putting pressure on Japan to establish relations with the west.
- Perspective that Japan was not as isolated as US believed and argued – links with Dutch.
- Some within Japan had been calling for the establishment of relations with the west by 1850, such as Shoin.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Beasley**: "it was generally thought that this time the closed door must be opened, or it would be broken down."
- **Tipton**: "the foreign threat was not new…Foreign ships had appeared with increasing frequency since the 1790s: Russians in the north and British in the south"…"Perry's mode of approach was no polite request conforming to Japanese diplomatic protocol."
- **Peter Kornicki**: "it is commonplace to assert that it was Commodore Perry who was responsible for opening Japan in 1853–4, but this is misleading…Japan was never completely closed, owing to the Dutch presence in Nagasaki and the active trade conducted by Japan with China and Korea."
- **Buruma**: "Perry's assumption of Japanese ignorance (in 1853) could not have been further from the truth. At the time of his arrival in Edo bay, the Japanese knew more about America than the Americans knew about Japan."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful as evidence of the developing relationship between Japan and the outside world in the 1850s.

**Question 2**

**How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of the impact of Meiji modernisation on living and working conditions?** (16 marks)

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources B** and **C** on the impact of the Meiji Reforms on living and working conditions, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Source B**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: accurate comment on Elise Tipton will receive credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Highlights negative impact of Meiji reforms on living and working conditions of females.
- Girls from poor farming areas contracted into factories by families, enticed by promise of free board and education.
- Prison-like dormitories.
- Long working hours, harsh treatment.
- Too exhausted to go to classes.
- High numbers contracted diseases.
- Many ran away or resorted to suicide.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Abolition of the caste structure freed up greater movement of workers and population.
- Women forming significant proportion of workforce – around 250 000 by 1900.
- Textile factories were the cornerstone of Meiji industrial reform, and women became the main workforce.
- Most were under twenty.
- Many were from farming villages who sent most of their wages home to their families and worked for the years before they were married.
- Working conditions were often dangerous.
- Working lives controlled by fathers and husbands.
- Government reforms encouraged industrialisation, such as providing low interest rates, direct subsidies, building model factories and supporting the Zaibatsu.

**Source C**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Written by a male trade unionist who was very aware of the impact of the Meiji reforms upon the work place.
- Written at a time when women were forming a huge proportion of the work force.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Impact of Meiji reforms is having a detrimental effect upon Japanese family life.
- Women and children forming an increasing proportion of workforce.
- Women, who should be looking after the home, are now working.
- Innocent children are being deprived of an education because they are working.
- Rise of factories, mills and machines are the cause of this 'unnatural state of affairs'.
- Men are paid too little to support a family on his wage alone.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Author acknowledging increasing use of women and children in the workforce.
- Main concern is not about their living and working conditions, but detrimental impact this is having upon traditional family life.
- Women being forced to adopt a lifestyle at odds with the role and status traditionally ascribed to them.
- Concern that men's wages are too low.

**Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Sources differ in perspective; while both acknowledge the increasing role of women, B is more concerned with the often appalling living and working conditions, whereas C is concerned that male wages are too low to support a family – hence women having to work.
- Number of women outside the home grew rapidly, but millions of women continued to work in the manual labour of farm work. The nature of agricultural work altered very little.
- Other women became secretaries, telephonists, teachers, nurses, clerks – growing in number after 1890.
- Wage discrepancy between male and female workers.
- New factories that were established attempted to echo loyalty and patriarchal society that Neo-Confucianism had been cultivating.
- Credit can be given to other Meiji reforms and aspects of modernisation that had an impact upon living and working conditions – eg conscription, educational reform.
- Counter-argument – agriculture continued to be the most important form of industry and largest employer.
- Credit can be given if candidate introduces positive perspective of reforms and any relevant supporting evidence.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Molony**: "The migration of these women from the countryside to the urban mills had tremendous demographic and social implications: it fuelled Japan's urbanisation and created a link that permitted the social and economic integration of city and countryside."
- **Tsurumi**: "Dormitories were intended to keep female workers from running away. The prison-like function is clear from their construction."
- **Hunter**: "As in other countries, male unionists feared women's advancement in the workplace."
- **Waswo**: "Many felt liberated by the Meiji Restoration and the lifting of restrictions on their personal and occupational mobility. Encountering new opportunities, they set about to improve their lives and the lives of their families."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in understanding the impact of the Meiji reforms on living and working conditions.

**Question 3**

**How fully does Source D explain how Japan changed as a result of its desire to rid itself of the Unequal Treaties?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source D** and the extent to which it explains how Japan changed as a result of its desire to rid itself of the Unequal Treaties in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: accurate comment on K B Pyle will receive credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Belief Japan could rid itself of Unequal Treaties if they borrowed exclusively from the west.
- Following Iwakura mission judicial reform introduced in attempt to overturn extraterritoriality.
- Attempt to address cultural differences by reform of traditional social norms, such as nakedness and mixed bathing, which were deemed socially unacceptable by westerners.
- Adoption of western practices such as balls and playing cards in an attempt to win favour with the west and overturn Unequal Treaties.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Japan altered Tokugawa's policy of isolation.
- Japan did change itself and copied many ideas from West in order to overturn Unequal Treaties, including political and constitutional reform.
- Further detail about Iwakura Mission and how it influenced Meiji leaders to bring in change, and thus challenge Unequal Treaties, in the following areas -
  - Industry.
  - Navy and military.
  - Education.
  - Social etiquette such as dress.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- Japan did not change by simply copying from the west – adopted many ideas to suit Japanese context eg educational reform.
- Some reforms, eg Zaibatsu, were Japanese in origin.
- Economic foundations laid during the Tokugawa period helped Japan modernise and overturn Unequal Treaties.
- Alliance with Britain in 1902.
- Backlash in 1890s against excessive westernisation.
- Embarked upon policy of imperialism, defeated China and Russia in conflict and became an imperial power.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Jansen**: "it should be sufficient to note that between 1868 and 1912 – the 45 years of the Meiji Emperor's rule – Japan came to acquire almost all of the ingredients of a modern state."
- **Fahs**: "Japan's strong feeling of national identity was helpful in preventing blind acceptance of everything western."
- **Gordon**: "…In 1889 Japan became the first non-Western nation to adopt a constitutional political system; while at the same time it became the first non-Western industrial, capitalist economy."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source D** is helpful in offering a full explanation of how Japan changed as a result of its desire to rid itself of the Unequal Treaties.

**Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**To what extent was it military defeat rather than the actions of the revolutionaries that brought about the creation of the Weimar Republic, 1918–19?**

The aim of this essay is to enable candidates to review and evaluate events surrounding the foundation of the Republic and in particular to weigh the importance of defeat and the revolution 'from above' against the importance of the revolution 'from below' in the creation of the Weimar Republic.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Points suggesting that military defeat was the principal cause of the revolution and the creation of the Weimar Republic**

- By the autumn of 1917 Germany faced serious economic and military difficulties. On the home front the effects of the British naval blockade were causing food shortages (the winter of 1917 was known as 'turnip winter') and there were shortages of military supplies too.
- General exhaustion on the Home Front and a growing sense of the futility of the war.
- The entry of the USA into the war against Germany meant that in the near future American troops would be arriving in large numbers to fight on the western front.
- In order to win the war Ludendorff launched a new offensive in March 1918 but in spite of initially spectacular advances, by mid July the offensive had lost its impetus. The Allies now returned to the offensive and by August the German generals realised that the war was lost. Ludendorff described Germany's defeat on the Somme on 8th August as "the blackest day for the German army in the history of the war".
- The German armies began moving back to the German frontier. Morale among the troops and at home was disintegrating. Among the generals, there was a growing fear of revolution prompted in part by the fact that in April radicals in the SPD had formed a new party – the USPD – that opposed the war and in July the Reichstag had voted for peace.
- By September Germany's allies were requesting an armistice and with the breaching of the Hindenburg Line on September 28th 1918 Germany itself now faced the prospect of invasion. On 29 September the Reichstag called for a new government that would have its confidence.
- For these reasons Ludendorff persuaded the Kaiser to transform the Second Reich into a parliamentary democracy by handing power over to a civilian government supported by the Reichstag and led by Max von Baden from 3 October (the revolution 'from above').
- Baden's 'October Reforms' went a long way towards establishing a democracy, but by this time popular unrest in Germany and in her armed forces was spreading rapidly and becoming increasingly violent so Max von Baden handed power over to Ebert and the majority SPD (revolution 'from below').
- On 9 November the Kaiser was forced to abdicate and a republic was declared.
- Philipp Scheidemann, an SPD leader and Chancellor of Germany from February to July 1919, argued that Germany's military collapse was not the result of revolution but rather the revolution was the result of military collapse.

**Points suggesting the actions of revolutionaries were the principal cause of the revolution and the creation of the Weimar Republic**

- Ludendorff and then Max von Baden did not want a revolution as such but rather wanted to stop one from happening.
- Although Ludendorff had handed power to Max von Baden he did this so the army would not be blamed for losing the war and because he thought that a civilian government would be better able to secure a lenient peace from the allies.
- Almost before the republic had even been created Ludendorff was putting it about that the German army had been betrayed – 'stabbed in the back' – by the civilian politicians, especially the socialists.
- From late October the unrest across Germany proved to be a powerful stimulus towards the creation of a full-blown republic (the revolution 'from below').
- Naval mutinies at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven encouraged the creation of sailors, soldiers and workers councils (soviets) across the country and these soviets – which were SPD dominated rather than Bolshevik – now challenged the authority of the states' governments.
- In response to the unrest and the spread of soviets, Max von Baden resigned and handed power to Ebert.
- The Communist Spartacists were also pushing for radical change; they wanted to see the immediate formation of a soviet republic as had been created in Russia in 1917.
- It was the combined impact of the events of the revolution 'from below' rather than military defeat as such that led directly to the creation of the republic.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Detlev Peukert (1987)**: The first phase of the revolution began "at the end of September 1918 when Germany's leaders decided to face up to imminent defeat on the battlefield". But the origins of the revolution in fact "go back much further" – to the disillusionment, dissatisfaction and anger caused by the authorities' failure to win the war and failure to ensure that during the war, standards of living did not fall and the burdens of the war were shared equally.
- **William Carr (1991 edn)**: By the end of October 1918 "a revolutionary situation existed in Germany". Wartime privation and hardship had eroded the old relationship between the Kaiser and his people. The shock of military defeat "was the last straw". Even so, it is only with the actions of the sailors at Wilhelmshaven from 30 October that the revolution can be said to have truly begun.
- **Ruth Henig (1998)**: The Weimar Republic was established "in inauspicious circumstances, in a defeated country at the end of a long war".
- **Stephen Lee (1998)**: Views the revolution as springing not simply from military defeat or from the actions of revolutionaries but rather from a mixture of ingredients: "defeat in the war, a disintegrating army and a radicalised left".
- **A J Nicholls (2000 edn)**: There were dramatic changes in Germany from September 1918, but the revolution began when the sailors at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven refused to obey orders, set up soviets and hoisted the Red Flag.
- **Eberhard Kolb (2004 edn)**: The German Empire weathered the storm of war for as long as the majority of Germans were borne up by the belief in ultimate victory, but when this belief faded and military defeat was in sight the political and social tensions of the empire rapidly developed into an acute political crisis that ended in the collapse of the state, the coming of revolution and the founding of the Republic. It was the shock of defeat that created ever-increasing support for revolutionary groups from the population.
- **Eric D Weitz (2007)**: The revolution of 1918–19 "spread from Kiel".

**Question 2**

**What factors best explain why the Weimar Republic was able to survive political attacks from the Left and the Right between 1919 and 1923?**

The aim of this essay is to enable candidates to review the political attacks on the republic from the left and from the right and to offer explanations about why these attacks did not succeed.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**A review of the attacks on the republic from the left and why these did not succeed that could include examples such as**

- January 1919: The Spartacist uprising and the swift response of the government to crush it using the army and the *Freikorps* in accordance with the Ebert-Groener pact of 10 November 1918.
- March 1919: The Bavarian soviet republic set up, backed by Red Guards and workers' councils, and crushed by the *Freikorps* in May 1919.
- March 1920: The Communist seizure of control of the Ruhr using the Ruhr Army which had been set up to resist the pro-Kapp *Putsch* army and *Freikorps*. However, the Ruhr revolutionaries were divided over government concessions and, obeying Ebert's orders, the army crushed the Ruhr rising with the help of the *Freikorps*.
- April 1920: Left-wing disturbances in Saxony and Thuringia suppressed by the government.
- Summer 1923: Economic crisis encouraged the KPD and the Comintern to organise a German Bolshevik revolution. Communist action centred on Saxony, but collapsed when the army was sent in to overthrow the SPD-KPD led Saxon government.
- Left-wing attacks failed for a variety of reasons including inadequate leadership, poor organisation internal divisions and lack of support. Furthermore, the government, often using Article 48 of the constitution highly effectively, acted swiftly and decisively to crush these uprisings and was strongly supported by the army and the *Freikorps* in its efforts to do so.

**A review of the attacks on the republic from the right and why these did not succeed that might include examples such as**

- March 1920: the Kapp *putsch* (led by Wolfgang Kapp, *Freikorps* leader Captain Hermann Ehrhardt and General Luttwitz) which originated in the government's efforts to reduce the size of the army in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and resulted in the army's refusal to support the government (the most influential staff officer in the defence ministry, General Hans von Seekt, declared that, "troops do not fire on troops" when he was asked by Ebert to organise the suppression of the Kapp *putschists*). This attempted *coup d'etat* was brought to an end by a General Strike organised by the trade unions.
- September 1923: The Bavarian state government opposed Gustav Streseman's decision to call off passive resistance in the Ruhr. It regarded the central government in Berlin as too left wing. The Bavarian government was concerned about the Communists' participation in the left-wing state governments of Saxony and Thuringia. However, the Bavarian government's threat to organise a march on Berlin came to nothing when Stresemann sent the army into Saxony and Thuringia and overthrew the left-wing governments of these states.
- November 1923: the Munich *putsch*, coming in the wake of the hyperinflation crisis and led by Adolf Hilter and the Nazis with support from General Ludendorff, was another attempt to overthrow the government in Berlin. The *putschists* did not get the support they had anticipated from the army, the police or the people and so did not succeed.
- Right wing attacks tended to fail because they over-estimated the strength of their popular support and were unsure how to proceed when faced with opposition. This was certainly the case in the Kapp and Munich *putsches*.

**A review of political assassinations 1920–23 that could include**

- Over 20 murders committed by left-wing extremists and over 300 committed by right-wing extremists.
- Right-wing extremists in particular organised assassinations of politicians they considered to be traitors to Germany.
- Victims included Matthias Erzberger (Centre Party statesman, head of the armistice delegation which accepted the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and later Finance Minister) murdered in August 1921, and Walther Rathenau (head of AEG the electrical company, who also participated in the armistice talks and became Foreign Minister in February 1922) murdered in June 1922 by Organisation Consul, extreme right-wing terrorists who hated the fact that Rathenau was involved in Versailles and was a Jew. 700 000 demonstrated against Rathenau's murder.
- Political murders helped to foster disillusionment with democracy, however, the republic survived in spite of them because they were not part of a single concerted and organised attack on the republic and because, especially following Rathenau's murder, there was a general revulsion against these tactics.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.
These may include reference to:**

- **Detlev Peukert (1987)**: The republic survived the political challenges from the left and the right because "it was not challenged by a convincing, full-dress alternative. The left had not yet recovered from its defeats of 1919 and 1920. The right was divided and pre-occupied with short-term campaigns of action".
- **William Carr (1991 edn)**: notes the readiness of governments under attack to use Article 48 of the constitution and Ebert's willingness, while President of the Republic, to consent to declarations of national emergency to protect the republic.
- **Ruth Henig (1998)**: From 1919–23 the republic was assaulted by Nationalists on the right and by Communists on the left. "It managed to survive, but not to win the active support of the majority of the population."
- **Stephen Lee (1998)**: the crises of 1919–23 were insufficient to destroy the republic at this stage. The radical left and right 'were disunited', the government used the constitution to keep control and the role of the army 'was ambivalent.' Indeed, Lee views the role of the army as decisive because it held back from actively backing right-wing movements and at the same time took an active role in suppressing left-wing revolts.
- **A J Nicholls (2000 edn)**: the ability of republican governments to withstand conspiratorial assaults "increased the tendency among monarchists and authoritarian opponents of the regime to make compromises with it".
- **Hite and Hinton (2000)**: note the fact that in the years 1919–23 the extreme left and the extreme right "failed to attract much support and were both divided and disorganised".
- **Eberhard Kolb (2004 edn)**: Weimar governments acted with different degrees of determination, and the army tended to be ambiguous in its support for those on the right intent on bringing down the legitimate government of the country.

**Question 3**

**"An economic miracle". How justified is the view that Nazi economic policies steered Germany towards economic recovery between 1933 and 1939?**

The aim of this question is to enable candidates to examine critically the argument – and the claims made by the Nazis themselves – that Nazi economic policies were responsible for Germany's economic recovery. Candidates would be expected to make reference to the period 1933–36 (when the economy was directed by Hjalmar Schacht) and at 1936–1939 (when the economy was run by Goering).

**Points supporting the claim that the Nazis' economic policies steered Germany towards economic recovery. These might include:**

- Hitler was determined and as a result of the Enabling Law he had more freedom to take decisive action than the Weimar governments had had under the 1919 constitution.
- The repression of Trade unions helped to restore business confidence, as did the ending of reparations payments.
- The appointment of Hjalmar Schacht as Economics Minister (the man who had reputedly saved Germany in the 1923 hyperinflation crisis). He embarked on a policy of deficit spending (whereby the government spends more than it receives in order to expand the economy). The new Nazi government increased public expenditure and investment in public works schemes (particularly in the construction of homes and motorways). Such works provided orders for many private companies who took on more workers.
- Profits in key industries increased, wages were kept low and the economy began to pick up.
- By the end of 1935 Germany had a trade surplus, unemployment had fallen and industrial production had increased by 49·5% since 1933.
- When the Nazis came to power Germany was importing more than it was exporting and gold and currency reserves were running low. Schacht's New Plan helped to overcome the country's balance of payments problems that resulted from this.
- Incipient recovery was sustained in Germany through the 1930s, whereas it was not in other countries, eg the United States. It was also much stronger in Germany.
- The refusal of the Nazi government to curtail spending when recovery had begun in the mid 1930s, and its insistence instead on increased levels of spending, mostly on autarky and rearmament programmes, was probably a factor in Germany's sustained recovery from the Depression.
- From 1936 Goering's Four Year Plan controlled foreign exchange, labour, raw materials and prices and thereby created a managed economy. In this period, the drive for rearmament helped to ensure that recovery was sustained.

**Points against the view that the Nazis economic policies steered Germany towards economic recovery. These might include:**

- Under Schacht the new regime in fact continued the policies of its predecessors, Bruning and Schleicher, and these policies were already beginning to have an effect before Hitler came to power. Unemployment, for instance, had passed its peak before Hitler came to power.
- Hitler was lucky; cyclical recovery was already underway in 1932, in Germany and elsewhere, and this owed more to the 'laws' of economic development than it did to governmental policy.
- The ending of reparations had little economic effect although it may have had a psychological effect (on confidence).
- Schacht's apparent success hid fundamental structural weaknesses. For example, although he had disguised a continuing balance of payments problem by clever financial schemes Schacht was unable to settle the competing demands for resources between, for instance, agriculture and the armaments industry.
- Between 1936 and 1937 there was in fact a balance of payments crisis. In early 1936 it became clear to Schacht that increasing demands of rearmament and consumption meant Germany would go deeply into debt. He suggested a reduction in spending on armaments. This was not acceptable to the Nazi leadership or to the army.
- Some degree of additional recovery from the Depression happened in 1936/7 in all industrialised countries, apparently regardless of the policies they pursued.
- Goering's Four Year Plan and the drive for rearmament and autarky caused the economy to overheat; there was still a serious problem of shortage of resources.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Richard Overy (1996 edn)**: "Many of the Nazi economic policies had their roots in the Weimar period."
- **Hite and Hinton (2000)**: "Hitler was lucky. Both the German and the world slump had bottomed out by late 1932, and the economy was improving."
- **Geoff Layton (2005)**: On the recovery of 1936, "It is difficult to believe that such a marked turnaround would have been achieved without Nazi economic policy".
- **Wolfgang Benz (2006)**: The German economy recovered more quickly from the depression than the economies of other countries. In part this was "the result of long-term economic cycles, but mostly it was due to the effect of the government's path towards autarky and rearmament, pursued and guided with the help of state contracts from 1934 on". Moreover, Schacht's financing schemes "were as ingenious as they were adventurous".
- **Adam Tooze (2006)**: The evidence suggests that "the German economy, like its American, British and Japanese counterparts, began its recovery in the summer of 1932". The economic impact of measures taken after January 1933, therefore, "should not be exaggerated". Downplays work creation and motorisation policies. Instead it was rearmament that from the outset propelled Nazi economic recovery.
- **Tim Kirk (2007)**: Many of the policies associated with the Nazi economic recovery were "products of the Weimar Republic, and not unusual in other countries". The Nazis had the good fortune "to come to power at a time when the world economy was beginning to recover anyway, but took measures to promote and accelerate the recovery in Germany".
- **Roderick Stackelberg (2007)**: The Nazis built in part on initiatives begun by Hitler's predecessor, Kurt von Schleicher, but they nevertheless "undertook innovative measures to counter the effects of the Great Depression".

**Question 4**

**How important were anti-Semitic policies in the Nazis' attempt to set up a *volksgemeinschaft*, 1933–39?**

The aim of this question is to enable candidates to weigh up the importance of anti-Semitic policies against the importance of other Nazi social policies that were designed to set up a *volksgemeinschaft*.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**A review of the anti-Semitic policies designed to exclude Jews completely from German society. This could include:**

- 1 April 1933: The national boycott of Jewish businesses.
- 7 April 1933: the *Law for the Restoration of the Civil Service* banned all Jews from employment in the Civil Service.
- Sept 1933: the *Entailed Farm Law* banned Jews from owning farms.
- 15 Sept 1935: the *Nuremberg Laws* including the *Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour* which forbade marriages between 'Aryans' and Jews, and the *Reich Citizenship Law* which deprived Jews of citizenship.
- June–Oct 1938: anti-Jewish decrees forbade Jewish doctors, dentist and lawyers from having 'Aryan' patients or clients; excluded Jews from some commercial activities, restaurants, theatres.
- 9–10th Nov 1938: the '*Kristallnacht'* pogrom.
- Nov 1938: *Decrees for the Exclusion of Jews from Economic Life*.
- 15 Nov 1938: Ministry of Education banned all Jewish children from attending state schools.
- 3 Dec 1938: Jews had their driving licences revoked.
- From January 1939: Jews were forced to add Sarah or Israel to their names and have their identity cards stamped with a red J.
- Examples of anti-Semitism in Nazi youth policies (the pervasiveness of anti-Semitism in the entire school curriculum, for instance).
- Examples of anti-Semitism in Nazi policies on women (see *Nuremberg Laws* above).

**A review of policies on other groups treated as 'biological outsiders'. This could include policies on:**

- 'Asocials'.
- The Roma and Sinti.
- Homosexuals.
- Mentally and physically 'handicapped'.

**A review of other Nazi social policies 1933–39 that were designed to help to set up a *volksgemeinschaft*. This could include:**

**Policies on youth such as**

- All youth organisations, except Roman Catholic ones protected under the Concordat, were taken over by the Hitler Youth.
- All other youth organisations were banned.
- 'Coordination' of school teachers: by 1937 97% of teachers had joined the National Socialist Teachers' League.  Members had to attend one-month training courses that stressed Nazi ideology and physical fitness.
- The Nazification of the curriculum.  For instance, History and Biology became vehicles for the inculcation of nationalism and racism.
- The setting up of new Nazi schools.  For example, National Political Institutes of Education for boys aged 10–18 to develop future leaders.
- All university teachers were made to sign a declaration in support of the Fuhrer and the Nazi state.
- Students were forced to join the Nazi controlled German Students' League.

**Policies on women such as**

- The attempt to reduce the number of women in the workplace.
- The introduction of marriage loans to encourage women to marry and have children.
- Making marriage to 'non-aryans' illegal.
- Increase in welfare services for mothers.

**Policies on the churches such as**

- The Concordat with the Roman Catholic Church.  Church and state agreed to respect each other's roles.
- The creation of a Reich Church to co-ordinate all Protestant churches.
- The Nazi supported Protestant group called the German Christians called for the cleansing of the gospels of un-German elements.

**Policies on workers and peasants such as**

- Trade Unions abolished and replaced by the German Workers' Front (DAF).
- The imposition of tariffs on imported foodstuffs while stimulating home demand for German produce.
- The Entailed Farm Law which aimed to give the peasantry 'of German blood' security of ownership by ruling that farms between 7·5 and 10 hectares could not be split up in the course of inheritance.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Wippermann (1991)**: Racial anti-Semitism was the key element in a programme designed to achieve the recovery of the Aryan Germanic race. The Nazi regime's *volksgemeinschaft* was based on the exclusion and the extermination of all those deemed to be alien, but especially the Jews. In the Third Reich this racial programme "became official dogma and the policy of the State". Social classes continued to exist, but Nazi Germany was increasingly "organised on racial rather than class lines".
- **Richard J Evans (2005)**: From September 1935 anti-Semitism became "a principle governing private as well as public life".
- **Tim Kirk (2007)**: The Nazis' preoccupations in the attempt to create a *volksgemeinschaft* "embraced the usual targets of right-wing populism: emancipated women and working mothers; lack of discipline in the young and the decline in social deference". The Nazis also picked up on concerns about criminality and disorder 'putting the blame on outsiders in the community.' And for the idea of the *volksgemeinschaft* to convince there "had to be some sense that industrial workers accepted and were being integrated into the nation".
- **Lisa Pine (2007)**: Once in power Hitler's intense personal hatred of the Jews "became central to state policy".
- **Roderick Stackelberg (2007)**: the *volksgemeinschaft* stood for "the overcoming of class, denominational, occupational and political divisions through the cultivation of a sense of ethnic solidarity".
- **Evans and Jenkins (2008 edn)**: Hitler's determination to create a *volksgemeinschaft* of Aryans of a healthy physical and mental condition "proved to be the most consistent, coherent and revolutionary aspect of Nazism". The Nazis were determined "to discriminate against or persecute all those who failed to fulfil their racial criteria".
- **Jill Stephenson (2008)**: the national community was to be based "on race and 'value', criteria which were intended to override the customary divisions of capitalist societies along the lines of class".
- **Nikolaus Wachsmann (2008)**: The Nazis believed that an extensive policy of exclusion was needed for national salvation and this meant repression of all 'racial aliens', above all of the Jews.

**Question 5**

**To what extent can the limited opposition to the Nazis after 1933 be explained by divisions within the opposition itself?**

The aim of this question is to enable candidates to examine the reasons for the lack of opposition in Nazi Germany up to 1939. Candidates would be expected to discuss why divisions within the opposition itself contributed to the failure of the opposition's efforts to resist the regime and the success of the regime in repressing opposition from early on and effectively preventing opposition thereafter. Candidates would be expected to engage with the historical debate about why opposition to the Nazis was so limited and how much the Nazis depended on consent and how much on coercion.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Commentary on the divisions within/weaknesses of the opposition itself**

- Opposition did not exist as one unified movement but was rather fragmented, often along class lines.
- Communist and Social Democrat underground opposition remained bitterly divided and completely unable to cooperate.
- There was lack of organisation, leadership and the ability to maintain secrecy.
- Opposition lacked a common purpose and was weakened by diversity of motives.
- Those in the army who had doubts about the regime were torn between their consciences and their loyalty: each soldier had taken an oath of allegiance to the Fuhrer and this was taken very seriously.
- The Churches were deeply divided over, and confused about, what to do about the Nazi regime. Both the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches tended to look after their own interests and so came to terms with the regime (for example, the *Concordat* between the state and the Vatican (20 July 1933) ensured that opposition from the Roman Catholic Church was neutered).

**Commentary on other factors that explain the limited opposition to the regime**

- 28 February 1933: *Decree of the Reich President for the Protection of the Nation and the State*, used to repress the KPD. By the end of March 20 000 Communists were in prison and by summer 100 000 Communists, Social Democrats and trade unionists.
- 13 March 1933: Goebbels appointed Minister of Propaganda and Enlightenment. The Nazis now took complete control of the press, radio, cinema and all cultural output and were thereby able to prevent opposition views from being heard and to ensure the complete dominance of Nazi propaganda.
- 22 June 1933: SPD banned; other political parties dissolved themselves soon after. Trade unions were made illegal.
- 30 June 1933: 'Night of the Long Knives' destroyed internal opposition (from the SA) and won support from the army for Hitler.
- 14 July 1933: *Law Against the Formation of New Parties*. Germany became a one party state.
- Success of apparatus of the Nazi Police State from 1933–39. In search of enemies of the state the *Gestapo* was allowed to operate outside the law and take suspects into custody. Such victims were liable to be tortured and sent to concentration camps. The courts were also thoroughly Nazified and the establishment of the People's Court (April 1934) ensured that 'treasonable offences' were dealt with harshly.
- The success and effectiveness of *Gleichschaltung*.
- Terror was highly effective as disincentive to opposition to the regime.
- Nazi propaganda did have an impact in persuading people to support the regime but, more important, as unemployment fell and living standards improved so more people felt better off and were minded to support rather than oppose the regime.
- Many people also welcomed Hitler's promises to restore national prestige, and his foreign policy successes 1933–39 seemed to many, proof that Hitler was able to fulfil these promises.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Klaus-Michael Mallmann and Gerhard Paul (1993):** The National Socialist rulers could live with insubordination, superficial conformity and insidious criticism "as long as the consensus in political fundamental principles appeared secure and dissatisfaction, nonconformity and partial opposition did not coalesce and organise" effectively.

- **Ian Kershaw (1985 and 1991):** An essential contribution to fundamental opposition to the National Socialist regime came from many ordinary people from working class circles, organised by the SPD and the KPD. However, resistance and opposition to Hitler "acted without the active mass support of the population". Large proportions of the population did not even passively support the resistance but rather, "widely condemned it". Resistance from groups hostile to the regime never ceased, but resistance was "fragmented, atomised and isolated from any possibility of mass support". In any case, "opposition – real and potential – was crushed and neutralised through the unprecedented level of repression by the Nazi state".

- **Robert Gellately (2001):** It was a characteristic feature of Nazi Germany that "the regime found no difficulty in obtaining the collaboration of ordinary citizens". On balance, Gellately argues, most people "seemed prepared to live with the idea of a surveillance society, to put aside the opportunity to develop the freedoms we usually associate with liberal democracies, in return for crime-free streets, a return to prosperity, and what they regarded as good government… There was no organised resistance".

- **Richard J Evans (2005):** In his critique of Gellately, Evans argues that Nazi terror was "nowhere more apparent than in the emerging power and fearsome reputation of the *Gestapo*". The *Gestapo* attained "an almost mythical status" as all-seeing and all-knowing although "the reality was rather different". Yet even so, Nazi Germany was not a self-policing society: "Denunciation was the exception, not the rule as far as the behaviour of the vast majority of Germans was concerned." Ultimately it was the *Gestapo* and the agencies it employed, exploited and worked alongside "who kept Germans under surveillance, not the German people". Moreover, everything that happened in the Third Reich took place "in a pervasive atmosphere of fear and terror, which never slackened…' And the Nazis did not just use terrorism to coerce the people; they also went to "unprecedented lengths" in propaganda to gain the enthusiastic support of the people and to change people's hearts and minds.

- **Nikolaus Wachsmann (2008):** Hitler's police apparatus "commanded extensive weapons of repression". Fear of the *Gestapo* "was widespread". The *Gestapo* drew extensively on support from outside its ranks. "It used information and denunciations from paid informers, low-ranking party activists, and state and municipal agencies, as well as from the general public." In addition, German judges did not need any prompting to crack down on the left opposition. In all, several tens of thousands of people had been sentenced for treason by 1939, usually for their connections with the Communist Party.

**Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A in explaining the advantages and disadvantages of the Dawes Plan for Germany's economic and political recovery after 1924?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

Candidates offer a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source A** as an explanation of the advantages and disadvantages of the Dawes Plan for Germany's economic and political recovery in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

**Origin**

- Accurate commentary on Gustav Stresemann's tenure as Chancellor and then Foreign Minister. During his time as Chancellor (1923) Stresemann had helped to organise and set up the Dawes Committee and as Foreign Minister (1924–29) he was the driving force behind winning acceptance of the Dawes Plan in Germany.

**Purpose**

- Source is a defence of Dawes in which Stresemann sets out why he thinks the Dawes Plan is so important and why it has – in his view rightly – been accepted.

**Points from source which highlight the ADVANTAGES for Germany, according to Stresemann, of acceptance of the Dawes Plan**

- The Dawes Plan is not just about material resources but will also help to restore Germany's sense of national pride and honour ('spiritual resources').
- The Dawes plan represents 'hope of progress' and stability ('settled conditions') for Germany.
- The Dawes Plan represents 'a new starting point for Germany' and for the world and a more peaceful and harmonious Europe ('pacified Europe').
- The Dawes Plan brings Germany's isolation in Europe to and end ('The time of national isolation is over.')
- The Dawes Plan will bring a new sense of freedom for Germans because they have been able to take part in the negotiations which they were not permitted to do when the original Treaty of Versailles was imposed on them ('a freedom secured by Treaty').
- Fulfilling the Dawes Plan will be difficult but at least it has been accepted by the Reichstag.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- The Dawes Plan dealt with the vexed problem of reparations demanded in the Treaty of Versailles and set by the Inter Allied Commission of 1921.
- The German economy was stricken by hyperinflation following the French and Belgian invasion of the Ruhr in January 1923, which was in turn a response to the German government's announcement in 1922 that it would not be able to make reparations payments for 1923.
- Reparations were paid in kind (coal and manufactured products) and in money in the form of gold, but not paper money.
- The German government bought the materials from German manufacturers and producers and gave them to nine foreign governments, but especially to France (50%) and Britain (20%).
- The Allied governments received the products and the money and kept some for their own use (to pay war pensions, for instance) but also paid back some of their war loans to America.
- Although Dawes did not reduce the size of the reparations cake it extended the length of time for reparations to be paid.
- The plan for recovery was based on an 800 million mark loan to help stabilise the currency.
- American loans came direct from the US government and from private investors. They were lent to both the German federal government and state governments to finance various spending programmes such as housing. Loans also went to private firms to help their expansion. American firms invested directly in Germany with firms such as General Motors and General Electric setting up factories there.
- Following the Dawes Plan Germany received more in loans than it paid in reparations.
- The Dawes Plan did indeed help to finance a recovery of the German economy that lasted until 1929.

**Points from recall which provide wider and more critical contextualisation of the DISADVANTAGES of the Dawes Plan**

- In return for their outlay Americans received interest payments on their loans or dividends from their investments.
- Although Germany received more in loans than it paid out in reparations, reparations were still permanent losses to Germany and loans had to be repaid.
- Overdependence on American loans (overdependence that was compounded by the Young Plan, 1929) meant that when the American economy crashed following the Wall Street Crash in October 1929 the German economy was hit hard too. So the Dawes Plan was a short-term success but did nothing to stabilise the German economy in the long term and indeed ensured that Germany's economic recovery was superficial rather than substantial.
- The Dawes Plan provided further fuel for right-wing nationalist attacks on the republic and democracy (especially from the Nazis) and so did nothing in the long term to heal the deep rifts in German politics that had existed since the November Revolution and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles.
- Nationalist opponents of the republic hated the Dawes Plan because they argued it did nothing to free Germany from the shackles of the Versailles; the 'shameful peace', the 'Diktat' (the Allies retained control of the railways, the Reichsbank and customs duties).
- The Dawes Plan ensured that the Treaty of Versailles, and especially the War Guilt and Reparations clauses, remained central in people's dissatisfaction with the republic. So the Dawes Plan helped the right and in the long term further undermined people's faith in democracy.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Detlev Peukert (1987)**: the Dawes Plan "granted Germany a reasonable scale of reparations payments". The technical problems of Germany's ability to pay "were detached from Franco-German rivalry". Dawes was also "a victory for financial realism". However, "in the medium term a vicious circle developed, as American credits were followed by German reparations payments, which led to French credit repayments, primarily to the Americans, which in turn were followed by new American credits. In late 1929 this whole overblown system collapsed, and the countries involved were sucked into world-wide recession".

- **Ruth Henig (1998)**: the Dawes Plan "proved extremely beneficial" in terms of attracting short-term capital to Germany. It enabled German industry "to recover its pre-war levels of output and to undergo significant modernisation of its factories and manufacturing processes". But the Dawes package was hated by the right-wing nationalists who condemned it as "enslavement to the allies".

- **Stephen Lee (1998)**: the Dawes Plan "drew the sting" from the commitment to reparations payments and "an enormous boost" was provided by the inflow of American investments. However, recovery was "based too heavily on externally generated credit. Short-term loans were used to finance long-term capital projects, the assumption being that it would not be difficult to renew the loans as payments fell due. This made the German economy highly vulnerable to any major fluctuations on the American stock market".

- **Eberhard Kolb (2005 edn)**: In spite of its disadvantages, the Dawes Plan "had some decisive advantages" for Germany. It "eased relations between Germany and the Allies", it provided Germany with "a breathing space" and it laid down precisely "from what sources and to what amounts the reparations should be paid".

- **Eric D Weitz (2007)**: For Germany, the Dawes Plan, and the withdrawal of French troops from the Ruhr that went with it, "constituted the final pieces of the stabilisation program". Yet the reparations issue "was far from resolution". Furthermore, reparations was an issue "handed on a silver platter to all the forces opposed to Weimar democracy". Propaganda against Dawes (and later on against the Young Plan) "sapped the political will and determination of even reasonable politicians who were ground down by popular outrage and grandstanding against reparations.". The right kept up a steady stream of attacks on the Dawes Plan, which they likened to "a second Versailles".

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** offers a full perspective on the advantages and disadvantages of the Dawes Plan.

**Question 2**

**How fully does Source B explain the reasons why people became members of the Nazi Party, 1925–1933?** **(12 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context and recall, including historians' views, that candidates provide in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

Candidates offer a structured evaluation of **Source B** as an adequate explanation of the reasons why people became members of the Nazi Party in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include comment on Theodore Abel, an American sociologist who set out to try to understand why people became members of the Nazi Party. Abel went to Germany in 1934 and collected autobiographies from members of the Nazi Party and then used these testimonies as the basis of a study of why people joined the Nazi Party.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- The source identifies a number of reasons why people became members of the Nazi Party, many of which are now widely accepted by historians because the evidence seems to bear them out.
- From 1929 in particular many Germans did indeed feel that their personal and social values were threatened and that Hitler and the Nazis offered a collective approach that would address these fears.
- Evidence from a variety of studies since Abel's research was carried out bear out his contention that Nazi ideology appealed to people because it often reflected views they already held, and that the energy and resourcefulness, and indeed youthfulness, of the party were important factors contributing to the party's attractiveness.
- Subsequent studies also bear out Abel's findings that Hitler's charismatic leadership was a crucial factor in attracting people to the Nazi Party and indeed his charismatic leadership was the 'glue' that held the National Socialist movement and its supporters together.
- Abel argues what many later historians have argued; namely, that there was not one single causal factor in drawing people to Nazi Party membership but rather a combination of factors.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- The Munich *putsch* failed to achieve its aim, but it hugely increased Hitler's authority and popularity and so enabled him to dominate the Nazi Party and movement upon his release from jail in early 1925.
- From 1926 Nazi Party membership increased markedly. 26 000 members were added in 1926 and the same number again in 1927.
- 35 000 people joined the party in 1928.
- A year later the Nazis had 3 400 party branches.
- The Great Depression speeded up Nazi recruitment and there were 850 000 members of the party by the time Hitler was appointed Chancellor in January 1933.
- Party membership was male-dominated and lower middle class with the working class under-represented.
- Party membership was also youthful. Over half of members were under the age of 41 and over a third were under 30.
- Many of those who joined the party had spent their formative years in the crises of the Republic and the Nazis' promises to end crises made the NSDAP attractive.
- After 1930 the membership changed as more working class men joined during the depression period.
- Membership of the SA, however, was different from membership of the party for the SA attracted far more manual workers. This led to tension between the lower middle class Nazi Party and the largely working class SA.

**Points from recall which provide wider and more critical contextualisation of the views in the source**

- The core Nazi message did not change after the failed Munich *putsch*. Hitler and the Nazis continued to focus on those themes that had been at the centre of their campaigning before the *putsch*.
- So, for example, attacking the Treaty of Versailles and the 'November Criminals' continued to be a key element in the Nazis' attack on the 'Weimar System' and democracy.
- What had changed dramatically from the 1928 agricultural depression on were the economic and political circumstances in which the Nazis' messages were now being spread and listened to.
- There is absolutely no doubt that just as the Nazi vote rose during the period of the depression so too did party membership.
- Although it is true that the 1933 membership of 850 000 seems paltry as a proportion of the total German population (of some 64 million people), this was part of a deliberate policy of the Nazi leadership to preserve an elite group. The 850 000 formed a dedicated core of relatively young, male activists, led by men from the lower middle classes.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Conan Fischer (1995)**: The middle classes joined the Nazi Party for a variety of reasons apart from their attraction to nationalist sentiments. They were also attracted by the Nazi Party's authoritarianism, anti-parliamentarianism and its traditionalism. By contrast, "idleness, hunger and poverty" among young workers during the slump alienated them from the traditional labour movement, and the NSDAP, especially the SA, "combined protest with the provision of basic material assistance and the promise of concrete, rapid measures to revive the labour market once in power".
- **Dick Geary (2000)**: Workers were "far less likely than middle-class elements" to be members of the NSDAP. The messages deployed by Nazi propaganda to attract and mobilise support "were many and various. The most significant were nationalism, denunciation of the Treaty of Versailles and anti-Marxism".
- **Richard J Evans (2003)**: For the grass roots party activist the speeches of Hitler and the banners and parades were more significant than elaborate theories. Among ordinary party activists in the 1920s and early 1930s "the most important aspect of Nazi ideology was its emphasis on social solidarity". It is worth noting, however, that "a substantial proportion of the party's members left after only a short time in its ranks". Even so, "by the early 1930s the Nazi Party was beginning to extend its appeal beyond the lower middle class that had provided its backbone since its foundation".
- **Tim Kirk (2007)**: The class composition of the party's membership "has been controversial". Even so, it seems to have been the case that the middle class were over-represented in party membership and even more heavily represented in the leadership than in the party as whole. The proportion of members from the lower classes was greater in the SA than in the party. Moreover, in spite of mass unemployment, those out of work "were in fact strikingly resistant to the party's appeal and decidedly under-represented among the party's members".
- **Peter Fritzsche (2008)**: No single explanation for the success of the Nazis is completely satisfying. It is possible to suggest "a focused interpretation" that stresses the Nazis' innovative political tactics, the charismatic leadership of Hitler and the disintegrative effects of the Great Depression. But "a broader interpretation" might emphasise instead "the political radicalisation of the nationalist camp as whole in the wake of WWI and the November Revolution" and "downplay strictly economic factors".

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source B** offers a full explanation of the reasons why people became members of the Nazi Party, 1925–33.

**Question 3**

**How well do Sources C and D illustrate differing interpretations of the significance of the "Night of the Long Knives" in the Nazi consolidation of power after 1933?** (16 marks)

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources C** and **D** on the significance of the "Night of the Long Knives" in the Nazi consolidation of power and offers a structured evaluation of how much the two interpretations reveal in terms of:

**Source C**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- *Volkischer Beobachter*: the Nazi newspaper.
- The Reich Cabinet of 3 July 1934, which met specifically to pass a retrospective law that would legalise the purge of the SA that had taken place on 30 June 1934.
- The fact that the Cabinet was effectively the Chancellor, Hitler.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Hitler's account of the 'high treason SA plot' (there was no plot).
- The significance of the support given to Hitler by the army via General Blomberg.
- The significance of the claim that Hitler had acted with 'greatness' and had 'saved the German nation from civil war'.
- The explicitly retrospective nature of the new law on 'measures for the self-defence of the state'.
- The significance of the support of the Minister of Justice.
- The claim by the Justice Minister that the purge of 30 June was not only legal but also Hitler's duty.
- The new law was passed by the Cabinet without recourse to the President (ie it was passed following the *Enabling Act* of March 1933).

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- The "Night of the Long Knives" was Hitler's deliberate action to crush the SA, which had become a threat to his own power and support and was holding back support for him from the army.
- Hitler needed the support of the army in order to remain in power and succeed to the presidency.
- He also needed the army's technical expertise for the rearmament programme, which he had launched in the summer of 1933.
- He could not therefore afford to lose the support of the two new leaders of the army, The Defence Minister, General Blomberg and the new Chief-of-Staff, Reichnau. These two persuaded Hitler to make a choice between themselves and the SA.
- Hitler was finally pushed into action by Goering and Himmler's reports of 'rumours' of an SA uprising.

**Source D**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Accurate comments on Tim Kirk will receive credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- The killings on the "Night of the Long Knives" were definitely murder.
- Hitler needed to consolidate his position because the German economy was not yet in full recovery and secure.
- The 'activities of the stormtroopers' were losing him support and undermining his claims that the Nazis were for law and order.
- The SS, led by Himmler, were being prevented from expanding their power because of the SA.
- The killings of 30 June were clearly illegal, but Hitler received universal support for his action.
- Hitler took for himself the role of Germany's supreme judge and the legal establishment did not object.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- The "Night of the Long Knives" solved many of the problems that faced Hitler in the early summer of 1934 and secured the consolidation of his power.
- Getting rid of Rohm and his rebellious SA won him the support of the army and conservative circles, and ended public disquiet over the street violence and terrorism of the SA.
- After the 30 June purge the SA lost its importance but the SS was now able to become the most powerful empire within the Nazi state.
- The 'Old Fighters' of the SA, without whom Hitler could never have got into power in the first place, were sacrificed in order that he could meet his major objectives: supreme power for himself, the support of the army, political stability and economic recovery.
- The "Night of the Long Knives" increased Hitler's personal standing and authority in the country.
- Frick drafted the new law that declared the murders of 30 June legal and it was passed by the Reichstag (which was by now nothing more than a Nazi assembly).

**Points from recall which offer wider and more critical contextualisation of the views in the sources**

The "Night of the Long Knives" was not the only significant action in the consolidation of power. Other significant developments in the process of *Gleichschaltung* ('Coordination') included:

- **28 Feb 1933**: Emergency Decrees following the Reichstag fire. These became the basic law of the Third Reich and were used to suspend constitutional rights, to give the secret police the power to hold people indefinitely in 'protective custody', and to suppress the KPD.
- 13 March: The takeover of the press and the media through the establishment of the Ministry for Enlightenment and Propaganda.
- 24 March: The Enabling Act (became the virtual constitution of the Third Reich).
- 7 April: Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (Jews and non-Germans excluded from Public service).
- 2 May: Trade Unions abolished.
- 14 July: Law Against the Formation of New Parties (Germany became a one party state).
- 14 October: Reichstag dissolved. In the elections of 12 November the Nazis won 92% of votes.
- **January 1934**: Elected state assemblies dissolved and Reich governors created to run the states.
- 1 August: Law Concerning the Head of State of the German Reich merged the offices of Chancellor and President in the new position of the Fuhrer and Reich Chancellor of Germany. Hitler became Head of State.
- 2 August 1934: Death of Hindenburg. The army then took an oath of personal loyalty to the Fuhrer.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Ian Kershaw (1991)**: The unrestrained brutality of the "Night of the Long Knives" provides "a further pointer to the truth of Mao's dictum that political power 'grows out of the barrel of a gun'". The Rohm purge was a clear example of "unscrupulous deployment of the might of the state".
- **Noakes and Pridham (1998 edn)**: The Nazi takeover represented "a compromise between the Nazi leadership who had acquired political power, and the traditional elites who retained their positions but put themselves at the service of the new regime".
- **Stephen Lee (1998)**: It might be argued that the real revolutionaries were the SA and that Hitler took emergency measures against these in the "Night of the Long Knives". On the other hand, Hitler stopped the second revolution "not through a preference for legality", but to maintain and strengthen his own position.
- **Michael Burleigh (2000)**: The "most spectacular legitimisation of the gravest of crimes" was the retroactive *Law Concerning Measures for the Defence of the State* of 3 July 1934 whereby "Hitler legalised dozens of murders" he had ordered. On 13 July Hitler then used "an aggressive confession to the Reichstag to demonstrate his total disdain for the rule of law".
- **Dick Geary (2000)**: The 30 June purge stood Hitler "in good stead with both the elites and the German public". It showed that the Nazi state "would brook no opposition".
- **Richard J Evans (2005)**: Despite "obviously personal motives" for the 30 June purge, the Nazis "lost no time in pumping out propaganda justifications for the murders". Goebbels and Hitler alleged there had been an SA plot to overthrow the Nazi regime and that the SA leadership had been infiltrated by Communists. Later, in his speech to the Reichstag on 13 July 1934 Hitler presented his audience with "a fantastic web of claims and assertions about the supposed conspiracy to overthrow the Reich". The speech was an "open confession of the illegality of his action" but "did not run into any criticism from the judicial authorities".
- **Wolfgang Benz (2006)**: The destruction of the labour unions and the disbanding of political parties "was the most spectacular chapter in the conquest of power" by the Nazis.
- **Robert Gellately (2007)**: The 30 June "Blood Purge" was "the first mass murder in the Third Reich and no effort was made to conceal the fact that the killings were without a semblance of a trial".
- **Roderick Stackelberg (2007)**: Despite "the extra-legal nature" of the purge of 30 June 1934 and its brutality, "many Germans regarded it as evidence that the Nazis repudiated the extra-legal violence of the SA".
- **Peter Fritzche (2008)**: The killings of June 30 1934 helped the regime "by burnishing its law-and-order credentials and promoting Hitler's statesmanlike image".

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources illustrate differing interpretations of the significance of the "Night of the Long Knives" in the Nazi consolidation of power after 1933.

**South Africa (1910–1984)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**How accurate is the view that African resistance to the policies of successive South African governments failed to achieve anything of lasting significance between 1910 and 1950?**

This question invites candidates to evaluate the view that African resistance to the white supremacist and segregationist policies of successive South African governments failed to achieve anything of lasting significance between 1910 and 1950. Candidates should show awareness of a range of resistance movements and should not concentrate solely on the ANC.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Evidence that suggests that African resistance failed to achieve anything of lasting significance**

- Led by an educated elite who pursued deferential policies.
- Little attempt to win the support of ordinary Africans, outside of the Transvaal.
- Even in the Transvaal Congress leaders were nervous about identifying with radical popular protest.
- The ANC was internally divided throughout much of the 1920s.
- The ANC leadership rejected the radicalism of the ICU and the millenarianism of rural protest.
- The ICU promised to link urban activists with the rural masses but ultimately it failed.
- Rural resistance existed but it was fragmented and highly local.
- Gumede's links with the CPSA alienated many and further reduced the effectiveness of the ANC.
- ANC methods concentrated on petitions and reasonable approaches.
- Failure to modify the major segregationist laws, including the Natives' Land Act (1913), The Native Urban Areas Act (1923) and the introduction of the colour bar.
- The All African Convention (established 1936) was unsuccessful in its opposition to Hertzog's Native Acts of 1936.
- Many were suspicious of cross-racial alliances.

**Evidence that suggests that there were some achievements of lasting significance**

- The formation of the Congress Youth League.
- The growing recognition of the need to relate to the masses.
- Increased awareness of the importance of direct action.
- Failings of the ANC led to the emergence of more radical movements such as the non-European Unity movement.
- Successful strikes and boycotts in the 1940s raised the profile of African resistance.
- The Programme of Action (1949).
- Increased popular protest in the 1940s, especially after WW2.
- The emergence of radical Africanist ideas and a new sense of African identity.
- The formulation of a non-racial and non-violent political ideology.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- Writing from the perspective of 1978, **Gail Gerhart** in *Black Power in South Africa* emphasised the importance of the emergence of the ideology of African nationalism during the 1940s, contrasting the 'rebels' – the Africanists – with the 'realists' who were moderate and integrationist.
- **Walshe**: criticised Seme, who replaced Gumede and led the ANC through most of the 1930s. Seme was highly critical of communism and when he spoke of Congress' future direction he ignored mass action and instead emphasised self-help and unity.
- **Meli**: as might be expected, sees the emergence of the Youth League as being of crucial importance. "The ANC was put on a path of struggle with a more concrete and radical programme than ever before." However, he also emphasises the achievements of the mineworkers in 1946, which he claims involved between 50,000 and 100,000, and which had a major impact on output. "The miner's strike opened the eyes of our people to the power and indeed the role of the working class, especially the miners, in our national liberation struggle."
- **William Beinart**: writing of this period, stresses the importance of rural resistance in all its manifestations: "Africans were not passive victims of ...oppression and segregation, but were involved in a wide range of inventive political responses and innovative forms of action". On the other hand, he acknowledges that "Africans could not mount any coordinated political action that might challenge the state. In many senses, the rural areas rather than the cities were the primary focus of political conflict in the 1920s". Nevertheless he highlights the significance of the emergence of both radical Africanist ideas and the non-violent, non-racial approach of the ANC for the future.
- **Saul Dubow**: writing in *History Making and Present Day Politics* (2007) comments on the achievements of the 1940s, when the ANC re-emerged as the leading force in black oppositional politics, its character newly reshaped by a growing mass base and an infusion of trade union, communist and Africanist ideas. Whereas early Africanist ideas sought to avoid contact with whites and flourished in rural areas, the Africanism of the 1940s was "overwhelmingly urban in orientation". Its aims were therefore different… its primary objective (was) the removal of white domination and the attainment of full citizenship under African leadership. Elsewhere, in *The ANC*, Dubow makes it clear that he believes the achievements of the 1940s enabled the ANC to lead resistance with new authority in the 1950s.
- **Giliomee and Mbenga**: (2007) credit Alfred Xuma with the revival of the ANC in the 1940s and see this as a major achievement. "Xuma began to transform that somewhat chaotic organisation into a more efficient body… The plaintive nationalism of the ANC made way for an aggressive and confident assertion of the rights of all individuals regardless of colour." They also highlight the importance of the Youth League although they play down its Africanist tendencies: "That view would soon change."

**Question 2**

**How important a factor was South Africa's participation in the Second World War in explaining the NP victory in 1948?**

This question invites candidates to evaluate the relative importance of a range of ways in which South African participation in World War Two increased NP support, while taking into consideration other factors which contributed to NP victory in 1948.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**The political impact of participation in World War Two**

- Hertzog's opposition to South African support for Great Britain and the split with Smuts.
- The legacy for Malan's 'purified' NP of Hertzog's political demise.
- Nevertheless the UP, allied with the Labour Party and the Dominion Party, won the 1943 election with 103 seats, while the NP gained 43.

**The social and economic impact of participation in World War Two**

- The relaxation of pass laws.
- Smuts acceptance of African urbanisation.
- The influx of Africans to towns.
- Impact of this on the availability of African labour on farms.

**Post war problems**

- War-time restrictions remained in place in 1948.
- White unemployment was rising.
- Increased pressure from black trade unions.
- Strikes, squatter movements, urban crime and rural protest frightened many whites.
- Rising cost of living.

**The National Party's 1948 election campaign**

- After 1945 the NP emphasised racial issues.
- The Sauer Report.
- The appeal of apartheid.
- Alliance with the Afrikaner Party.
- Farmers in the Transvaal and the OFS attracted by the promise of cheap contract labour.
- Farmers opposed Smuts price control policy which kept food cheaper for towns.
- Afrikaner traders welcomed the removal of Indian competition promised by stricter segregation.
- NP advocated nationalisation on a wide scale.

**The United Party's election campaign**

- The Fagan Report's rejection of influx control (1946).
- Concerns about the 'liberalism' of Hofmeyr, Smuts' likely successor.
- Lacklustre campaign.
- Smuts' cabinet was largely English speaking.
- Smuts' call for 'millions' of immigrants threatened Afrikaners.
- The vagaries of the electoral system ensured a narrow NP victory.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Nigel Worden**: "The main thrust of support for Malan (during and immediately after the war) came not from far-right organisations, but from an alliance of voters who saw their own position threatened by the economic and social changes within South Africa."
- **James Barber**: argues that Smuts faced new domestic problems after 1945, including issues relating to race relations. But as international opinion turned against racism and colonialism so South Africa was subjected to increasing criticism. This criticism served to reinforce divisions within white society and between black and white. Barber concludes that "increasingly it was race that dominated the scene".
- **G H L Le May**: (in the 1948 election campaign) "the United Party scarcely recognised the changing tide of world opinion. The National Party did – and promised to swim against it".
- **Dan O'Meara**: argues the swing to the NP among Transvaal farmers and white working class voters on the Transvaal was a protest at the relaxation of labour controls during the war which accelerated urbanisation and led to agricultural labour shortages.
- **William Beinart**: "Had it not been for the war, the compromises that Smuts and Hertzog hammered out under the Fusion agreement might have lasted. While Afrikaner exclusivist thinking, the tight equation of ethnicity with nation, certainly found support, the survival of a more broadly based white party may have provided sufficient Afrikaans speakers with an alternative political home."
- **Kenneth Heard**: argues that the UP lost in 1948 as a result of complacency at a time when the British Empire was being transformed with the independence of India, Pakistan and Burma, as well as the onset of the Cold War. He states: "These were some of the more obvious of the general currents that disturbed the minds of men, and that were in the end perhaps to be decisive in the overthrow of the United Party Government. For if there is one thing that is antipathetical to the disturbed, it is the appearance of complacency in those in authority, and it was this appearance that, rightly or wrongly, the government tended to convey".

**Question 3**

**How valid is the claim that apartheid policies entered a "second phase" in the 1960s?**

This question invites candidates to evaluate the validity of the claim that there was a fundamental change in National Party apartheid policies around 1960, which amounted to a 'second phase'. The expression 'second phase' is associated with the work of Deborah Posel (1991), with most historians since then broadly following her line of argument.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**Apartheid policies in the 1950s**

- The ambiguities of the Sauer Report and NP election pledges.
- Apartheid policies in the 1950s, including legislation.
- Baaskap apartheid.
- 'Practical' segregation.
- The 'problem' of urbanised blacks – the attempts at 'influx control'.
- The conflicting demands of mining, agriculture and manufacturing industry.
- The impact of black opposition.
- Despite the government's efforts, black urbanisation increased.

**Possible turning points**

- The 'winds of change' and decolonisation in the many parts of Africa.
- South Africa's growing international isolation.
- The growing demand for African democratic rights.
- Alarm at the increase in urban protest, culminating in Sharpeville.
- The failure of local authorities to deal with urban influx.

**Apartheid in the 1960s**

- 'Total separation'.
- The increasingly repressive nature of the South African state.
- Intensified efforts to decrease the African urban population and withdraw Section 10 rights.
- Separate development and 'independent' homelands.
- Homelands presented as the 'legitimate' way of meeting African political aspirations.
- After 1960 the Broederbond infiltrated the Bantu Affairs Department and worked to undermine the practical apartheid of the 1950s.
- Preference given to industries willing to relocate to areas near the reserves.
- No net increase in the number of urbanised blacks.

**Arguments in favour of continuity between the 1950s and 1960s**

- The Sauer Commission called for total separation of black and white.
- The 'grand design' view of apartheid.
- The role of Verwoerd as the 'visionary' of apartheid from 1948 until his death.
- The aims of apartheid remained throughout the maintenance of white supremacy through white control of the state and the economy.
- The increased emphasis on the reserves in the 1950s, leading to the concept of 'independent homelands' in the 1960s.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Deborah Posel**: argues that the contradictions within the Sauer Report refute the belief that it was a blueprint and that forces outside Afrikanerdom – white and black – influenced the development of apartheid in the 1950s. In the early 1960s, she claims, apartheid "underwent an important change of direction ...which ushered in a discrete second phase of policy making".
- **Clark and Worger**: "Separating the races was not enough… By the end of the 1950s, the government began to move quickly to implement what would be called Grand Apartheid."
- **Brian Bunting**: provides a contemporary communist perspective, arguing that there was continuity between the 1950s and the 1960s. "Operating on the basis of a preconceived ideology… the Nationalists have planned their strategy with care and worked step by step towards their goal. Nothing has been left to chance."
- **Dan O'Meara**: favours the 'grand design' view – sees coherence between the policies of the 1950s and those of the 1960s and claims that the policies of the 1960s such as decentralisation, population removal and homelands development were central to the development of apartheid from the start.
- **James Barber**: "Apartheid was not a single cohesive policy… nor was the application of apartheid set in concrete, rather it evolved as circumstances and ideas developed."
- **Giliomee, Mbenga et al**: in the *New History of South Africa* present apartheid as a coherent body of discriminatory laws, while acknowledging that after 1960 Verwoerd saw the homelands as an alternative form of political representation for black South Africans at a time when political rights were increasingly on the agenda throughout the continent.

**Question 4**

**How important was the part played by organised black labour in the revival of African resistance in the 1970s?**

This question asks the candidate to evaluate the importance of the part played by organised labour in the revival of African resistance in the 1970s in comparison with other factors such as the role of the Black Consciousness movement, the Soweto uprising and external factors.

**The candidate might use evidence such as:**

**The contribution of organised black labour**

- Jan–March 1973: 60 000 black workers on strike.
- In total over 200 000 workers were involved in Durban and the rest of Natal, East London and parts of the Rand.
- Strikers achieved improved pay and conditions.
- By 1976 real wages for Africans in manufacturing were 40% higher than in 1970.
- 1973–5: five independent unions established with 11 000 members.
- 1979: the Wiehahn report recommended that African rights to TUs should be recognised.
- The Riekert report recommended that urbanised workers should be allowed to stay in the towns permanently, together with their families.
- Later 1970s: the government urged employers to relax colour bar restrictions.

**The contribution of the black consciousness movement**

- The leadership of Steve Biko.
- Black Consciousness encouraged Africans to be self-reliant.
- The role of the Black Communities Programme (1970).
- The Azanian People's Organisation brought together the Black People's Convention, BCP and SASO, all organisations which had been banned after the Soweto riots.
- The role of the BCM was limited because it did not develop a coherent political strategy.

**The Soweto uprising**

- By the early 1980s more African children were in school; educational levels were rising.
- Schools for Africans were underfunded.
- Employment prospects for those completing schooling remained poor.
- In 1976 the government decided that half of the high school curriculum should be taught in Afrikaans.
- This marked the beginning of the Soweto Uprising.
- The Cillie Commission blamed 'outside agitators'.
- No real evidence of ANC involvement at the start of the uprising.
- Soweto High School students more influenced by ideas of the BCM.

**External influences**

- Developments elsewhere in southern Africa.
- The successes of the anti-colonial movements in Mozambique and Angola.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include:**

- Writing in 1979, the Marxist historian **Baruch Hirson** argued that increased worker militancy, more than Black Consciousness, explained the township revolts.
- **Robert Ross**: identifies two ways in which individual dissatisfactions were brought together to form a collective challenge to the state: firstly through the Black Consciousness movement and, secondly, through the wave of strikes which occurred from 1973 onwards.
- **R W Johnson**: The Riekert and Wiehahn reports were, in fact a death blow to Apartheid.
- **Adrian Guelke**: "There were two dimensions to the recovery of African nationalism in South Africa. One was ideological; the other industrial."
- **Charles Feinstein**: "A new mood of confidence reinforced old grievances and demands, and a long period of industrial quiescence was finally broken by a remarkable wave of strikes."
- **Nigel Worden**: links renewed African resistance to economic recession caused by a drop in gold prices and an increase in oil prices. Worden also points out that some contemporaries, eg **Archie Mafeje**, regarded Soweto as a missed opportunity because there were no formal links with work organisations.

**Question 5**

**What factors best explain the limited achievements of international opposition to apartheid before 1984?**

This question invites candidates to consider a range of key factors which limited the achievements of international opposition to apartheid before 1984 and determine their relative importance.

**South Africa as an ally of the West in the Cold War**

- South African foreign propaganda played on Cold War fears.
- Suspicions relating to the ANC in exile: evidence of ANC links with Communists.
- Refusal to implement arms embargoes related to Cold War.
- Role of Thatcher and Reagan after 1979.
- USSR and East Germany provided aid to Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia. China supported Mugabe's ZANU.
- Soviet-armed Cuban troops sent to Angola.
- Strategic importance of the Cape route.
- The Simonstown Agreement protected routes to the Middle East until 1975.
- Boycotts drew attention to the situation in South Africa but had limited impact on government policies towards South Africa.

**Western economic interests**

- The main western powers did little to enforce the 1977 UN arms embargo.
- In 1978 Britain was responsible for 40% of all foreign investment in SA.
- 10% of British overseas direct investment in SA.
- British banks controlled 60% of South African bank deposits.
- SA's other European trading partners (West Germany, France, Switzerland) not prepared to risk trade and investments in SA by taking action against apartheid.
- US less involved in the South African economy but Pentagon wanted access to SA's strategic minerals such as uranium.
- Campaigns to achieve disinvestment only effective from 1984 onwards.

**The front line states**

- South African economic superiority used to dominate neighbouring countries.
- The Anglo-American Corporation of SA had substantial interests in Botswana, Zimbabwe and Zambia.
- SA controlled energy supplies to neighbours.
- SA employed over 250,000 migrant workers from other countries in the region.
- Attempts to reduce regional economic dependence on SA largely failed.
- SA used its military strength to conduct covert operations against its neighbours.
- SA forces occupied Namibia and intervened in Angola and Mozambique.

**Liberal economic theories**

- Belief that demands of a capitalist economy would eventually undermine apartheid.
- The Sullivan Principles (1977) aimed to undermine apartheid by improving wages and working conditions.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- The classic 'liberal' view of 1960s and early 1970s argued that capitalism and apartheid were incompatible and that economic growth would erode apartheid and usher in a period of declining discrimination and western style democracy. Writing in 1985, **Merle Lipton** argued that "The trend (among capitalists) is towards increasing opposition (to apartheid) and it has been accelerating". She argued that in many ways capitalist interests within SA were already working to undermine apartheid by the late 1970s and early 1980s and that therefore capitalists should be seen as allies in the fight to get rid of apartheid. For those who accepted this view, disinvestment was unnecessary.

- **Rodney Davenport**: considers the disinvestment campaign of the 1970s and the factors militating against it. He points out the negative impact of Reaganite and Thatcherite free market economics on this movement: "The influence of the Reagan government in the US with its policy of 'constructive engagement' and of Margaret Thatcher's government in Britain with its strong encouragement of free enterprise, more than counterbalanced the negative influence of a new hardline in President Mitterrand's France".

- **Leonard Thompson**: "South African foreign propaganda was well tuned to the Cold War fears and prejudices of Europeans and Americans. It portrayed South Africa as a stable, civilised and indispensable member of the 'free world' in its unremitting struggle against international communism."

- **Adrian Guelke**: "Apartheid SA was regarded for many years as a reliable bulwark against communism precisely because of its hostility towards notions of human equality."

- **Robert Ross:** "The stress on the Communist threat to South Africa found a sympathetic hearing in Reaganite Washington, where the pressure on South Africa imposed by the Carter administration declined after 1980."

- **R W Johnson**: puts forward alternative reasons why the West might be suspicious of the ANC. "The ANC over decades of exile became a movement which preached democracy but was authoritarian, claimed to stand for human rights but abused them, and which espoused non-racialism but was racked by tribalism and referred to its enemy in straightforwardly ethnic terms… Moreover, it began to take on many features of the hated Afrikaner nationalist: there was the same paranoia, the same inferiority complex, the same reliance on a secret inner core (the SACP instead of the Broederbond) and the same laager mentality."

**South Africa (1910–1984)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How much do Sources A and B reveal about differing interpretations of the constitutional settlement which created the Union of South Africa in 1910?**                                    **(16 marks)**

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources A** and **B** as explanations of the constitutional settlement which created the Union of South Africa Act in 1910, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Source A**

**Provenance**: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit.  These may include accurate comment on C W de Kiewiet which may be credited as historiography.

- De Kiewiet was one of the leading 'liberal' historians of the first half of the twentieth century.
- In common with other liberal historians of this period he traced the origins of South Africa's racial policies to Afrikaner communities.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- White South Africans were the main beneficiaries of the Act of Union.
- Had the British government sought to safeguard the interests of Africans, no agreement would have been reached.
- With regard to 'native policy' ie the status of Africans, the Union Constitution represented a triumph of the Boers.
- Boer values – and so the values embedded in the Constitution – were based on assumptions about race and the privileges of race.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source:**

- The (limited) Cape franchise for Africans was retained, but it was not extended to the other three provinces.
- The issue of the possible extension of the Cape franchise threatened to derail the constitutional negotiations.
- Membership of Parliament was reserved for whites.
- Concessions made to Afrikaners included the recognition of Dutch as one of the official languages.
- Rural constituencies could have up to 15% fewer voters which favoured Afrikaners.
- Legislation introduced by successive parliaments favoured whites at the expense of Africans.
- At the time Milner pointed out that "all power is with the Boers and will remain with them".

**Source B**

**Provenance**: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include accurate comment on Magubane as an African historian writing post 1994 which will be credited as historiography.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- The South Africa Act was influenced by the Socialist Imperialist movement.
- Socialist Imperialism sought to safeguard British security and economic self-interests through the consolidation of political unity in the white dominions which would ensure self-sufficiency.
- The Union of South Africa safeguarded British interests at a time when they were being challenged.
- It also safeguarded economic interests since the effective disenfranchisement of Africans facilitated the exploitation of black labour.

**Points which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Britain's determination to safeguard the Empire at a time of mounting challenges.
- Both Liberals and Conservatives sought a solution to the South African problem in 1910.
- Some in Westminster (eg Balfour) condoned the racist values which underpinned the Union of South Africa Act.
- Britain had sought to create some kind of unified South African Federation for some time.
- Members of the black elite petitioned the Westminster Parliament for the removal of the colour bars from the constitution.
- Solomon Plaatje and Selope Thema highlighted the plight of Africans under the new constitution.
- SANNC was established to attempt to alter the terms of the Constitution.
- After 1910 successive governments restricted African access to well-paid labour and to land outside the reserves.

**Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Conflicts over tariffs, transport costs and competing demands for labour led to clashes which Milner and his associates believed could only be solved through Union.
- Afrikaners sought South African unity in the belief that it would weaken imperial interference.
- Britain never allowed the incorporation of Southern Rhodesia, Basutoland, Bechuanaland or Swaziland, although this was envisaged in the constitution.
- Britain gained because the cost of controlling South Africa passed into local hands.
- The economic ties between South Africa and Britain were strengthened and expanded by Union.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- Traditional 'liberal' historians like **de Kiewiet**, argued that the values of the frontier – Afrikaner ideas about race – triumphed in 1910.  This view is almost completely discredited today and Anglophones are seen by historians as having contributed greatly to the values embedded in the constitution.
- Revisionist historians placed great emphasis on the demand for cheap labour which was effectively guaranteed by the constitution.
- **Worden**:  "white unity was upheld at the expense of black political and land rights."
- **Sempe Terreblanche**:  "An Act of the British parliament was therefore the bridgehead that enabled whites in South Africa to perpetuate the power relations of European colonialism."
- **Charles Feinstein**:  "In the search for unity, the historical concern for equality before the law which had shaped earlier British policy in the Cape in the nineteenth century had been discarded."
- **R W Johnson**:  "In one sense the creation of the Union was a great betrayal.  It may be, however, that from a future vantage point this will come to seem less significant than the fact that the century of British rule transformed South Africa from a polyglot assortment of undeveloped territories into a single modern state with a developing industrial base and infrastructure."
- **Barber**:  "The British objective was to establish a stable, prosperous and loyal dominion.  With that in mind, the view that prevailed was that native policy was best left to the local whites."
- **Hermann Giliomee**:  "The Union of South Africa confirmed black fears that whites did not want to share the land but would fight to keep it in their hands."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about how much the two sources reveal about differing interpretations of the constitutional settlement which created the Union of South Africa in 1910.

**Question 2**

**How fully does Source C illustrate the concerns of leading Afrikaners in the 1930s?          (12 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidates provide in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source C** as an adequate explanation of the concerns of leading Afrikaners in the 1930s in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit.  These may include: accurate comment on Eric Louw, a distinguished Afrikaner diplomat and/or on D F Malan who was a minister in Hertzog's government 1924–33 and a leading advocate of replacing Dutch with Afrikaans.  A year later he broke with Hertzog over Fusion and formed the Purified National Party.

**Points from the source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- The English community is more influential in South Africa for a number of reasons.
- English is spoken throughout the world.
- Most businesses are owned by Anglophone.
- English speakers are more educated than Afrikaans speakers.
- The connection with the UK gives moral strength to the English speaking community.
- Regrettably, many Afrikaners look up to the English community and try to curry favour with them.
- The only way to revive a true nationalist spirit among Afrikaners is to establish a party with no connections to Britain – an authentic Republican Party.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Mining capital was largely in the hands of Anglophones.
- Although numerically there were more Afrikaners than English speakers, the upper echelons of society were very largely Anglophone.
- Out of 100 Afrikaner children starting school, nearly half left without passing the eighth year.
- Relations with Britain had been an issue for Hertzog until the Statute of Westminster which satisfied the demands of moderate Afrikaners.
- In 1939 only 3% of engineers, 11% of lawyers and 15% of doctors were Afrikaners.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- The following year, Malan rejected Fusion and established the Purified National Party.
- The problem of the poor whites: a major concern in the 1930s.
- Afrikaner leaders feared that the culture and ethnic identity of poor whites was being undermined in cities.
- The Afrikaner press sought to instil Afrikaner values through popular publications.
- The role of the FAK in propagating Afrikaner culture.
- The Broederbond and others sought to create and develop Afrikaner businesses.
- The DRC organised a Volkskongres to discuss ways in which the problem of white poverty could be prioritised.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Dan O Meara**: emphasises the efforts made by Malan's Purified NP to mobilise Afrikaners across divisions of region and class.
- **Le May**: emphasises the role of the Broederbond in attempting to propagate Afrikaner values and culture. He describes the Broederbond as "the underground branch of the PNP".
- **R W Johnson**: in *South Africa, the first man, the last nation*: "Because Afrikaners were poorer and less educated than English speaking whites they tended to bear the brunt of hard time, but they were encouraged to see the situation in nationalist, rather than class terms".
- **Hermann Giliomee**: in *The Afrikaners*, emphasises the poor white issue, highlighting the contribution of Verwoerd, who advocated discrimination in favour of poor whites: "if someone has to be unemployed, a white man or a native, it is best in the current circumstances… and more economical for the nation that the native should be unemployed".

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which **Source C** offers a full explanation of the concerns of leading Afrikaners in the 1930s.

**Question 3**

**How useful is Source D as an explanation of the changing tactics adopted by African opponents of White minority rule in the early 1960s?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of the usefulness of **Source D** as an explanation of the changing tactics adopted during the early 1960s by the African opponents of National Party rule.

**Provenance:**

- Umkhonto we Sizwe was the separate armed wing of the ANC and worked closely with the SACP.
- Initially its tactics were geared towards sabotage.
- Umkhonto's aims and tactics differed from those of Poqo – the armed wing of the PAC.
- This leaflet was issued to coincide with the start of Umkhonto's campaign.
- The formation of Umkhonto and the beginning of the armed struggle was a direct response to the banning of the ANC after Sharpeville.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Until now the main organisations campaigning for Africans' rights have pursued a policy of non-violence.
- They have not used violence despite the government's attempts to provoke them.
- They have behaved in this way because the people want to avoid the horrors of civil war.
- The time has come to abandon the policies of the past and fight back.
- Peaceful methods have been interpreted as weakness.
- The refusal to use violence has been interpreted as an invitation to the government to use armed force.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- The ANC's Defiance campaign had concentrated on civil disobedience.
- ANC campaigns throughout the 1950s, including pass burning and bus boycotts (Alexandra).
- Rural protest employed more militant methods, including in Pondoland in 1960.
- Albert Luthuli, ANC President for much of the 1950s, was committed to passive resistance.
- The Sharpeville massacre saw the government use armed force against peaceful protestors.
- The banning of the ANC, PAC and the Communist Party.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- Umkhonto carried out over 200 small-scale attacks over the next 18 months.
- Rivalry between the PAC and the ANC.
- Poqo (1962) carried out attacks on whites and African agents of the government, influenced by Frantz Fanon.
- All of the early underground movements were broken up by police arrests.
- Poqo received much more media coverage than Umkhonto.
- Mandela worked closely with Joe Slovo (CP) in Umkhonto.
- Luthuli opposed the adoption of violence.
- 1963: Operation Mayibuye envisaged a guerrilla insurgency movement within South Africa.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Saul Dubow**: "With the liberation movements driven underground, the ANC's need for a military capability became inescapable."
- **Nigel Worden**: "Sharpeville revealed the failure of non-violent resistance and forced a new approach from opponents of apartheid."
- **Davis and Fine**: stress that while the move to armed struggle was a decision of the leaders of the nationalist movements, it had in fact already been effected by popular actions such as that in Pondoland (1960).
- **Meli**: "Although Umkhonto was made up of members of the Congress alliance and the CP… none of the constituent organisations of the Congress Alliance had formally adopted the policy of armed struggle."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the usefulness of **Source D** as an explanation of the changing tactics adopted by the African opponents of white minority rule by the 1960s.

**Soviet Union (1917–1953)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**To what extent was October a "proletarian revolution" rather than a "coup d'état"?**

Candidates are invited to discuss the reasons for revolution, whether it was a popular revolution which had the support of the majority and was Bolshevik in nature, or whether the extent of Bolshevik support was in fact limited to a few.

**Relevant areas for discussion of reasons for October might include:**

**The extent of popular support based on**

**Popularity of Bolshevism**

- From industrial workers because of limitations of workers organisations. Growth in support for Petrograd Soviet with a core committee making decisions alienated rank and file which Bolsheviks exploited after July.
- Trade unions and factory committees – 'Red Guards' a forum for Bolshevik propaganda.
- Soldiers – perhaps there was still front-line patriotism, but not so in the garrisons, plus peasant soldier support.
- The Soviet view as expressed by Lenin that the majority of working class were with them and that "half of the army immediately join" followed by "nine tenths of the peasants …in a few weeks".
- By September there was greater evidence of popular impatience – army officers' authority declined, peasants against private landownership, strikes increased especially amongst less skilled workers.
- November elections reflected limited Bolshevik popularity but in some areas of Petrograd they gained as much as 70% support.

**Policies**

- April Theses, 'Peace, bread and land'.
- The Bolsheviks were taking control of soviets; popularity was increasing due to Trotsky as much as Lenin.
- Forming the MRC, again Trotsky; gave more direct control over soldiers in the capital… and arms and ammunition more readily available.
- October 22$^{nd}$ the Commissar for the Western front cabled Kerensky that 'disintegration has attained its limits'. Evidence of mutinies, pogroms – Kharkov, Tambov, Ostrog – a picture of murders and pillages, of arson and theft.

**That not popular, rather a coup d'état**

- That the Bolsheviks were not that popular… Constituent Assembly elections show this, but they had key support in Moscow and Petrograd, the centres of power. Most people unimpressed, Sukhanov thought Bolshevik regime was short-lived.
- That the Bolsheviks were not that prepared… July Days reflects this… 'wait and see' policy of Lenin's and the moment was lost, arrests follow and Lenin in hiding… as a means of preparing?
- Plotting the coup at Sukhanov's apartment on October 10th, 12 members took part.
- Debates about 'when' in the Central committee and fear that in a revolutionary war soldiers would not support them (Zinoviev and Kamenev), hence delays until 26 October (Second Congress of All Russian Soviets) suggested by Trotsky to allow seizure in the name of the soviets not the Bolsheviks. Tactics to maximise popular support, focus on Petrograd Soviet. This gave the coup an appearance of greater legitimacy, hence Trotsky delays it to coincide with the Congress of Soviets.
- Some would describe events as an amateur action of the MRC (which was dominated by Bolsheviks), some sailors of the Baltic fleet and a handful of Red Guards.
- The Petrograd proletariat and the city's military garrison remained overwhelmingly neutral.
- Martov, leader of the Mensheviks declared it to be "…a military plot organised by one of the revolutionary Parties".
- This was no revolution from below, the working class of Petrograd were nearly absent during the "ten days that shook the world".

**Other factors**

- The Provisional Government was weak by its nature – real power was held by the Soviet, it was temporary, internal divisions prevented clear policies, failed to call Constituent Assembly early enough.
- Kerensky handed over power to the Bolsheviks.
- Bolsheviks only party that opposed continuing the war.
- Role of Lenin was crucial; no October revolution without him… and Trotsky shows fluidity of Party.
- There was significant independent action at local levels in the party and in the soviets.
- Kornilov throws Provisional Government into disarray.
- More about national disintegration. Structures of imperial Russia unravelling after February – army, industrial economy, social structure of the countryside, Great Russian provinces and nationalities areas… and open for others to take power.
- The impact of WWI, Order No1, role of Kerensky, the July Days, Kornilov's attempted coup failed to restore Russia's fighting capacity by sweeping away soviets.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **G Hosking**: "…the Bolsheviks rode to power on the crest of a groundswell generated by the mass of people."
- **Robert Service**: "The conditions for a seizure of power with the sanction of exhausted workers, war-weary soldiers and angry peasants could hardly have been more favourable."
- **Beryl Williams**: notes that the people may have supported the Bolsheviks, but they hardly knew what Bolshevism stood for. There is significant evidence pointing to the fact that it was a coup.
- **Richard Pipes**: A "clandestine coup d'état".
- **Sheila Fitzpatrick**: claims it was the workers, soldiers and peasants who created the circumstances for Bolshevik success.
- **Christopher Read**: claims that Lenin was a key figure, but there was also a lot of independent action at local level.

**Question 2**

**How far was the outcome of the Civil War determined by the actions of the Allies rather than the policies of the Bolsheviks?**

While the focus will open with the role of Allied intervention and will develop and evaluate Bolshevik policies, essays here should demonstrate a detailed understanding of the range and importance of the different factors involved and the variety of influences on the outcome of the conflict.

**Relevant areas for discussion might include:**

**The role of the Allies supporting Whites and withdrawal of support** – here the Reds did not win, the Whites were losing.

- The primary goal of the Allied intervention was never to overthrow Lenin but to re-activate the Eastern front – under Lenin's government, or any other.  Only Churchill cared about the Bolsheviks' long-term plans – the rest of the Allied leadership was 100% focused on defeating Germany.
- Many of the landings were actually made by request of Lenin and Trotsky to strengthen their hand in the bargaining with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk.  Trotsky approved the Murmansk Soviets' request for British military protection of supply depots (which were believed to be threatened by German-supported Finnish forces).
- After the armistice the Allies showed interest in internal Russian politics – and Churchill was fighting the rest of the British leadership the whole time.  American troops had orders to simply remain in ports and guard supply depots.  British and French troops did give some material support and intelligence to White forces, but the Allied leadership was extremely divided.
- There was no significant fighting between Allied troops and Russians.  Japan lost more troops than the other interventionists, lacked U S support for territorial expansion and so made no serious effort to make permanent territorial gains.
- Soviet propagandists exploited limited Allied intervention; the facts show feeblest intent to crusade against Communism.  Over the Czech legion the scale of Allied operations was trivial, as their combat losses show.  The British did provide military equipment to the Whites, but soon abandoned their Russian friends to their fate.
- Murmansk and Archangelsk – British and American naval troops landed in March 1918 to prevent large stores of arms in warehouses there from falling into the hands of the Germans, and to rescue stranded British submariners and Serbian volunteers.
- Larger force arrived 4 months later, fought the Red Army in the south and aided in the formation and training of the White Army of General Miller.  They led a limited offensive towards the south in a failed attempt to link up with the Whites in Siberia before falling back to the ports.  The half-hearted allies pulled out of Archangel and Murmansk.  The interventionists lost more than 400 troops (including 144 Americans) in combat with the Reds here and in 1920 abandoned the Whites to their fate.
- In the South, an 8,000-man force of French troops along with a unit of Polish troops formed on the Western front, landed in Odessa December 18, 1918,  joined in January 1919 by 24,000 Greek soldiers of the two-division Army Corps "A" and elements of the British Royal Navy.  Losing men to typhus, lack of mission, and the myriad of hostile forces in the area led to the rapid withdrawal of these units.  Most had left by April 1919 when the Reds threatened Odessa.
- The British navy captured the Russian battleships *Evstafiy*, *Potemkin*, *Tri Svyatitelya* and *Ioann Zlatoust* and scuttled them when they withdrew from Odessa on April 25th 1919.  Token forces remained including a tank company, a marine battalion, and the Royal Scots Fusiliers until their final withdrawal from the Crimea in June 1920.  The British Royal Navy battleship, *HMS Marlborough*, evacuated most of what was left of the Russian royal family including the dowager empress, the Tsar's sisters, Prince Felix Yusupov, and the Grand Duke Nicholas.  The allies suffered nearly a thousand deaths in this theatre.
- The Far East had a 25,000-man allied intervention force, primarily Japanese and Americans, landing in Vladivostok in April 1918.  The Americans sent 9,014 men titled the American Expeditionary Force Siberia under Major General WS Graves.  The British sent two battalions who were joined by 10,700 French under General Maurice Janin who would command the entire expedition and some 1,400 Italian troops.

- The allies formed a base of operations joined by the White Army in Siberia. Major General Sir Alfred William Fortescue Knox of the British Army, who had served as military attaché to the Tsar since 1911 and as the liaison with the Russian Army during the war was now instrumental in forming a liaison with the new White government. The Western Allies pushed from Vladivostok along the Trans-Siberian railway, moved as far into Siberia as Chita, actively fighting the Reds and supporting the Whites. This expedition assisted with the Czech Legion as well as other allied military units. General Graves was determined to help the Czechs withdraw and not to involve his men in the Civil War. That mission accomplished, the Whites in retreat, most Allied forces withdrew from Siberia in April 1920. This force lost around 500 men combined, including 170 Americans.
- The Japanese sent 12,000 soldiers and followed their own orders and agenda. They had territorial designs on the Russian Far East and raised their forces to over 70,000 land troops under General K Otani plus a large naval detachment. Together with locally recruited auxiliaries including mercenary Cossack bands of the warlord generals Semenov, Annekov and Kalmykov, the Japanese could count on some 120,000 armed men on the ground in Russia. In 1920 the Japanese remained in sole occupation, continued a low-key warfare against Red partisan bands for two years. They set up a puppet White government in eastern Siberia, did not withdraw from mainland Russia until after pressure from the west in October 1922. The Japanese maintained occupation of the Russian half of the north Pacific island of Sakhalin until 1925. They lost over 5,000 men to combat and disease.
- Smaller interventionist forces served in the Caucasus, 1300 men. Summer 1919 on Baltic sea a flotilla of 55 foot British coastal motor boats sank the Oleg, raided the Red naval base at Kronstadt, sinking battleship *Petropavlovsk*, and cruiser *Paimat Azova*.
- The British Volunteer Tank Detachment, with 48 men and six tanks, fought with General Yudenich's Whites in their attack on St Petersburg in 1919.

**Discussion of the other factors in the Red victory including**

- The organisational skills of the Bolsheviks strong leadership, role of Trotsky, a sense of unity, and the skill of the Red Army.
- Geographical advantages, control of the Russian heartland.
- Support of the peasants, the issue of popular support for the different sides in the Civil War.
- Propaganda, Red exploitation of White weaknesses (eg efficient use of propaganda, terror).
- The inability of the Whites to forge a common purpose or military front against the Reds, the inadequacies of the White leaders' policies and methods.
- The role of non-White opposition to the Bolsheviks (eg the Greens, the foreign interventionists) and their impact on events.

**At this level candidates should consider the disorganisation of the Bolsheviks' opponents, but will note that victory cannot be explained in these terms alone**

- The political propaganda and the battle for the hearts and minds of the people.
- The promise of land for the peasants where the Whites returned it or gave it to former landlords.
- The Whites lost the support of the nationalist groups by their pre-1917 policy on the borders which would deny autonomy to some.
- Detail on the armies will cover the leadership and the behaviour of the ordinary soldiers.

In the best pieces the debate will note the subtleties of support and varieties of causes within this one Civil War which did not help the Whites but, because of the 'one cause' belief, did help the Reds.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.
These may include reference to:**

- **Evan Mawdsley**:  cites the advantage of the 'Aladdin's cave' regarding the territory.
- **Robert Service**: cites Trotsky's brilliance.
- **Richard Pipes**:  sees the objective factors (like the territory the Reds controlled) as the cause of victory, rather than leadership or motivation.
- **Orlando Figes:** suggests the crucial advantage the Reds had, which meant more men volunteered to be part of the fighting force, was the claim that they were defending 'the Revolution'.
- **Figes:** also states that the root of White failure was one of politics.
- **Bruce Lincoln:**  also highlights this in Wrangel's attempt in 1920 to offer land to the peasants as well.
- **Richard Pipes:**  states "(N)either in the closing year of World War I nor following the Armistice, were attempts made to rid Russia of the Bolsheviks.  Until November 1918 the great powers were too busy fighting each other to worry about developments in remote Russia".  Also "Only the British intervened actively on the side of the anti-Bolshevik forces, and they did so in a half-hearted manner, largely at the initiative of one man, Winston Churchill".

**Question 3**

**Was NEP anything more than a desperate response to desperate economic and political circumstances?**

An evaluation of the reasons for the introduction of NEP should cover economic and political motivations and its role **as part of the socialist revolution**. Hence candidates may present evidence of its introduction and perhaps impact, if part of the justification, in both economic and political terms. It should be looked at as part of the socialist programme **not** in isolation.

**Relevant areas for discussion of reasons/rationale for introduction might include:**

- Failure of War Communism including the refusal of the peasants to give up their produce.
- Need to raise agricultural production and the handover of this output.
- Lenin's view of NEP as a temporary "retreat".
- Dislocation between Party and society evidenced by Kronstadt and peasant rebellions.
- Opportunity to woo peasants towards party including establishment of control over them via expansion of party membership.
- Increased role of co-ops and expansion of party-driven administrative system.
- Need to develop foreign trade to appease foreign critics in age of expansion of foreign trade and drawing up of foreign trade agreements.

**Evidence of problems**

- 1921 famine – 5 million dead because of drought and requisitioning programme, international aid, one of worst famines of twentieth century.
- Economy – industrial output 20% pre-war levels; 1921 finished products 16% 1912 levels; unfinished 12%. (C Ward)
- Peasant threats – Tambov rising August 1920–June 1921, "powerless to resist rebels" March 1921. (Figes)
- Worker opposition – January 1921 bread ration cut by one third in cities, militarised factories, no union representation but controllers for the state.
- Party divisions – Workers' Opposition – Shlyapnikov and Kollontai.
- Problems form Kronstadt – March 1921 rebellion and mutiny, authority had to act.

**NEP – its impact and reflection or contradiction of political ideals** – **Economic**

- No grain requisitioning, ban on private trade removed, small business re-opened, state controlled heavy industry.
- Shops, cafes, restaurants re-open and cities begin to revitalise.
- Nepmen and their success – first three to four years – deals, corruption and 'get-rich-quick' mentality.
- Walter Duranty – two years on there were over 25,000 private traders in Moscow.
- Limitations – progress not even – 1923 Scissors Crisis – some believed it marked the end of the Soviet experiment, return of capitalism.
- Problems show ill-thought-out policy – huge unemployment: 1·24 million jobless in 1924 – younger workers hardest hit.
- Generated further class divisions within the peasantry.
- Impact on intellectual life – sovietisation.

**NEP Political – impact and effect**

- Zinoviev stated it was "a temporary deviation, a tactical retreat".
- Bukharin said it was an economic concession to avoid political concessions.
- 'New Exploitation of the Proletariat' – attitudes of urban workers in first two years.
- 1922 – censorship, writers and scholars deported, pre-publication censorship – Glavlitt.
- GPU, secret police and arbitrary imprisonment and death penalty as instrument of social policy.
- Attack on rivals, show trials – 34 SR leaders condemned as terrorists, 11 executed.
- Crushing peasant revolts – Tambov 1922, salt given as reward for good behaviour.
- Attack on Church – Union of Militant Godless, death penalties for leaders of Russian Orthodox Church, thousands of priests imprisoned.
- But decline in morale of Communist Party due to ideological retreat eg Platform of 46.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Walter Duranty**: "To the Communists and to the small group of proletarian leaders … NEP was doubtless repugnant." (witness)
- **Figes**: War communism was a political response to the urban crisis of 1918.
- **Fitzpatrick**: a radical measure to cope with a desperate situation; NEP the compromise – because of failure to recover economically and protests – Tambov and Kronstadt the "symbolic parting of the ways between the workers councils and the Bolshevik Party". A betrayal reintroducing the bourgeois experts, Nepmen, kulaks, a compromise in ideology for long-term gain.
- **Katerina Clark**: it was the heyday of the intellectual not particularly committed to one particular party.
- **Shapiro**: "NEP years were something of a golden age in Russian intellectual life."

**Question 4**

**How valid is the view that Stalin emerged as the leader of Russia mainly because he was able to present himself as the true heir of Lenin?**

Candidates here would consider the key issues at the end of the Leninist period and examine these in the light of Stalin's emergence as leader. They might also consider the other factors and their relative merit in explaining why Stalin emerged as leader of Soviet Russia.

**Legitimate heir**

- Lenin believed that the 'vanguard party' would have to be tightly controlled with a strong central committee.
- Organisation, discipline and centralisation would be a vital key to the move to a socialist utopia.
- 8th Party Congress 1919 put Russian party's Central Committee above others (Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia).
- Emphasis on 'democratic centralism': 9th Party Congress 1920 'iron discipline'.
- 'vertical centralism' also embedded and vital to success of the Party.
- Anti-democratic views explained in 'On Party Unity'.
- These points gave Stalin the backdrop he needed to succeed.
- Other contenders became victims of the machines they created.

**Stalin and the Party and State machinery**

- The organisation gave him the means to succeed.
- Narkomnets gave him the breadth of power across the Republic and USSR.
- Control of Rabkrin allowed promotion of friends, and dismissal of enemies, clouded in the notion of 'administrative necessity'.
- Power locally became 'Stalinist' in nature as much as it did centrally.
- In central politics others might win the debate, but Stalin won the vote.
- Stalin had a confidential personal secretariat briefing on other leaders.
- Because the old pre-revolutionary proletariat had disappeared, institutions (Soviets) atrophied, or drifted away from the party line, so appointment began to replace election and the Cheka dealt with 'counter-revolutionaries'.

**Change in Bolshevism**

- Civil War opened up membership to a range of people.
- Because of this the need to control led to the language of 'attack' and 'struggle' becoming part of leadership.
- Lenin Enrolment opened up a chaotic mix of members who would strike against tyrannical objects of policy, than managers. The party masses were now the objects of policy and the dictatorship of the proletariat now became Bolshevik dictatorship and the dictatorship of the leader.
- Middle-ranking party leaders (born in the military stress of the Civil War) were eager to obey (not debate) and to command (not persuade); ideal for Stalin and his bureaucratic empire.

**Ideology and policy- more than the façade for ambition**

- NEP and the danger of restored capitalism.
- 'Permanent Revolution' v 'Socialism in one country' genuine belief or a policy to oust Zinoviev and win support from Trotsky?

**Stalin's ancestry and personality**

- His wisdom in defending socialism against Trotskyists and Bukharinists.
- Ruthlessness associated with 'Asiatic' (Leonid Krasin).
- Manipulating allies and enemies alike (Robert Conquest/Robert Tucker).
- Allying with Right and Left.
- Failings of the other contenders – Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, and Stalin's manipulation.
- Naivety of Trotsky over Lenin's Testament.
- But his unique predisposition to succeed is a difficult argument to sustain – he manipulated – so did others; he changed his mind – so did others.
- Trotsky – the fear of Napoleon, when Stalin was the loyal and trustworthy servant.
- Stalin had little to say on the burning issues of the day: 'socialism in one country' was Bukharin's; but his support of it was genuine and he gained the support from the workers.
- The development of the governing institutions made Stalin powerful because of his links between Politburo, Secretariat and Orgburo.

Each interpretation of the struggle for power can be criticised, and his actions in many cases can be linked to the Leninist tradition.  Overall, candidates may conclude that the Leninist period did indeed give birth to a 'politics of permanent emergency' which saw a development of a military and administrative approach.  Stalin was well placed at the centre of all of this.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **S Cohen**:  that Stalin's policies gained support from Bolsheviks who believed in his pragmatic solutions.
- **E H Carr**:  Stalin's victory "was a triumph not of reason but of organisation".
- **Dmitri Volkogonov**:  "The greatest secret of Stalin's invulnerability, his diabolical strength, was his monopoly on Lenin."
- **Christopher Ward**:  states that Stalin's policy of 'socialism in one country' made sense to many.
- **I Deutscher**:  states that Trotsky did not attack Stalin because he felt secure.
- **R Conquest**:  highlights Stalin's ability as he manoeuvred the political situation.

**Question 5**

**What factors best explain why the Soviet Union's wartime alliance with UK and the USA developed into the hostility of the Cold War after 1945?**

In this essay conflicting issues were predominantly about support during the war and territory after the war. The wartime alliances were strange creatures where none liked each other and there was little real mutual support when it came to the East. Indeed the debate might consider that they were never really allies but uncomfortable bedfellows.

**Relevant areas for discussion might include:**

- **The long term**, older tensions from Versailles, to the defeat of Tsarism and the Civil War. Answers here will consider the legacy of WWI where America was pro-Provisional Government as the last vestiges of democracy (some might note those who informed the USA thinking – the Riga Axioms – and those who ended up in the USA eg Miliukov).
- Here the Soviet perspective will be considered when the rapid success of the Red Army taking over the Baltic States and Poland is seen as a justifiable reversal of Versailles.
- The West did not trust the Russians since they killed the Tsar.
- The legacy of Allied Intervention in the Civil War did not promote trust.
- Decision in favour of isolation already established in 1920s with the doctrine of 'socialism in one country'.
- Abandonment of collective security in favour of Nazi-Soviet Pact.
- Hitler-Molotov conference in Berlin 1940, Stalin refused integration into a German-dominated Europe.

**During the war**

- That from the beginning there was a realisation that the alliances were nominal; the attempt of the Allies pre-Nazi-Soviet Pact is testimony to this. America and the League of Nations only accepted Russia when faced with the greater danger that was Hitler. Indeed the later decision was not really the USA's. Barbarossa was 6 months before Pearl Harbour and Churchill's declaring that "Stalin is our ally" meant a fait accompli. The Grand Alliance was a marriage of convenience.
- The impact of the delay over the Second Front detailing the attitudes fostered by procrastination. The Soviet resentment as they waited from 1941 on. The feeling that the allies were willing to fight till last drop of Russian blood was spilt permeated Soviet society. Truman said as much in June/July 1941. Allied reluctance to act until 1944 was interpreted by Soviets as deliberate exhaustion of Germany and USSR.
- Only after Stalingrad and Kursk was there an alteration because of the turnaround.

**Treaties and failure of integrationist strategy in foreign policy**

- Evidence of prescient hostility might be seen initially via the discussion of the main alliances and conferences during WW2 ie Yalta and Potsdam (but also mid-Atlantic 1941, Casablanca, Quebec and Teheran 1943).
- The agreements that were reached were essentially compromises that did not settle the larger issues. The problem of spheres of influence considering different attitudes eg Churchill negotiating with Stalin over spheres of influence and the changes with the entry of the USA.
- The ideologies and personalities involved in 'the Big Three', and the post-war situation with the common enemy defeated and a return to suspicion. Moving to the 'Big Four' added France as an occupying power.
- Agreement on reparations was impossible. The Reparations Commission sited in Moscow founded to balance Soviet demands for harsh economic restrictions on Germany with other Allies' endeavour not to allow Russia to drain Germany dry while they were pouring in resources to prevent collapse.
- Poland – pro-Soviet Provisional Government was installed and fear that this would become a Kremlin puppet caused tension.
- Eastern and central Europe – Soviets to pursue democracy but fear made them focus on a buffer state against future German aggression, which became Western anti-Communism.
- By Potsdam relations between powers had further deteriorated. The final surrender of Germany in May broke the remaining link which had joined the USSR and the Allies.
- The differences resulting from attitudes towards Japan; for the Russians the threat in Siberia and the USA with Pearl Harbour.
- The developments in nuclear power, new technology causing the cold war. By 1948 USA had expanding nuclear arsenal, forward based delivery systems (bombers based in Britain), and 1949 USSR produced first nuclear bomb, no equal to USA until 1960s – hence this is a threat.
- Marshall Plan 1947 – rejection of multilateral aid programme (although not against principle of reconstruction) USSR founding of Cominform, Zhdanov's proclamation of the two-camps doctrine (Sept 1947), Stalinist Gleichschaltung of Eastern Europe, because Moscow's worst fears for the prospect of collaboration had been confirmed and the Molotov Plan began the process leading to Comecon.
- Three trends in Soviet policy and politics – as Christopher Read sums up – a return to Marxist-Leninist ideological orthodoxy internally, the triumph of Leftist trends in the international communist arena, acceptance of a hawkish interpretation of US foreign policy.

The more directed answers then might consider the **driving ideological split** which meant that the alliances were indeed aberrations that the Cold War was a continuation of the East-West split, this time with nuclear technology eg whether Soviet actions justified by Yalta and were a reaction to US policy from Truman to NATO. It might note that the Soviet government had to persuade the public on the alliance, that there was no plan for 'world domination', the western invention of the 'soviet threat' and the revisionist view that soviet interests in Eastern Europe were primarily defensive.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **The traditional viewpoint**: blame Soviets and see Cold War as the crusade for liberty.
- **Revisionist view**: US partly to blame, used Cold War and anti-communism for establishing global economy, cultural and political hegemony.
- **Evan Mawdsley**: "fear of the outside made Moscow take extraordinary measures to guarantee its security; those measures themselves fanned the fears outside."
- **Vladislav Zubok and Constantine Pleshakov**: in the first book written by historians schooled in the Soviet system but with exposure to the West "learned that, along with 'hard power' of spheres of influence, bombs and missiles, there was the 'soft power' of fear and suspicion, distorted perceptions that had driven both sides"… also contend that Stalin's aim was to build the Soviet Empire.
- **Richard Sakwa**: "As long as Stalin hoped to maintain elements of the wartime coalition he tolerated some national autonomy in Eastern Europe."

**Soviet Union (1917–1953)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A as an explanation of the nature of the February Revolution?** (12 marks)

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source A** in understanding the nature of the February Revolution in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Diarist, most authentic memoirist of the Revolution, unique position.
- Knew the Bolshevik leaders very well, his wife was a Bolshevik.
- He was a Menshevik-Internationalist, group headed by Martov.
- Published in 1922 after five years of the revolution.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- 'period of agony of Tsarism' recognising the threats to Romanov rule.
- Focus on St Petersburg, the city, and those in Russian 'society', the elites.
- Middle class concerns reflected by reaction of 'political circles' in the 'State Duma' convened at this time.
- Suggestion that for some this is linked to the street demonstrations.
- Sukhanov and the Left disagree with this suggestion, because the working class and middle class did not join together against Rasputin, there was a fear of the power of the masses, and difference on 'carrying on the war to total victory'.
- That no-one in February 'was preparing for the great upheaval'; this was not a political revolution at the start.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Tsarism in decline because of Nicholas himself, personality, German wife, reliance on Rasputin. Plus his failures previously eg Russo-Japanese War.
- Duma undermined by Tsar, limiting power. Tsarina and Rasputin dismissing ministers on a regular basis when the Tsar had gone to the front.
- The conduct of the war – failed offensives, Tannenberg, Masurian Lakes, war-weariness by 1917 with Tsar directly in charge from September 1915.
- 'Bread' reflecting the economic privations of the time – shortages, queuing for 24 hours, excessive inflation.
- Actions of the elites (Yusupov) in 1916 killing Rasputin – but this was more about the crumbling Romanov dynasty – his death a means of the elites saving autocracy.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- Demonstrations and strikes were not uncommon, but the key leaders were not Bolshevik. Schliapnikov the leading Bolshevik scoffed at the idea that this was a revolution "What revolution?" he asked a local meeting of the party leaders on the 25th. "Give the workers a pound of bread and the movement will peter out". (Figes)
- February 23rd International Womens' Day – the temperature rising to -5 degrees, more people on the streets, Putilov workers join and the soldiers mutiny.
- 1916 bread ration from 2·5lb to 1·5lb, prices rise sixfold in Petrograd.
- By 1917 the average working woman was spending 60 hours a week in bread lines.
- War casualties 1917 1,700,000 deaths and 6,000,000 wounded.
- Factory conditions were improving, 1912 sickness and accident benefits schemes.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.**
**These may include reference to:**

- **Figes**: stated that the mutiny turned disorder into revolution.
- **Peter Kenez**: "there was not to be found anywhere in the country any groups of the population…which were ready to put up a fight for the old regime."
- **Robert McKean**: "the Great War acted as the spark which set the combustible of mass discontent alight."
- **R Pipes**: "rebellions happen, revolutions are made."
- **Shapiro**: "the only solution lay in the complete democratisation of the system of government."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful for understanding the reasons for the February Revolution.

**Question 2**

**How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations on the impact of collectivisation?** (16 marks)

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources B** and **C** on the impact of collectivisation and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Source B**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Over 42 million copies of the book were issued, in 301 printings and 67 languages.
- Most often referred to simply as the Short Course, the book was viewed as the encyclopaedia of Marxism until de-Stalinization occurred in the Soviet Union in 1956.
- Stalin claimed to have been the author from 1945 onwards.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Success in collectivisation allowed success in industry, producing tractors and machinery.
- Production levels increased significantly – 400,000,000 poods of grain each year.
- Eliminating the kulak class freed the peasants from their bondage, giving the poor and middle peasants their place, and ridding the USSR of the bourgeois rich peasants.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Larger units in collective farms meant efficiency via mechanisation – tractors and machinery through MTS and releasing workers to move into industry.
- Estimated 70% peasants' households collectivised by 1934, and 90% by 1936; 120 million people, 600,000 villages, 25 million holdings consolidated into 240,000 state-controlled collective farms.
- Many crops suited better to larger farms – small farms meant poor use of labour, unable to benefit from mechanisation, grain production here shows success of collectives.
- 1st February 1930, a decree allowing local party organisations to take 'necessary measures'.
- 'Dizzy with success' speech (2 March 1930) meant pace slowed down and return to voluntary principle indicates recognition of limitations of policy.
- Kulak liquidation part of the 'class war' in order to establish total control, at the minimum to force peasants to join collectives.
- Denouncing neighbours was revenge for past grievances, to acquire animals and equipment, extended to child informers.

**Source C**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Conquest, well-known historian, witnessed development of Soviet communism in 1940s.
- Critical of regime in previous work *The Great Terror*, anti-communist.
- This work reflects his awareness of the detail of the holocaust in Ukraine and throughout the USSR. Here he is even more critical of left-wing intellectuals who, he feels, denied the full scale of the terror famine.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Enforced decrees to impose collectivisation resulting in widespread starvation of peasants, particularly in Ukraine which suffered a man-made famine.
- Rigour of enforcement and any attempts to evade, which could be armed resistance and riots which lasted for days, were crushed.
- The early 'successes' in grain procurement resulted from the great efforts of peasants, but famine was the result.
- Watchtowers and guards with guns, reflects the severity of collectivisation. This is not voluntary, more like an agricultural gulag.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Peasants burned crops, broke tools, destroyed houses rather than hand over to the state their farms – slaughter of animals.
- Famine 1932–34 because high targets at time of huge drop in grain production due to collectivisation, OGPU were vicious. 1·73 million tons exported and 7 million died from a man-made famine.
- Detail of the horror of dekulakisation.
- 'Twenty Five Thousanders' rounded up families, and deported some 10 million people (some estimate 20 million dead or deported).
- The extent of denunciations by neighbours reflects the impact of the propaganda machine inflaming class hatred. Using Terror and force alongside this.

**Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Tractors were largely imaginary – 2,500 MTS in first three years, but this was a proletarian bastion in the countryside, staffed by workers and OGPU.
- Villagers often unwilling to identify kulaks, wrote letters in support of neighbours.
- Kulak farmers sold animals, stopped hiring labour to become 'middle' peasants.
- Local party officials against this policy as farmers were valuable to community.
- Statistics of production distorted to show success.
- This was social engineering involving 25 million households – 120 million people.
- Of a population of 121 million rural inhabitants and 26 urban ones in 1926: by 1937 2/3rds still lived in the countryside: by 1937 – 243 kolkhozy and 4000 state farms.
- Impact on nationalities eg peasants in Ukraine, nomads of Kazakh ASSR. Western studies show that the regime was sincere about the value of nativisation, but reversed this in favour of ethnic Russians when the 'revolution from above' met resistance in 1930s.
- Using this as a political tool to break peasant resistance and halt growth of Ukrainian nationalism.
- Conquest states that the human toll was "higher that the total deaths for all countries in WWI".

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **E Mawdsley**:  states that the rural economy did deliver what was required, and armies were fed but there was no 'green' revolution.  The fragility was shown in the drought of 1946–7: production in 1953 lower than 1913.  He also stated "there was, especially in the initial collectivisation decision, naivety, misperception and bungling" and "the rural economy was thrown into confusion in 1930–33 culminating in the famine of mid–1933".
- **Moshe Lewin**:  creating a "quicksand society" where the state was in control of everyone and all were "equal".
- **S Cohen**:  states that the peasantry was seen as "a vast inert and yet somehow threatening mass of people, barring Russia's path to industrialisation, modernity, socialism: a kingdom of darkness that must be conquered before the Soviet Union could become the Promised land".

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on the impact of collectivisation.

**Question 3**

**How fully does Source D explain the development of the totalitarian regime in Stalinist Russia?**
**(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source D** as an adequate explanation of the development of a totalitarian regime in Stalinist Russia in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Former Colonel General in the Soviet Army's propaganda department (until his views came to be regarded as un-soviet), Director of the Institute of Military History and Defence Advisor to President Yeltsin from 1991 to his death in 1995.
- Unrivalled access to Soviet military archives, communist documents and secret presidential files.
- Determined to reveal the truth behind the regime and its leadership.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- That there was the one ideology which was believed to be true by everyone.
- That the instruments of this ideology in the Party were 'legions of bureaucrats'. The god-like leader Stalin, a vast military presence and a total political surveillance.
- That the people were obedient tools of the state – 'tiny cogs in the machine'.
- That the Party dominated, making sure that the Soviet state endured, even by force – NKVD.
- And the pyramid of power was such that it allowed this to happen.
- In all the state was the overwhelming monolith, the individual subsumed by it.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source**

- The ideology of 'socialism in one country' with strong emphasis on nationalism and patriotism.
- Totalitarian features – propaganda, no independent social or cultural organisations, a command economy, use of terror, centralisation and censorship.
- Bureaucracy and the creation of control from Moscow, with a system of privileges to keep the elite loyal – nomenklatura.
- The hierarchy of the Party itself.
- The source highlights the change from cultural diversity and tolerance in the 1920s to a period of stricter control – aiming to promote Stalin's leadership style and harness mass Party support, developing in particular the cult of the personality. The God-like status as shown by Pavel Litvinov.
- The development of the military, the use of the Purges to 'oust' betrayers as Stalin had Tukhachevsky and seven other generals killed, 11 war commissars, 3 marshals, admirals, senior commanders of the airforce – and more.
- The apparatus of the command economy in the Five Year Plans, the development of industry, Magnitogorsk, the Stakhanovite movement – myth and reality.
- The role of the NKVD – the Show Trials, purges and gulag system, as it develops into the Terror.
- This period called 'the great retreat'… from the radical left, but also consolidating itself as a new social order.

**Points from recall which offer a more critical contextualisation of the view in the source**

- That this was all encompassing but there were aspects of Russian life which survived Stalinism.
- Religion – was under State control, but never managed to destroy faith, in spite of atrocities to priests, attacks on the Patriarchs and destruction of buildings.
- At local level a quiet life was possible as Fitzpatrick states in *Everyday Stalinism.*
- In the creative world there was Socialist Realism but also a shadow culture of writers, artists and musicians – Shostakovich, jazzmen like Alexander Tsfarsman or Yakov Skomorovsky.
- Writers might include Sholokhov, Solzhenitsyn, Mickhail Bulgakov, Boris Paternak.
- Traditional gender roles were maintained (Beryl Williams) and family came first (Sheila Fitzpatrick).
- The positive response of the young to the regime – from Young Pioneers to Komsomol.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Kowalski**: states that propaganda, education and cultural developments were central to building socialism.
- **Richard Stites**: notes the negation of all existing culture because it is better to have no culture rather than bourgeois culture.
- **Sheila Fitzpatrick**: notes the difficulty of 'spontaneously' creating this Proletkult, to be proletarian and distinct from the formerly dominating bourgeois culture and that it was halted in its infancy, its idealism and aspirations smothered by the desire to control in the 1930s.
- **J Arch Getty**: "The Great Terror of the 1930s in the Soviet Union was one of the most horrible cases of political violence in modern history."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source D** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the nature of the Stalinist State.

**The Spanish Civil War (1931–1939)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**How justified is it to view the Asturias rising as "The first battle of the Spanish Civil War"?**

The candidate should address the question by discussing to what extent the Asturias rising was a legitimate incident of industrial action, and to what extent it was the beginning of concerted opposition between left and right in Spain. The interpretation could be taken that war was inevitable after this incident.

**The candidate would be expected to use evidence such as:**

| Other interpretations | First Battle? | Associated Effects |
|---|---|---|
| Coordinated by Trade Unions therefore a 'normal strike'.  SCW did not break out until 1936 and when it did, it was initiated by the right.  Asturias not alone. Strikes all over Spain.  Labour conditions in Asturias were horrendous and strike action was justified.  Brutality of Casas Viejas.  Cortes not disbanded. No right wing coup. Socialist Party and TUs not proscribed.  Left had good reason to fear Robles' rhetoric. | Asturias rising inspired by legal inclusion of elected members therefore an illegal attack by government. Short-term devastation over and above that required to restore order, therefore an attack on workers by the forces of reaction. Declaration of Catalan State on announcement of CEDA delegates – undemocratic. Insurrectionary behaviour of CNT, UGT, FAI. Reactions to FNTT strikes, banning on grounds of harvest being 'sacred'. Suspension of *El Obrera de la Tierra.* Suspension of strike meetings. Azaña, Companys, Caballero imprisoned. Government of Catalonia disbanded. Statute of autonomy suspended. Martial law. | Convinced right that left had abandoned democracy. War was closer.  Convinced left that any gains made in 31–33 were doomed.  Left knew that unity was essential.  Polarisation between right and left.  HOWEVER  Both sides participated in '36 election and initially accepted the results.  It was election defeat which persuaded right to rebel. |

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Carr**: "Robles had declared…that socialism must be defeated at all costs."
  "When it (the Asturias rising) was over the nation was morally divided between those who favoured repression and those who did not."
- **Payne**: "The stance and rhetoric (during the period) of the CEDA were often provocative and threatening."
- **Preston**: Increasing mimicking of Fascist tactics – "A crowd of 20,000 gathered and shouted *¡jefe¡!jefe!¡jefe!* and "Our Leaders never make mistakes!"
- **Thomas**: Largo "reaffirmed his belief in the necessity of preparing a proletarian rising". Describes this as "a fatal error of judgement".
- "Political feelings were...worsened beyond cure (during Bienio Negro)."
- "Where lay the difference between Dollfuss and Gil Robles? Gil Robles did nothing to make it clear."
- **Preston**: "little doubt that the Catalan crisis was manipulated by Robles to provoke the left."
  "CEDA (under Robles) were driving the Socialists to play with the idea of a revolutionary rising."
  "The left and centre-left closed ranks on the basis of a programme of amnesty for prisoners, basic social and educational reform and trade union freedom."
- **Brenan**: Asturias "first battle of the Civil War" (left united against CEDA).

**Question 2**

**What factors best explain why the coup of 1936 developed into a full-blown civil war?**

The candidate is required to compare and evaluate the main reasons the coup developed into a Civil War. They would be expected to explain why the Coup failed, why the republican government failed to re-establish their complete control and the factors which explain the continued conflict which followed.

**The candidate would be expected to use evidence such as:**

| Reasons Rebels Failed | Reasons Government Failed | Reasons for Civil War |
|---|---|---|
| Role of Miaja and Rojo. | Role of General Emilio Mola. | Polarisation had already taken place. |
| Government departure allowed the Communist Party to assume the lead in defending Madrid. | Disbelief as to seriousness of coup. | Relatively even divide of armed forces. |
| Decision to liberate the Alcazar allowed the delivery of Soviet aid and also the formation of the International Brigades. | Sizable amount of armed forces rebelled. | Relatively even geographical split. |
| Connected battles such as Guadalajara (North-East of Madrid).  Victory due partly to weather and poor Italian troops. | Failure to arm workers. | Industry in hands of Republic, raw materials with rebels. |
| Role of Russian tanks and aircraft in stemming the Nationalist advance. | Navy 'disabled' and unable to stop Army of Africa crossing. | Continued foreign intervention on both sides. |
| Arrival of the first International Brigade units to reach the front line. | Divisions, politically and militarily. | Stalin's deliberate policy to keep conflict going. |
| Popular defence – Women and children helped with food, communications and medical supplies. | Unsure of loyalty of officers. | Fear on both sides of consequences of defeat/surrender. |
| Prominent Communists such as Dolores Ibarruri, 'La Pasionaria', rallied the defenders with ringing oratory: "It is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees." | Advantage of loyalty in industrial/urban areas. | Incompatible aims – Republican, monarchical, religious, political sects, regionalism. |
| Many of armed forces remained loyal to Republic. | Arrival of foreign planes to transport Army of Africa. | Franco's attitude to compromise or negotiation. |
| Nationalist battle plan in pocket of dead Italian soldier. | | |
| Poor planning – unaware of support on the ground for Republic. | | |

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Heywood**: "the brutality and cynicism with which the Communists imposed discipline and built up the Popular Army contributed to the disillusionment of many on the Republican side."
- **Preston**: "If the communists had been able to find some way to harness the revolutionary spirit… instead of simply crushing it, they may have won."
  "The Republican force as a whole suffered from its internal political divisions despite the Popular Army's discipline."
- **Thomas**: "(locally) militias of sorts existed since 1934 under the guise of athletics associations"
  "(Early in the defence)…these (Russian) tanks…were shown to be effective. One Russian tank was said to have destroyed eleven Italian ones."
  "(Republican Russian) …tanks made little impact…partly because the Spaniards now manning them were baffled by their complexity"
  "…new Russian fighters showed their superiority in dispersing a squadron of Fiat fighters which escorted some Junkers 52."
  "much of the organisation of the resistance, emanating from (Maija's) headquarters…derived less from Maija than from the Russian General Goriev"
  "…it does seem that Voronov was the inspiration behind the artillery"
  "the Republican army had checked Varela before the arrival of the (12th) Brigade…The bravery and experience of the Brigades was, however, crucial."
- **Payne**: "In Madrid…the revolt never had much chance of success. The organised revolutionary groups were so large compared to the military…"
  "In Madrid…the revolt was uncoordinated in the extreme…"
  "recent reassignments had broken up whatever unity there had been earlier."
  "the police…accepted the bent of the population and fought valiantly for the leftist authorities."
- **Bolloten**: "…far fewer generals on active service supported the rebellion than remained with the government."
- **Thomas**: "The system of communications with Mola was bad and their morale was low."
  "Mola…failed to coordinate (in Madrid) the diverse elements…there was doubt whether…Maija was or was not with the rebels."
  **but**
  "…much of the forces of law and order…were with the rebels"
  "(In Barcelona) …the loyalty of the security forces was not unquestionable."
- **Preston**: "The plotters had not foreseen that their rising would turn into a long and bloody civil war."
  "…they had not counted on the strength of working-class resistance."
  "Even those areas which had been won by the rebels had produced sufficient popular hostility to suggest…a major war of conquest."
  "In rural districts…supporters of the Republic were usually able to overpower small Civil Guard garrisons."
  **but**
  "In the Catholic heartlands…the rising had enjoyed instant success…"

**Question 3**

**"They seemed to have no common goal other than the overthrow of Azaña's administration."**
**How far is this an accurate description of the motives of those who fought for the Nationalists between 1936 and 1939?**

The candidate should assess the motives of those who fought for the overthrow of the Republic discussing whether or not their sole purpose was to remove the government or if there were a variety of reasons for the rising and its popularity amongst different groups and individuals.

**The candidate would be expected to use evidence such as:**

| Shared goals | Separate goals |
|---|---|
| **Order**<br>Many of the right who would have supported democratic change initially would have been shaken by the assassinations and general disorder throughout the country.<br><br>Sotelo's murder legitimised rising. | **Army**<br>Following Spanish 'tradition' of Pronunciamentos. Angry at reforms of 31–33 and feared more drastic actions from Popular Front.<br>Azaña's hostility was known: "No-one speaks for the Army now, nor does the Army itself speak".<br>Franco aggrieved since Academies closed.<br>Sanjurjo had always opposed Republic (Sanjurjada). |
| **Fear of Communism**<br>The right-wing press attributed this to the 'red' government and many of the Spanish middle-classes were frightened and saw the rebels as the only hope for 'order'. | **Carlists**<br>Saw Republic as 'Godless'.  Detested notion of secular state. |
| **Antipathy to Regime**<br>The government had not been short of using its forces to quell rioters and to imprison opponents, allowing it to be portrayed as non-democratic. | **Alphonsists**<br>Some similarities to above and also sought return of King. |
| **Religion**<br>The right's 'umbrella' had been and remained the Church.  The nature of the extreme left and the influence of the Communist party allowed the regime to be portrayed as 'godless'.  Azaña was well documented as anti-Catholic. | **Falange**<br>Sought fascist revolution, restructuring state to a 'dynamic' militarist model.  Hoped to control the rebellion to ensure state similar to that of Hitler's Germany or Mussolini's Italy. |
| **Saving Spain**<br>Many feared the end of the nation. | |

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Preston**: The Generals saw the government as "helpless to stop...the break up of Spain and responsible for the policies that were undermining the structure of society". At all levels there was a belief that the Army had a right to intervene in politics. Carlists were "anti-modern advocates of a theocracy".

- **Beevor**: Carlists famous for their "ferocious rejection of modernity". Those who were soon to call themselves Nationalists were to insist that the assassination of Sotelo was the final straw. However for months Falangists had been co-ordinating in secret with rebel officers.

- **Robinson**: Sotelo (believed) that the revolution of 1934 proved that the Left were not willing to accept a parliamentary system which allowed the Right to govern. When the leftist coalition won the majority of seats, though not of votes, and revolution seemed again to threaten, (Robles') followers began to desert and put their faith in… violence...

- **Thomas**: (between February and June 1936 according to Robles)... 160 churches had been burned to the ground, 269 mainly political murders and 1,287 assaults. 69 political centres had been wrecked, there had been 113 general strikes and 228 partial strikes, while 10 newspaper offices had been sacked. The conditions in the country and the regime were as grave as Robles described them.

- **Preston**: (of Franco) Removed once more from a job he loved, Franco was more than ever a general to be feared. (Franco felt) revulsion at the Left's disrespect for God and the Church. Franco believed he was rebelling to save the Patria... from Communist infiltration.

- **Payne**: According to José Antonio (Primo de Rivera) Spain needed a strong state dominated by a revolutionary elite. A very large number of people wanted a new Spain which would be worthy of Spain's great past. Murders for political reasons (in 1936) were reported almost daily.

**Question 4**

**"The Spanish people knew they were not fighting alone."**
**Was the boost to morale the main contribution of the International Brigades during the Spanish Civil War?**

The candidate should evaluate the contribution of the International Brigades during the Spanish Civil War and compare their contribution to morale to their other effects.

**The candidate would be expected to use evidence such as:**

| Morale | Other Contributions | Criticisms |
|---|---|---|
| Arrival gave hope in lieu of 'real' international allies. | Madrid: Suicidal bravery. XIth and XIIth Battalion heavily involved. | Became focus of communist-influenced support, to detriment of other Republican forces. |
| Legitimised the Republican cause as more than a simple defence of a country. Similar to Franco's 'Crusade' the IBs gave the impression of an international stance against fascism. | Jarama: British Battalion bore the brunt of attacks. Thaelmann Battalion also held off attacks. XIVth and XVth also involved. Pattern would be repeated that IBs held ground well but failed to make advances. | Successes partly due to privileged access to communist resources. |
| Numbers never over 20,000 at any one time. Overall estimates vary wildly. Only 5% of the forces in Madrid. Madrileños were the real difference, especially in the early stages. | Guadalajara: Only well-known Republican victory. Humiliation of Italian forces and consequently altered Franco's tactics. Immediate entry of Madrid no longer the objective. Heavy involvement of IBs. | Defensive successes not backed by major offensives. |
| | Brunete: Growing unrest within IBs by this time. Troops being forced back at gunpoint. British down to 80 men. Majority Spaniards who resented foreign leaders who could not speak their language. | Vast majority of combatants Spanish. |
| Both Nationalists and Communists exaggerated IBs importance for different reasons. | Teruel: Initial victory and occupation of town followed by counter attack and loss. XVth Brigade heavily involved in defending a town of no strategic value which they had no hope of holding at great losses. | Machine guns deployed behind the lines for deserters. IBs had own 'concentration camp' – 4,000 men sent there in 3 months. |
| Campaigns became literally 'history and legend' due to skilful oratory of La Pasionaria and others. | Ebro: XIVth Brigade lost 1,200 men in 24 hours. Brigades exhausted by this time and Spanish forces had 'outstripped them' in fighting and discipline. | |
| | Superior training helped other Republican forces. | |
| | 60,000 troops in all. 9,934 dead, 7,686 missing, 37,541 wounded. | |

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Beevor**: The Brigaders were hardly more skilful than the Militias. The arrival of the XI Battalion had a powerful effect on the people of Madrid.
- **Preston**: Their part in the defence of Madrid should not be exaggerated; it was part of a heroic effort. Dolorres Ibarruri; heroic example of the solidarity and universality of democracy.
- **Koestler**: The rendez-vous of International Leftist bohemia.
- **Taylor**: Emotional experience of a lifetime.
- **H Browne**: Sign of international support.

**Question 5**

**How far can it be argued that the Civil War left Spain a divided and ruined land?**

The candidate should evaluate the cases that can be made for the degree of destruction and political dislocation that came about in Spain as a consequence of the Civil War.

| Divided and Ruined | Other evidence |
| --- | --- |
| Return to dictatorship and strict social control. | Unity secured. |
| Military courts in place until 1943. | Spanish Neutrality in WW2. |
| Secret Police system along with official party – FET y de las JONS intelligence brigade. | Eventual recognition by all major powers. |
| Social welfare linked to regime loyalty – power of party official. | Left Spain in position to secure wartime alliances with West and to maintain them in the post-war period due to its anti-Communist nature. |
| Bribery and corruption rife. | Regime was to be the basis of Spain's most economically successful period for centuries. |
| Documentary evidence used to persecute individuals connected to TUs. | The regime was popular with many. |
| 26,000 political prisoners by mid-40s. | Franco was never removed and his appointed monarch was popular enough to remain through the transition to democracy. |
| Re-establishment of the power of the Church, Army and Landowners. | |
| Repression of opposition in Basque area and, particularly in Catalonia. | |
| Repressive systems of education, employment, policing, courts. | |
| Widespread killings. | |
| Franco's maintaining of polarisation. | |

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Ellwood**: "Plurality and diversity were replaced in every sphere."
  "...acts of individual cruelty, however brutal, were easily surpassed by the collective cruelty (of the Dictatorship)."
  "even children who had participated in union-organised picnics ...were listed."
- **Preston**: "...until Franco's death, Spain was governed as if it were a country occupied by a victorious foreign army."
  "Wages were slashed, strikes treated as sabotage. The CNT and UGT were crushed. Travel and search for jobs were controlled."
  "Every effort was made to maintain the division between the victors and the vanquished."
- **Carr/Fusi**: His (Franco) aim was "to destroy the nineteenth century"; that is, parliamentary liberalism. "The secret of Franco's power lay in his manipulation of the political families (and for this purpose we must include the Falange, the Army and…the Church)." "His early governments were… paralysed by the mutual mistrust of soldiers and civilians."

**The Spanish Civil War (1931–1939)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How fully does Source A explain the reasons for the internal tensions in Spain in the early 1930s?**
(12 marks)

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context; recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source A** in providing an adequate explanation of the reasons for the internal tensions in Spain in the early 1930s, in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: accurate comment on Beevor will receive credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- A clash between left and right.
- Centralism against regional independence.
- Authoritarianism against freedom.
- 'Suicidal egotism' of the landowners.
- 'Revolutionary gymnastics' and rhetoric (of left).
- Could not have been avoided.
- (No) compromise could have been achieved after the failed left-wing coup of 1934.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Long-term factors of Church, Army, Regions and Land ownership were all significant.
- 36 election heralded death of Right's 'accidentalism'.
- Azaña's return was dreaded by Right and especially the Church and Army, both of which had been attacked in his previous administration.
- Sotelo's death cited but arrangements well under way by then.

**Points from recall which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Even in 1936, most Spaniards would vote for 'moderate' Left or Right and not for revolutionary parties.
- Left/Right struggle was an issue. Socialists were far more militant and both Anarchists and Communists had a disproportionate influence of Spanish politics.
- In the case of Barcelona this was a political issue as much as, or more than, regional. This was also true of the Asturias.
- Difficulty to know possibility of compromise since neither side pursued this strategy until later stages of the war, and then this reflected the desperation of the Republicans.
- Some comments hinted at a possibility, even during the war – General Yague: "We must be generous comrades".

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Thomas**: "The Spanish Republic failed because it came to be rejected by...both Left And Right... estranged many who, at first, with whatever reluctance, contemplated collaboration."
  "The country was constructed upon quarrels."
  "A liberal historian is tempted to blame individuals; Azaña, for his excessive pride...Robles, for vacillation...Caballero and Sotelo for incendiary speeches...Lerroux was indolent and corrupt."
- **Malefakis**: "The Right intensified the polarisation of society...and contributed to the conditions that would eventually erupt in the Spanish Civil War."
- **Preston**: "Ultimately, the SCW was to grow out of the efforts of the progressive leaders of the Republic to carry out reform against ...the most powerful sections of society."
  "Given the apparent determination of the working class to introduce major reforms and of the oligarchy to resist them, the failure of the legalist tactics could not but lead to a resurgence of the 'catastrophist' Right and the imposition of a corporative state by force of arms."
- **Esenwein and Shubert**: "What prompted the military rising was not the Republic's failure but…the possibility that it would succeed."
- **Ellwood**: "Calvo Sotelo's murder...hand(ed) to its enemies...the justification for its destruction."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the reasons for the internal tensions in Spain in the early 1930s.

**Question 2**

**How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations on the motives behind British Foreign Policy towards Spain?** **(16 marks)**

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)**

These **10 marks** will be awarded for:

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the views in **Sources B** and **C** on the motives behind British Foreign Policy towards Spain, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Points from Source B**

**Provenance:** Samuel Hoare, First Lord of the Admiralty and advocate and joint architect of Appeasement, influencing British Foreign Policy. The much criticised Hoare-Laval Pact is clear evidence of his political stance.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Call for 'strict neutrality'.
- Russians not to 'give help to the Communists'.
- On no account must we do anything to bolster up Communism.
- Communism in Portugal...would be a grave danger to the British Empire.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Amongst British Conservatives, anti-communist feeling was rife.
- Government increasingly became linked to Soviets due to need for aid.
- Until 30s USSR had made their intention to expand apparent.
- Spread to Spain and Portugal would cut off crucial sea routes and bases for Britain.

**Points from Source C**

**Provenance:** any accurate comment on Preston will receive credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- British goal to persuade Germans to the east if they wished to expand.
- Concern about the overall left-right balance in Europe.
- Inclined by their commercial interests to support Nationalists.
- Believed that the anarchists liable to seize and collectivise British holdings.

**Points from recall which support and explain the source's view**

- Appeasement policy had pandered to Fascist expansion in the east.
- Fear of Communism was a greater concern than rise of Fascism to many in west.
- British businesses had widespread investments.
- Extreme Left were keen to launch economic, political and social revolution.
- Collectivisation would take place throughout Spain early in the conflict.

**Points from recall which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the sources**

- Popular Front was not a Communist Government.
- Many British right-wingers overtly or covertly supported Franco.
- MI6 now implicated in rising by many.
- Labour Party originally supported the government's non-intervention policy therefore little mainstream opposition.
- Motives of individuals such as Chamberlain, Eden, Halifax could explain lack of enforcement.
- References to NYON conference and Non-Intervention.
- Extent to which Britain was aware of Fascist intervention could highlight motives.
- Antipathy to Soviet Union.
- Economic state.
- Military unreadiness.
- Franco did remain neutral in WWII.
- Straits of Gibraltar and Mediterranean crucial to British interests.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Preston**:  "Both sides denied aid though the Republic had a legal right."
  "a quiet glee that they may turn Hitler and Mussolini against the European Left."
  "Inclined by their considerable commercial interests to be...anything but sympathetic to the Republic."
- **Thomas**:  (Eden) "British interests would be best served by a stalemate."
  "Negrin talked...to Eden who said British public opinion did not want Franco to win."
- **Alpert**:  "Britain was an insular society for whom abroad was very far away."
  "(At the Labour Conference) the block vote system ensured that the motion against Non-Intervention was defeated by 3,029,000 to 51,000 votes."
- **Carr**:  "'The British stationed at Gibraltar were Nationalist sympathizers to a man."

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on the motives behind British Foreign Policy towards Spain.

**Question 3**

**How useful is Source D in explaining the reasons for Communist support of the Republic?**
                                                                                      **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.  These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views, that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of **Source D** in providing an adequate explanation of the reasons the Communist party came to the aid of the Republic in terms of:

**Provenance:** Primary source from Stalin, leader of the Soviet Union and in complete control of the Communist aid from Russia.  He is defining and controlling policy.  December '36, shortly after the arrival of crucial Aid from the Soviet Union.  Letter addressed to Caballero who was leader of the Popular Front govt…comment on form of communication?

**Points from source which show candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Peasants who are of great importance in country.
- Middle classes must be attracted.
- The Republican Party... should be drawn in.
- It is necessary to... prevent the enemies of Spain from presenting it as a Communist Republic and thus avert their open intervention.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualize those in the source**

- Stalin well-documented as aiming primarily for an alliance with Western Powers.
- Communists in Spain were extremely anti-revolutionary.
- Weapons restricted to pro-communist Republicans.
- Soviet aid was not provided for free.
- Evidence that Stalin was interested in prolonging the hostilities to pre-occupy Hitler and Mussolini.
- Many argued that the Communists restored much needed order to an 'anarchic' Republic.

**Points from recall which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source**

- Many Spanish and foreign Communists involved in the International Brigades would have been 'Party' politically motivated.
- Soviet Aid was crucial in the defence of Madrid and the continuation of Republican opposition to Franco.
- Communist antipathy towards other groups defending the Republic often cited in portraying them as 'using' Spain.
- Recent research has shown only a small accounting gap in payments made to USSR.
- Archives prove what many had suspected, namely "that Stalin sought from the very beginning to control events in Spain and to manage or prevent the spread of actual social revolution".
- Some have long argued – from Gerald Brenan, George Orwell and Vernon Richards in the 1930s, to Murray Bookchin and Noam Chomsky in the 1960s and later – that the Communists' authoritarianism and counter-revolutionary politics (deliberately) destroyed the capacity of the Spanish peasants and workers to fight on.
- Opposing view has held that the social revolution and the anarchists' role in it only interfered with the urgency of waging a campaign against Franco.
- According to Bolloten, the Communists' aim was to expand their power gradually and gain influence over the army, police and political apparatus.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Heywood**: the Republic's key problem was re-establishing order which had effectively passed on to revolutionary groups with their own agenda (Barcelona–CNT, Madrid–UGT). 'Revolutionary experiments' (spontaneous and forced collectivisation) had drastically undermined the government's authority. Therefore, arguably, the communists were acting in best interests of the Republic.
- **Preston**: "Political ideologies of Anarchists and Communists were entirely incompatible."
- **Thomas**: "Caballero even suspected that Kleber (leader of the International Brigades) ...wished to stage a communist coup d'état in Madrid." "They (Prieto and Negrín) hated the P.O.U.M. and the anarchists as much as the Communists did." Therefore little 'unity' between Republican forces.
- **Orwell**: "A government which sends boys of fifteen to the front and keeps the biggest men and the newest weapons in the rear is manifestly more afraid of the revolution than of the Fascists." Loyal Communists kept at home to 'police' Anarchists.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source D** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the reasons the Communist party came to the aid of the Republic.

**Britain At War and Peace (1939–1951)**

**Part 1**
**Each question is worth 25 marks**

**Question 1**

**What factors best explain Britain's victory in the Battle of the Atlantic?**

As Churchill said "...the only thing that ever really frightened me during the war was the U-boat peril". By that he meant that the threat to Britain's Atlantic lifeline posed by German submarines was so great that it would in all probability have led to wholesale defeat in the war. The candidate would be expected to reflect the importance of this conflict in their answer and to explore the various strategies, technological improvements and tactical developments which led to the ultimate defeat of the wolf packs.

**The candidate will offer an explanation for Britain's victory in the Battle of the Atlantic in terms of evidence such as:**

- Britain in 1939 purchased half her food and two thirds of her raw materials from abroad. The inability to safeguard the regular supply of these vital materials would have forced Britain out of the war at a very early stage.
- In October 1940, each German U-boat operating in the Atlantic sank the equivalent of 920 tons of shipping per day. Such losses to merchant shipping, had they continued at that rate, would have been disastrous.

**Tactical factors**

- The foundation of victory over the U-boats was laid at the Casablanca Conference when Churchill and Roosevelt decided that the defeat of the U-boat menace must become the Allies' top priority.
- Corvettes, small warships of less than 100 tons were added to the convoys to help plug the gaps in the Royal Navy's escort capability. Their deployment within the rapidly increasing Royal Canadian Navy was to have a huge impact on convoy protection.
- The US Navy took over convoy protection in the western Atlantic from 1942 and their naval strength eventually wore down the U-boats in this theatre.
- The deployment of VLR aircraft to the Royal Canadian Navy in the shape of Liberators with centimetric radar helped to close the mid-Atlantic air gap and helped immensely in the detection of U-boats. This was developed by the second half of 1943 when Bomber Harris was finally persuaded to release more long-range aircraft for this purpose, instead of bombing U-boat pens and production facilities as previously used.

**Technological developments**

- The use of High Frequency Direction Finding equipment (Huff-Duff) on escort ships further improved U-boat detection on the convoys.
- The capture of the enigma code machines was a vital breakthrough in intelligence and the resulting 'Ultra' intelligence gave the British a priceless advantage. With advance notice of where the U-boats were operating, the British were able to divert convoys away from where the wolf packs were operating.
- Improved radio communication from ship-to-ship and ship-to-shore helped significantly in avoiding lurking U-boats.
- The development of the 'hedgehog' multiple mortar system, fired from the front of escort vessels instead of the rear as depth charges were, was a big improvement in U-boat destruction.
- ASV radar helped detect surfaced U-boats at a far greater distance and aircraft could be directed towards them speedily.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Richard Overy**: is reluctant to pinpoint any one factor over the other as a specific reason for victory but commends highly the energy, drive and invention of Admiral Horton as being significant.
- **Prof D Syrett**: stresses the huge importance of intelligence in winning the battle and in particular, the cracking of the Enigma code.
- Canadian historian **Jim Lotz**: rightly praises the enormous contribution of the Canadian Navy to ultimate victory.
- **John Keegan**: stresses the importance of the revamped convoy system as an integral part of the success had against the submarine menace.

**Question 2**

**"History will judge us kindly." (Churchill)**
**How justified are criticisms of Churchill's wartime leadership?**

The question invites the candidate to evaluate the ongoing debate between historians about the importance of Churchill's leadership during the Second World War. The question is open to interpretation. However, the question cannot be answered sufficiently with just a narrative of Churchill's success as Prime Minister. The best candidates will be able to make a balanced judgement from the evidence presented by Churchill's critics as well as his supporters. The candidate ought to be aware of the fact that Churchill, himself, wrote a definitive history of the Second World War and this has influenced the debate ever since.

**The candidate will assess the validity of the view in terms of evidence such as:**

**The possible justifications for criticism about Winston Churchill**

- He did not push to make Britain neutral in 1939.
- He was perceived to have sold Britain out to the Americans.
- He was so single-minded and stubborn it prevented him seeing the big picture of the war.
- His military tactics were suspect, Narvik and Greece.
- He frequently dismissed his military advisors if they did not agree with his military strategies. As a consequence prolonging the war.
- He was impulsive, so much so he had to be discretely reined in by his closest advisors.
- He had an excessive ego and believed in his own manifest destiny.
- He had no desire to organise the Home Front.
- His actions and alliances caused the decline of the British Colonial Empire.
- Because of Britain's debt and colonial decline she became a bit-part player on the world political stage. Churchill was implicated in causing this.
- His role in the end-of-war conferences.

**The possible justifications for a defence of Churchill against his critics**

- Excellent leadership skills in a time of national crisis.
- A great orator with a charismatic personality.
- He was an archetypal visionary.
- He had an experienced military background.
- Historically he was a dissenter of appeasement.
- He immersed himself fully in the military side of the war.
- He was a very good diplomat.
- He made natural friendships and alliances with countries who were decidedly more powerful than Britain.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Martin Gilbert**: who the candidate can use as Churchill's defence lawyer because of his research from primary source material against harsher critics such as **John Charmley** who is a well-documented unsubscriber to the Churchill fan club. He believes the predicament of winning the war meant that Churchill betrayed his core values of British independence, Empire, and anti-socialism. Charmley identifies this betrayal when Churchill hocks Britain to America and fails miserably to win the election in 1945.
- **Ponting**: is unsure of Churchill's motives whilst **John Strawson** rejects Charmley's more critical views.
- **Richard Lamb**: however, is less controversial. He does not attack Churchill's integrity but prefers to be critical about his strategic awareness. Lamb is not alone in his evaluation of Churchill's naivety in all matters military. His view is corroborated by **Stephen Roskill** who criticises Churchill's use of the Air force to primarily bomb Germany rather than support the Navy during the Battle of the Atlantic.
- **Andrew Roberts**: is credited for works about Churchill's diplomatic skills with our allies. He has also published work comparing the leadership styles of Churchill and Hitler. Furthermore, he identified the rocky relationship Churchill had with the Conservative Party during the war years. Nevertheless there are other eminent supporters of Churchill such as Norman Rose and Geoffrey Best.

This list is not exhaustive; there are many other historians with views about Churchill. However, candidates may wish to consider that Churchill provided the world with a prolific account of his own involvement in the War. The difficulty for the candidate therefore is in maintaining their objectivity.

When studying this issue Churchill's views sit like a pink elephant in the corner of the room. The candidates ought to realise that as they review his work it needs to be scrutinised in conjunction with other relevant historiography in order to put it in context.

**Question 3**

**"The surprising thing about the war is how little it changed women's lives."**
**How valid is this view?**

The key to answering this question lies in the candidate's interpretation of change. Clearly all women's lives were changed to some degree by the experience of war but what H L Smith means in this quote is change in a lasting sense, beyond the immediate confines of the war. A successful answer to this question will, therefore, examine how the war impacted on women's lives and make an assessment of the degree to which these changes had a long-term impact.

**The candidate will offer an assessment of the validity of the viewpoint in the question in terms of evidence such as:**

**In favour of the view that there was not significant change**

- The number of women remaining in full-time work after the war fell significantly thus contradicting the notion that war work was an emancipating experience.
- The marriage rate increased post (and during) war and the baby boom post war would seem to indicate a significant return to the pre-war notion of domesticity and motherhood as women's primary preoccupation.
- Mass Observation surveys tend to reinforce the point of view that war work was seen as a temporary phenomenon and that women expected to return to their more traditional roles in society once the conflict ended.
- In this respect, the Beveridge Report proved to be a socially conservative document in introducing Family Allowances as a 'reward' for child bearing and in making the retrieval of missed national insurance contributions for women who took time out to have children, more difficult than for men who returned to work after a break.
- The education reforms introduced through the Butler Education Act certainly reinforced the notion of training for motherhood as a substantial part of the education of those who failed the eleven plus test.
- Trade union opposition to women members and to women in skilled occupations remained steadfast and whilst career opportunities for professional women expanded in the fifties, social norms still centred round a woman as a carer and housewife.

**Against the view**

- The view that the impact of the war on women's role in society was fundamental in changing their lives is central to Marwick's theories. His view is that war work was emancipating, drew women, traditionally housebound, into the world of work, giving them a financial independence and an enhanced sense of their status in society. Candidates may have a lot to say on the extent of change, during the war, that women saw in their everyday jobs and the range of jobs they were called upon to do eg work in shipbuilding, heavy engineering, munitions and on the land. Some employers even went as far as to increase wages for women to the level of men's in like-for-like non-skilled jobs and there was an increase in the female membership of trade unions.
- Psychologically, women may have developed an alternative view of their subordinate role within marriage after having coped with their enforced position as head of the household, main breadwinner, disciplinarian and family decision maker, in the absence of the male figure in the home. Spiralling divorce rates tend to reinforce this notion.
- Educational opportunities certainly opened up for all girls post-1945 and an increasing number of girls were attending university by the late fifties.
- Although equal pay was a long way off, the differentials had been eroded during the war and women were better paid for similar type work as men.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **H L Smith**:  is clearly dubious about any real lasting impact and in this respect he is partly supported by **Penny Summerfield**.
- **Marwick and Titmus**:  hold the traditionalist line that the war had a profound social impact and that its effects were to be felt long after its conclusion.
- **Peter Hennessy**:  in his admirable book on the fifties in Britain, presents the view that women were more influenced by the community in which they lived with regards to their expectations of life and that the prevailing norm of the fifties was a return to domesticity and motherhood.
- **De Groot** hails the advent of the contraceptive pill in the sixties as the real emancipator of women.

**Question 4**

**How accurate is the view that the outcome of the 1945 election was due to the Conservatives' complacency?**

The question can be treated as an isolated factor question. It ought to evaluate the contribution of the complacent attitude shown to the electorate and its significance to the Conservatives' electoral defeat. However, the question leads the candidate to explore other reasons behind the Conservatives defeat such as the failings of their election campaign, the attractiveness of their rival's campaigns as well as other mitigating factors such as the apparent shift to the left in British politics post 1945.

**The candidate will assess the validity of the view in the terms of such evidence as:**

**The complacent aspects of the Conservative election campaign**

- Suspect campaigning methods and the inability to read the changing mood of the nation.
- The response the Conservatives gave to the Beveridge Report.
- They took for granted a public gratitude for winning the war.
- They focused too much on Churchill's charismatic leadership.

**Other factors that need considering are**

- The electorate's view of the Conservative Party.
- The effect war had upon party organisation.
- The decision to end the coalition.
- The significance of the ten-year election gap.
- The ghost of the hungry 1930's.
- The apparent swing to the left because of the hope of a 'New Jerusalem'.
- The expertise of the Labour Party, whose responsibility was the 'home front' in the Coalition Government.
- The importance of the armed forces vote and the influence of organisations such as ABCA.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.**
**They may include reference to:**

- **Paul Adelman**: who assesses the importance of the Conservative smear campaigns as a factor in losing the election. He criticises the use of such tactics and he tells us they 'backfire' as a plausible vote winner.
- **Henry Pelling**: however, justifies the overwhelming support for Labour as a reaction to Conservative rule in the 1930's.
- Whilst **Jefferys, Pugh and Addison**: all agree that the responsibility for the 'Home Front' held by Labour members of the Coalition Government as a major vote winner. Nevertheless, we cannot discount **Clark's** view that Armed Service votes and the contribution of organisations such as ABCA played a major role in the defeat of the Conservatives.
- Finally, we ought to confront the nonconformist view of **Fielding**. His hypothesis is that the winner of the election would simply be the party who whole heartedly advocated the social change proposed in the Beveridge Report regardless of label and campaign style.

**Question 5**

**To what extent did a political consensus exist between the main political parties by 1951?**

This essay focuses on the end of the topic and requires the candidate to examine the political philosophies of the two main parties by 1951 and assess the degree to which they were in agreement over fundamental issues relating to social and economic policy. Can it be said that the Tories had moved their philosophy closer to the middle ground of politics and adopted Labour's clothes in order to become electable? Were these changes in philosophy to be a permanent feature of the British political landscape post-1951 or were these policy movements adopted only by a political elite within both parties, leaving the rank and file to continue their bitter ideological war from the back benches? Which historians subscribe to which views and what are their arguments? A successful answer will show a clear understanding of what might comprise the nuts and bolts of a 'consensus' and an awareness of the arguments surrounding the validity of this concept.

**The candidate will assess the extent to which a political consensus existed in terms of such evidence as:**

**Arguments for consensus**

- The notion of the existence of such a consensus was first put forward by Paul Addison in his book *The Road to 1945*. In it he claims that the experience of working together in the wartime coalition had engendered a common belief in what was required of post-war reconstruction, an area of common ground which persisted into the 50s and beyond. The White Paper chase of 1944 had seen the development of policies leading to legislation on Education and Family Allowances.
- By the late 1940s and early 50s he argues, this common approach to solving problems of reconstruction had led to both parties accepting as fixed points in the landscape, ideas such as a mixed economy, full employment, a welfare state and co-operation with the trade union movement.
- Evidence of this could be seen in the Tories' *Industrial Charter* drafted by Butler in 1947 and *The Right Road for Britain* in 1949 where a commitment to these principles was made.
- The minimal policy difference on domestic issues in the respective Tory and Labour manifestos of 1950 and 1951.
- In the 1950s – Churchill's insistence, on being elected in 1951, that they did not pick a fight with the unions and to work co-operatively with them.
- Any reference to post 1951 Butskellism should be credited.

**Arguments against consensus**

- On the other hand Kevin Jefferys, in his article *Consensus revisited* challenged the extent to which any such adoption of common ground existed outside of what he called the "political elite" of both parties. He claimed that there continued to be much hostility towards such "socialist" ideas from the rank and file of the Conservative Party, particularly over the issue of nationalisation. Webster, the official historian of the NHS states that the "fragile coalition between the two on the creation of an NHS" had broken down as early as 1944 and that both parties kept their own counsel on this topic.
- Disagreement over nationalisation can be seen in the battle over the steel industry and the commonly held argument amongst Tory MPs that the first priority of post-war reconstruction should be economic regeneration rather than Beveridge's expensive proposals for welfare reform. Addison responded to this argument by modifying his terminology of consensus, preferring instead to refer in future works to a "post-war settlement" as opposed to a consensus. However, there is general agreement amongst historians of the post-war period that whichever government held power after 1951, the broad principles of a mixed economy, full employment and a welfare state were 'untouchable'. That is until Thatcher came to power in 1979 and substituted consensus politics for conviction politics.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **Corelli Barnett's**: withering attack on all post-war governments for following the same policies on reconstruction and welfarism throughout the 50s.
- **Addison's**: theories on the extent of cross-party cooperation is broadly supported by **Kavanagh and Morris and Button.**
- **Ben Pimlott and Steven Fielding**: agree with **Jefferys** that the degree of consensual thinking was reserved for those at ministerial level and that within the 1922 Committee for example and the Labour National Executive the politics of confrontation continued to thrive well into the 60s.

**Britain at War and Peace (1939–1951)**

**Part 2**

**Question 1**

**How useful is Source A as evidence of Britain's preparedness for war in 1939?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded **a total of 5 marks** for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. This may be split 3/2 or 2/3.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's value.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of the usefulness of **Source A** as evidence of Britain's preparedness for war in 1939 in terms of:

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- Comments from an eyewitness who was a Government Minister at the outbreak of war and in a position to evaluate the situation first hand.
- May well be biased or exaggerated given his role as a Government Minister of the time and contain possible retrospective exoneration of the Government's record on this issue.
- Memoir… value of that.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Identifies as crucial to enhancing Britain's preparedness, the year's gap between the Munich settlement (implied) and the outbreak of war.
- Identifies huge improvements in the operational capabilities of Fighter Command in this year's grace as well as ground defences against German bombers.
- Indicates that the enhanced provision of a chain of radar stations from the far north to London was a crucial factor in ensuring the country's safety.
- Other anti-aircraft defences increased.

**Points from recall which support and contextualise those in the source**

- Lord Swanton, Air Minister developed Scheme L in 1938 which provided for 12,000 planes over the next two years and an integrated production system saw shadow factories built as a priority.
- In Sept 1938, the RAF had 5 squadrons of Hurricanes and one of Spitfires. A year later it had 26 squadrons of both types. Lack of trained pilots remained a big problem, however.
- Bomber aircraft were hastily constructed with increased production of the Wellington, Hampden and Whitley.
- The provision of anti-aircraft guns had expanded fourfold between 1937 and 1939 and the chain of radar stations first proposed by Robert Watson-Watt was indeed in place by summer 1939.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- The candidate would be expected to challenge the view put forward by Butler that Britain was well prepared for war in 1939 not only in terms of the rearmament debate but also in terms of economic and civil defence provision.
- Mention could be made of the fact that anti-aircraft guns were only at two fifths of estimated requirements and that Coventry for example had no such provision.
- An analysis of the state of the navy and army would be expected with the army being the poor relation of the three and designed for a limited liability war, consisting of provision for home and imperial defence but not a continental war.
- In terms of expenditure on rearmament, Germany was spending £1710 million in 1938 compared to Britain's £358 million.
- In economic terms, Chamberlain had done little to gear the domestic economy up for total war in the firm belief that his 'long game' strategy would bring a quick economic strangulation of Germany and therefore obviate the necessity of disrupting the workings of the free market economy. Having one and a quarter million unemployed in Jan 1940 was testimony to that.
- Whilst evacuation had been successfully planned and to some degree successfully carried out, the adequacy of provision of air raid defences remains a hotly contested topic.
- Candidates may also wish to dispute whether the National Government had done all that it could pre-1939 to secure reliable allies in a potential conflict with Germany and whether Churchill's criticisms of appeasement as a policy had any merit.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- **C L Mowatt**: who criticises the extent of preparedness of the army and the lack of mechanised transport available by 1939.
- **Michael Howard**: who suggests that the navy was the only branch of the services equipped for a modern war.
- **Tiratsoo and Hylton**: who are adamant that civil defence preparations were utterly inadequate and perhaps even deliberately so for fear of engendering a deep shelter mentality.
- **Paul Addison** who slates Chamberlain's economic policy prior to the outbreak of war as myopic and politically self-interested.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful as evidence of Britain's preparedness for war in 1939.

**Question 2**

**How much do Sources B and C reveal about the differing interpretations of the impact of the blitz in Britain during the war?** (16 marks)

**Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)**

Candidates may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of **each** source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

**Contextual and historical interpretation (maximum 10 marks)**

**These 10 marks will be awarded for:**

- the quality and depth of the contextual recall
- the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
- the range and quality of historians' views
- provenance comment – (if appropriate).

The candidate considers the interpretations in **Sources B** and **C** on the impact of the blitz, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

**Source B**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include:

- An eyewitness account from the period at the beginning of the blitz in London.
- Letter sent to parents for private communication so no suggestion of bias… but maybe sent to re-assure.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Source credits Londoners with high morale.
- Source expresses considerable admiration for her fellow sufferers and the way they react to adversity.
- Claims that those sheltering from the raid were full of communal spirit and looked out for each other.
- Suggests a large degree of bravery on the part of the people sheltering who simply sang when a bomb fell nearby, implying a high degree of morale.

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**

- Viewpoints in the source certainly typify those expressed by many at the time and which were expanded upon by Ministry of Information newsreel films for public consumption in cinemas both home and abroad.
- Those who advocate that a spirit of the blitz did exist and who went on to claim that the British were at their best in this period of extreme adversity would subscribe to the view outlined in the source.
- There are plenty of eyewitness accounts and Mass Observation reports on record which would echo the sentiments in this source.
- The fact that there was no wide scale collapse of civilian morale would suggest a fair element of truth in the source's interpretation of people's reactions to the blitz.
- This is certainly the image that the government wished to convey to the public at large and (just as vitally) to the American public and press.

**Source C**

**Provenance:** appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: Accurate commentary on James Richards and his revisionist views may be given credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show that the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Clear statement that the notion of a British people united in adversity and with high morale is nothing more than a myth.
- That there were clear class differences in people's experience of the blitz and that those who had money could avoid the worst dangers of bombing.
- That the government displayed a callous disregard for the welfare of the ordinary population in its provision of shelter facilities and that ordinary people were forced to take matters into their own hands to find adequate shelter or leave the cities altogether at night time to find safety in the countryside.
- That far from high spirits and cheerful disposition amongst the population there was anger, despair and bitter feelings of class resentment.

**Points which offer wider contextualisation of views in the source**

- Much evidence is available of panic and low morale in cities like Plymouth where trekking was a regular feature of the public's response to heavy raids.
- Many better-off people did disperse to their country estates or to relatives in the countryside and many sent their children overseas for the duration. This caused considerable anger amongst lower classes and lowered morale. Use of reinforced concrete cellars in the Dorchester Hotel and the Cafe de Paris was restricted to those who could afford to patronise such establishments, again causing resentment.
- Shelter provision in the east end of London was patchy and often highly inadequate, leading the locals to take over the railway arches and vast warehouse at Tilbury in Stepney where upwards of 11,000 sheltered nightly. Finally, frustration with the complete lack of deep shelters forced Londoners to take over tube stations at night, after first being refused access to them by a panicky government.
- The image of the cheerful cockneys, joining in community singing is at odds with most recollections of east enders and by 1941 only 9 per cent of them were using shelters provided for them, preferring instead to shelter at home or in improvised circumstances.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:**

- Modern historian **Andrew Roberts**: who remains steadfast in his adherence to the 'finest hour' argument and insists that the British people were indeed at their best in this period of crisis and that morale was rock solid.
- **Dr Nick Tiratsoo and Stuart Hylton's**: more sceptical view of this thesis and their assertion that morale was nowhere near as high as suggested, citing widespread panic and anger in the east end of London at inadequate shelter provision as well as the widespread incidence of industrial unrest especially on the Clyde where workers often saw their employers as a greater enemy than Hitler.
- **H L Smith**: makes several references to the huge increase in opportunistic crime during the blitz as does **Angus Calder**.
- **Robert Mackay**: in his book *Half the Battle* does his best to drag the argument back into the middle ground and suggests clearly in his work that there is considerable foundation to the notion that morale did indeed remain strong during the blitz. The adherents to the 'spirit of the blitz' as a traditional view are not prepared to concede that more modern evidence cited by the revisionists named above outweighs the heroism, altruism and solidarity of the many. **Stevenson** (1984) **Thorpe** (1992) **Hennessy** (1992) and **Mackay** (1999)

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on the impact of the blitz on civilian morale.

**Question 3**

**How fully does Source D explain the effectiveness of the Labour Governments in their management of the economy between 1945–1951?** **(12 marks)**

The candidate may be awarded up to **3 marks** for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians' views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source's fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source D** as an adequate analysis of the effectiveness of the Labour Governments in their management of the economy between 1945–1951, in terms of:

**Provenance:** Appropriate and relevant comments on provenance can earn credit. These may include: Accurate commentary on Kevin Jefferys may be given credit under historiography.

**Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant view(s)**

- Source suggests Labour was successful in providing the climate for sustained economic growth over the 6 years.
- That exports, the lifeblood of the economy, increased threefold in this period and that industrial output also increased significantly.
- Balance of Payments were healthy in at least two of the years, a not inconsiderable feat given the decimation of overseas trade by the war.
- Inflation was kept to a minimum of 5 per cent through wage and price controls.
- There was no return to the mass unemployment suffered by the industrial heartlands of Britain in the thirties through a sensitive handling of demobilisation.

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise the views in the source**

- Dalton made it clear that the overriding priority of economic policy was to substantially increase overseas exports, cut back on non-essential imports and find a way to reduce the balance of payments deficit. The economy was therefore geared towards producing exportable commodities at the expense of domestic consumables. Balance of payments surpluses in two of the years showed some degree of success in this sphere.
- A strict control on wages, prices and rents led to a low rate of inflation over the 6 years.
- Unemployment was held at a steady 2 and a half per cent which contrasted greatly with the high levels pre-war and was partly attributable to nationalisation of strategic industries and demand management policies of the government.

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the source**

- Some reference to the Financial Dunkirk scenario would be expected and an appraisal of how Labour, with the aid of foreign loans, staved off bankruptcy and restructured the economy.
- An appraisal of Labour's flagship policy of nationalisation and other aspects of a managed economy. Candidates may have a lot to say about the extent of nationalisation and how it altered the economic landscape in Britain.
- The extent to which demand management and tight fiscal controls helped the economy to recover.
- That the creation of a fully-fledged welfare state was achieved against this kind of economic backdrop.
- The candidate would also be expected to balance out this picture of success with reference to significant failings such as the fuel crisis of 1947 and Shinwell's mishandling of the situation.
- The government did not tackle the fundamental weakness of the economy in areas of over manning in staple industries. Comment on the state of labour unrest in 1945–51 period.
- Critics also refer to the frequent Sterling crises and the devaluation of the pound, over reliance on US economic aid and the failure to meet the demands of the public for consumer goods in the period of austerity. Critics also claim the bureaucratic nature of a state-managed economy-stifled enterprise and individual initiative.

**Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views.**
**These may include reference to:**

- **Kenneth Morgan**: is a staunch supporter of Labour's economic record, citing it as one of the most successful governments of the 20th century.
- **Peter Hennessy**: also praises Labour's ability to deliver a large measure of welfarism in the face of economic adversity and commends its Keynesian approach to demand management.
- Critics from the left such as **Tomlinson and Fielding** bemoan the lack of genuine socialism in its policies, criticise nationalisation plans for not incorporating workers' representatives on boards of management and failing to pursue redistributive taxation policies.
- From the right we have the familiar litany of complaints from **Barnett** that nothing was done to regenerate industry or recapitalise it in terms of plant and capacity. Equally he bemoans the creation of an expensive welfare state, ill-affordable in a time when there were other more pressing priorities such as education and which led, he says, to a dependency culture from which Britain has never broken free.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source D** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the degree to which the Labour Governments of 1945–1951 successfully managed the economy, presenting a balanced viewpoint ranged around the points made above.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]