

**2004 History**

**Advanced Higher**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

## **HISTORY – ADVANCED HIGHER 2004**

### **Contents page**

<b>Field 1:</b>	<b>Northern Britain from the Romans to AD1000</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>Field 2:</b>	<b>Scottish Independence (1286-1329)</b>	<b>Page 16</b>
<b>Field 3:</b>	<b>The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries</b>	<b>Page 29</b>
<b>Field 4:</b>	<b>France in the Age of Louis XIV</b>	<b>Page 41</b>
<b>Field 5:</b>	<b>Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland 1715-1800</b>	<b>Page 54</b>
<b>Field 6:</b>	<b>“The House Divided”: USA (1850-1865)</b>	<b>Page 65</b>
<b>Field 7:</b>	<b>Japan: From Medieval to Modern State (1850s – 1920)</b>	<b>Page 76</b>
<b>Field 8:</b>	<b>Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War</b>	<b>Page 88</b>
<b>Field 9:</b>	<b>South Africa (1910 – 1984)</b>	<b>Page 105</b>
<b>Field 10:</b>	<b>Soviet Russia (1917 – 1953)</b>	<b>Page 124</b>
<b>Field 11:</b>	<b>The Spanish Civil War (1931 – 1939)</b>	<b>Page 138</b>
<b>Field 12:</b>	<b>Britain at War and Peace (1939 – 1951)</b>	<b>Page 149</b>

## **HISTORY – ADVANCED HIGHER 2004**

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

#### **Part 1**

**Each question is worth 25 marks**

#### **Question 1**

**How much does the evidence tell us about Iron Age society in Northern Britain before the Roman invasion?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will show that the candidate knows about the main archaeological and literary evidence and has some familiarity with the work of eg Breeze and Armit. The candidate should know that all the literary evidence was written outside Northern Britain by Romans, eg Tacitus, Dio, Herodian, Ptolemy and Caesar, and will be aware of its limitations. The candidate may draw comparisons with what is known about society in Gaul, Southern Britain and Ireland. A lot is in fact known from archaeology about settlements and housing, weapons and tools and a fair picture may be made of a tribal and hierarchical society with religious beliefs. The Ballachulish figure – religion, beliefs: finds in pits in houses – animal/humans. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will do the above but will develop a more coherent and analytical answer. It should be familiar with the literary evidence (there is not much) and critical of it while accepting that there is something in it, especially in Ptolemy's "Map". It should be clear about the distinctive features of "Celtic" society, on which Breeze and Armit agree, viz that it was more or less rural, tribal, hierarchical, familiar, heroic and non-literate. It should be clear about settlement types - hill forts, broch villages, unenclosed settlements - and about the variety and quality of housing - various types of round houses, brochs, duns, souterrains, crannogs - and should reveal knowledge about tools, weapons, farming and religion, eg votive offerings. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will contain all the above and will provide a clear synthesis of both kinds of evidence, showing familiarity with the historiography, all welded into a well structured essay which deals clearly and in a balanced way with the question. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 2

**“They create a desolation and call it peace.” Is this a fair comment on Roman contacts with Northern Britain?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) may not even identify the quotation! Calgacus, the British/Caledonian leader, according to the speech written for him by Tacitus, uttered this memorable phrase in his pre-battle speech. The candidate will be familiar, perhaps at the expense of answering the question, with the main phases of Roman contact - Flavian, Hadrianic, Antonine, Severan - and will make an attempt to assess the impact of the Roman armies and occupation, dealing with warfare, forced labour, taxation, slavery, recruitment on the debit side and with the *Pax Romana*, peace, treaty relationships, army service, economic opportunities, road and fort building, civil settlements, circulation of currency and the start of literacy on the credit side. There may be consideration of the beginnings of Christianity...or more souterrains meaning increased food production. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will do the above and should show some knowledge of the discussion in the speeches in the *Agricola* of the impact of Roman conquest. It should include some estimate of the numbers of Roman soldiers involved and how often, going into the evidence for fighting, the *Agricola* and the Antonine Wall Distance Slabs and the views of eg Armit that *Agricola*'s advance must have had devastating results. The discussion of the pros and cons of Roman occupation should be more analytical and show knowledge of differential treatment of eg the Votadini and the Venicones contrasted with the Selgovae and Caledonii. It should examine what is known about Roman and native contacts and should be aware that the Roman presence/pressure led to a reduction of the number of "political units" in Northern Britain. The answer should try to strike a balance about the impact of Rome; probably good on the whole. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD Answer (18+ marks) will do all of the above and will from the start keep focused on the issue, was Roman conquest a disaster, was it beneficial or harmful, was it a mixture, perhaps considering the views of Tacitus, a typical Roman imperialist. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians, which may include Armit and Breeze.

### Question 3

#### **Is St Columba the most significant figure in the history of Christianity in Northern Britain?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will basically answer "Yes" after looking at the appearance of Christianity in Northern Britain, associated with the Roman Army on Hadrian's Wall, and discussing the rather shadowy Niniavus, St Ninian, and his work as a Bishop at Whithorn in Galloway from 395AD on; his immediate followers may have spread the faith in the East of Scotland and in the area where the Antonine Wall had been; certainly Ninian came to a Christian community and arguably strengthened it.

The only other great figure, leaving aside St Mungo and St Cuthbert, was St Columba, whose arrival in the West of Scotland at Hinba in 563 and later at Iona was of major significance; Iona was a major religious, cultural and political influence and its establishment and work later led to the conversion of the Picts and even the Vikings. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will put a lot more flesh on the above, with more evidence about early Christianity, the importance of Constantine and more detailed analysis of Ninian's work; at Whithorn he did not come to a pagan community, but was sent as a Bishop to an existing Christian Community. He had been "regularly instructed at Rome" (which is ambiguous) but certainly represented the Roman and hierarchical model of the church. A good answer will reveal that Columba too probably came to a community of the faithful but expanded it by founding other monasteries besides Iona which, with their scriptoria and libraries and patronage of craftsmen, had a profound effect. His "model" of the church organisation was based on a rural society and the central institution and figure was the abbey and abbot, a model which later prevailed all over Scotland. He played a political role in the succession to the Dal Riata throne (he was of royal Dal Riata stock himself) and made the church one of the major institutions in society. No wonder he was the Patron Saint of Scotland before his position was usurped by St Andrew; Columba's bones were paraded in a reliquary before the Scottish Army on the eve of Bannockburn. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will be a much more confident discussion of the above, looking critically and analytically at the roles of the various *dramatis personae* and getting to grips with their significance. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians, which may include Sally M Foster.

#### Question 4

##### **Examine the changing relations between the Picts and their neighbours up to 800 AD.**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will attempt a broad survey of relations between the Picts and the Scots of Dal Riata in Argyll; the Britons of Strathclyde with their stronghold at Dumbarton Rock; the Angles/Northumbrians of Northumbria/Lothian. Candidates will realise that the date 800 AD precludes any discussion of the Vikings and ends before the takeover of Pictland by the Scots in the 9<sup>th</sup> century. The question could be answered chronologically or by studying the relations with each neighbour in turn. The candidate would be expected to consider some of the aspects below.

Whether or not the Dal Riata moved from NE Ulster/Antrim to Argyll or not (see discussion in Campbell's *Saints and Sea Kings*), the people of that name, also called Scots, though they shared a common Celtic heritage with the Picts and the Britons, assumed a distinct political identity which the Picts failed to crush in the 5<sup>th</sup> century or later. Relations between Scots and Picts swung back and forth. In 563 the Picts defeated the Scots in Dal Riata. In 603 the Scots, under Aidan, were again defeated by the Picts, at Degsastan (Dawston) and their power and influence waned thereafter for some time.

The work of Columba among the Scots 563-597 led to missionary contact with the Picts, outcome unknown. There was a westward movement of the Scots into Pictland but in 685, by which date the Picts were the most important people in North Britain, they appear to have redefined their boundaries with the Scots, giving them all the lands west of Druim Alban in exchange for Scottish settlements in Perthshire. In 741 there was "the smiting of Dal Riata by Oengus son of Fergus [King of Scots]" in which he "utterly destroyed" the Scots - no doubt a great exaggeration; battles then featured hundreds a side more often than thousands. That was the first and last sustained campaign by the Picts against the Scots; it did not work; in 768 there was a battle in Fortriu, a Pictish province, between Picts and Scots; the latter must have moved west. The Scots at times considered the Picts as a subject people and thought they had a traditional right to an overlordship of them. By the 8<sup>th</sup> century southern Pictland was increasingly associated with the Scots and a Pictish Scottish alliance grew until there was little to distinguish between the two peoples; Kings of Scots were simultaneously Kings of Picts and vice versa. Apart from these "political" relations there were ecclesiastical/cultural ones. Who converted the Picts is a thorny question but it may have been Scots/Columban missionaries and before and after links with the Northumbrian church, the church in Pictland may have been Columban. Through contacts with the Scots, Pictland was brought into contact with Iona, one of the greatest centres of monastic civilisation at the time and the great disseminator of ideas and motifs throughout Pictland; Irish Art clearly had some influence on Pictish Art.

Moving on to relations with the Britons, they too sometimes considered the Picts a subject people and once imposed a king on them in the late 7<sup>th</sup> century. Ecgfrith of Northumbria massacred a Pictish army c672, leaving the southern Picts devoid of leadership and fighting men and enabling the Britons to assume overlordship of the Picts. Thirty years before the Britons helped the Picts, unintentionally, by defeating and killing Domnall Breac, King of the Scots, at the battle of Strathcarron, leading to a serious decline in the affairs of the Scots. You could say the Britons confined the Scots and Picts above the Forth-Clyde line. The battle of Nechtansmere (Dunnichen Moss) 685 in which the Picts killed Ecgfrith of Northumbria regained them the southern part of their kingdom and released the Scots and Britons from their tribute obligations to the Northumbrians. The Picts had a direct "frontier" with the Scots and Angles, less so with the Britons, so relations were less complex.

Relations with the Angles were complex. From the mid 7<sup>th</sup> century the Scots, Picts and Britons all suffered from Northumbrian aggression. The Picts temporarily lost part of southern Pictland, while the Scots and Britons had to acknowledge Anglian overlordship and pay some kind of tribute. That was the down side; the up side was that Anglian contacts brought the Picts into contact with Northumbrian political and ecclesiastical circles when there was an intellectual and artistic flowering under way; one result was probably Class 11 Pictish symbol stones, among the world's greatest art. The Picts were lucky; to their own genius they added that of Ireland, through Iona, and of the Angles. They, the Angles, were aggressive, against all their neighbours. Ecgfrith, their king, massacred the Pictish Army c672, trying to conquer Pictland and impose his religious authority too. They imposed two puppet kings, Talorgen and Drest, on the Picts at the time when Oswiu of Northumberland dominated southern Pictland and he also appointed his Bishop Wilfrid as Bishop of the Picts in his sphere of influence as well as Bishop of Northumbria. Abercorn on the Forth was a Northumbrian Bishopric 681-685. When Oswiu died in 670 the Picts expelled Drest and in 685 defeated the Northumbrians at the battle of Nechtansmere (Dunnichen Moss) in Angus, killing King Ecgfrith in the process. Southern Pictland was regained. He, Ecgfrith, had led an expedition into Pictland, ostensibly because the Britons had imposed a king on the Picts. They were led by Bridei, son of Bili, king 672-693. At the same time the Picts attacked the Scots at Dunadd. The Angles/Northumbrians licked their wounds and turned their attention to the Britons of Strathclyde. Then in 710 King Nechtan of the Picts (706-742) approached the Angles/Northumbrians either because he had decided to align himself with them or because he saw that was inevitable (Smyth's view) and asked the king of the Angles for advice on calculating the date of Easter and for masons to build a stone church "in the Roman fashion." Abbot Coelfrith of Jarrow sent, via Bede as a scribe, the appropriate advice and in 717 Nechtan allegedly expelled the Columban clergy "across the spine of Britain", though no doubt they came back. On receipt of Coelfrith's letter Nechtan had ordered that the new regulations be promulgated throughout Pictland. Class II Pictish symbol stones are thought by some to be the result of this connection with the Angles. It is interesting to note that through all these troubles and travails the "intellectuals" of the day, poets, artists, genealogists, travelled freely throughout North Britain and Ireland.

Obviously, a PASS answer is not going to contain all or much of the above but it must refer to some of the points, and have the flavour of them. Some account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will contain much more of the information above and will be well structured, which is difficult to do. It will also come to a conclusion about why, under all these pressures, Pictland/the Picts survived and in fact gained from the association with neighbours. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will deal confidently with much of the material above, either chronologically (difficult) or by kingdoms and will recognise the breadth of the question - political, cultural, artistic and religious - and will have an interesting conclusion about the genius of the Picts. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of historians.

## Question 5

### **What made the Vikings so successful in their raiding and conquest of the Northern and Western Isles?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will survey the many reasons for success, mentioning some of the more important ones. The many reasons include the utter ruthlessness of the Vikings, in the early days, even using torture to find out where treasures were. The first raids were often led by the most ruthless and irresponsible men in society. There was no forewarning; the longships grounded very soon after being spotted, if indeed they were, and their shallow draught meant they could come right on shore and the warriors could leap onto dry land. Longships could also be hauled across portages so it was very difficult to work out where was safe. Huge numbers of Vikings came in massive military expeditions. From 850 on, royal fleets came from Norway and Denmark, using the great anchorage of Scapa Flow. Even the winds were on the Vikings' side! In the Spring the winds blew from the East, bringing them over; in the Autumn the prevailing winds from the West bore them safely home. The Vikings were masters of the sea *par excellence*, theirs was a seaborne empire, a thalassocracy. It was easier for them to travel by sea than by land and parts of Northern Britain were nearer to them than some homeland settlements. Norway was only 70 miles and 24 hours sailing from Scotland and it was impossible to miss the long chain of the North Coast of Scotland, Orkney, Fair Isle and Shetland. After hitting that chain navigation by landmarks was easy. Once in the Northern and Western Isles the Vikings often found a physical environment very similar to home. The other side of the coin is the so to speak native one; why were the Northern and Western Isles so easily raided and conquered? Both the Scots and the Picts had warriors and ships, the Picts indeed had an Admiral, but they naturally had no standing army or navy as such and were no match for people organised for raiding and conquering. They had no way of stopping the Vikings at sea and the population of the Isles was presumably small and could not muster enough warriors to defeat huge war parties. The Vikings developed pirate bases and the natives paid tribute. The Vikings were safe in the Isles when the Picts and Scots could not bring their numerical superiority to bear, even if the Scots in fact had it. The political structures of the day did not lend themselves to alliances or co-operation between Picts, Scots and Britons (Vikings attacked the 'power houses' – the churches and abbeys) so successful resistance to large numbers of ruthless raiders and conquerors was impossible and for that reason allied with all those above the Vikings were irresistible in their element, the open seas of the Northern and Western Isles. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will be a better version of the above, dealing with more of the reasons. It may also look at the weaknesses on the side of the Picts and Scots; though they had warriors, ships and a kind of royal service due to the king, they were not organised for defence or co-operation, their communications were cut off by the Vikings and the attackers were not biting off more than they could chew, they seized familiar looking territory off the mainland and, since their mastery of the sea was without equal, were able to hang on to it. Where were the natives to go? They could not flee by sea and there were no dense forests or mountains in which they could hide. They do not appear to have been massacred and they later intermingled with their conquerors but they certainly could not resist unpredictable, sudden, massive and ruthless attacks. Neither the Scots or Picts had a united kingdom with a secure succession; the Picts indeed had seven provinces or sub-kingdoms, the Scots too were sub-divided so there was no realistic possibility of the huge effort needed to stop the Vikings. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will weave many of the points above into a very good synthesis, and will have a good structure dealing with the thesis from both the Viking and preferably native point of view. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 6

### Why did a powerful Viking earldom become established in the Orkney Islands?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will be a general survey of the reasons, which include; there was a power vacuum in the North in the late 10<sup>th</sup> century, the Kings of Denmark and Norway were concentrating on conquering Anglo-Saxon England while the Vikings in Ireland had become thoroughly integrated into Irish politics and had begun to lose such control as they had over the Hebrides - this cleared the way for unhindered political developments in and around Orkney. There are two theories about the actual creation of the Earldom, one that King Harald of Norway gave the title and lands to Rognvald of More after the latter's son was killed in a great raid in the West and that Rognvald gave it to his brother, Sigurd the Mighty, first Earl. The other, more likely, is that Rognvald and his sons conquered Orkney and perhaps Shetland, and Harald merely confirmed this. Either way the earldom was established c867-870. The Orkneys had been raided for nearly 100 years by then, had become pirate lairs and had then fallen under the control of various Viking chieftains. Rognvald and his family established firm control and kept it in the family, eliminated piracy and subjugated the remaining natives. The family managed to check the rivalry between the descendants of previous earls, all of whom could lay claim to land and authority in the earldom. The family obviously had considerable political skill. Rognvald's family established an apparently efficient administration of estate farming and tax collection which realised large resources; Earl Sigurd the Stout was the most powerful figure in Scandinavian Scotland, a great warrior with plenty men, ships and supplies which he used to gain power over the Hebrides and Man. He ruled the former through a tribal earl, Gilli, who married his sister. He taxed the latter. He apparently overcame the rulers of Moray in Caithness and went on to marry the daughter of Malcolm II, King of Scots. He became a Christian, at least nominally, in 995, gaining even more credibility.

A PASS answer will deal with some of these reasons, but no doubt in rather an unstructured way. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will deal with most of the above reasons, perhaps breaking them down into categories - political, the power vacuum, the skill of the earls, the successful marriage policy, economic, the efficient administration, raising of resources and using them for expansion, geographical (the Orkneys are a unit and he who controls them and the magnificent safe anchorage at Scapa Flow can also control the Shetlands, the Hebrides and the Irish Sea) - the background reasons, and the progress from raids to pirate lairs to settlements, to conquest, to ambitions to carve out what was in effect a kingdom realised. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will do all of the above confidently, probably combining both a chronological and an analytic approach, giving a detailed and developed analysis of the remarkable growth of the earldom. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

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

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

**How helpful is Source A in providing information about the strategic context and purposes of the Antonine Wall?**

The candidate offers a structured explanation of what can be deduced from the source in terms of;

#### **Origin**

Secondary plan of Antonine Wall and its environs, without contours.

#### **Possible purpose**

Of the Wall itself, primarily to control North South movement, along with a host of other functions; of the source, to illustrate the siting of the wall and the reasons for the decision to put it there.

#### **Points from source which can then be developed with additional explanation from recall.**

The Wall spans the narrowest part of Scotland, from the Firth of Forth to the Firth of Clyde. It began not at Carriden, a detached fort, but at Bo'ness and ended, not at Bishopton, but at Old Kilpatrick on the right or North bank of the Clyde. It clings to the crest of the hills overlooking the Forth-Kelvin valley, giving an excellent outlook to the North. It pays attention to its flanks, having a fort and two fortlets, Outerwards and Lurg Moor (West to East) overlooking the Firth of Clyde, and two forts, at Cramond and Inveresk, overlooking the Firth of Forth; thus the flanks of the wall cannot be turned. The spur (Camelon, missing fort, Stirling? Ardoch, Strageath, missing fort? Bertha) on the Tay demonstrates both that the wall was not primarily a defensive barrier/frontier and that there was a perception that a real threat lay further North, on which an eye had to be kept. The spur also offered protection to the natives in Fife, the pro-Roman Venicones. The wall itself offered protection to the equally pro-Roman Votadini in the Lothians and Berwickshire. Thus with the minimum of manpower the Roman hold on Northern Britain was assured; an impassable barrier, well guarded flanks, a strategic spur/tripwire to the North.

#### **Points which can be added by way of wider contextualisation to stress the strategic importance and purpose of the wall.**

The Romans made several attempts to find the ideal frontier in Britain, given that total conquest and pacification was never achieved. Agricola built a line of forts across the Forth-Clyde isthmus. He probably also built the Gask Frontier further North, probably Corialis in the light of recent digs. Trajan developed a frontier of sorts in the Tyne - Irthing- Eden valley, Hadrian built his wall North of that, Severus and/or his son planned a frontier based on Carpow on the Tay. All of these attempts tried to find a short line which to varying degrees would control movement, demarcate the Empire, delimit it, allow revenue to be raised, act as a base for troops and patrols, give advance intelligence, deter minor raids, hold up large ones, impress the natives, keep the troops busy and allow peaceful economic development further South as well as, in the case of the two walls, be monuments to their creators.

**Possible new points from recall to offer more critical contextualisation about the strategic importance and purposes of the wall**

There is a view that Hadrian's Wall was tactically successful in controlling movement etc but was a strategic failure in that it did not defend Northern pro-Roman tribes and was too far from the real source of trouble, the Caledones; it also used a lot of manpower. A line half the length, 40 Roman miles, would deal with these deficiencies while using half the manpower. Hadrian died "hated by all" because he had stopped the expansion of the Empire; Antoninus Pius was his adopted son and had no military background; he needed a quick victory and advance somewhere to consolidate his position; Northern Britain was ideal. No doubt one of the purposes of the wall was to impress; its ditch was formidable, its rampart and palisade high and it ended up with a fort, large or small, every two miles, 19 in all apparently.

Candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the usefulness of Source A in explaining the strategic importance and purposes of the wall.

**Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **Question 2**

### **How valid is Source B as a description of Pictish symbol stones?**

The candidate offers a structured explanation of the validity of the source in terms of:

#### **Origin**

Secondary source Book on Archaeology of Shetland.

#### **Possible purpose**

To account for the variety of Pictish symbols, their geographical spread, their origin and their possible purposes.

#### **Points from source which can then be developed with additional explanation from recall**

There was a great variety of symbols; these fall into two groups, animals we can recognise, once native to Scotland or still native, and abstract designs. The animals are snake, salmon or cod, wolf, horse, red deer, bull, cow, wild boar. The abstract designs include comb, mirror, (easily recognisable) crescent and V rod, double disc, tuning fork or sword, Z rod, notched rectangle, and the famous swimming elephant. "Different mediums were used, only the stone, bronze and silver have survived". The designs may also have been tattooed on people – the painted people. The styles were also influenced by Irish Art, via Iona, and by Northumbrian Art as well as by continental influences. There are several theories about the purposes of the symbols on stones. Charles Thomas saw them as memories of late Iron Age weapons and equipment and as symbols of rank; carvings were made on stones marking graves instead of using grave goods. Anthony Jackson thinks they may be records of marriage treaties, erected on the boundaries of united lands. Perhaps the symbols represent the elements of names. Perhaps they mark territory. Probably they commemorate a named individual.

#### **Points which can be added by way of further contextualisation of the validity of the source**

We recognise two classes of symbol stones. Class I stones are undressed boulders or slabs on which the symbols were incised. They occur all over eastern Pictland, often where good arable land joins upland, perhaps suggesting they were territorial markers. Class II stones were on dressed upright rectangular slabs and the symbols were done in relief. They have a cross on one side and scenes from Christian sculpture, every day life, such as hunting, and weird composite beasts. They tend to be concentrated in the Moray Firth and Tayside, the two main Pictish power centres. There may be a link between the Class II stones and their Christian motifs and contact with the Angles in the 8<sup>th</sup> century. Specific stones may be mentioned – eg Aberlemno, battle scenes (Nechtasmere).

#### **Possible new points from recall to offer more critical contextualisation about the source**

Dating of the stones is difficult but they may have been carved between the 6th century and the 9th century, Class I from c600 on and Class II from c700 on. The takeover of Pictland by the Scots in the 9<sup>th</sup> century seems to have led to the end of the erection of symbol stones. The uniformity of the designs over a large area suggests, obviously, a common culture and it may be also that, as with Broch builders, the carvers were a small group of travelling specialists who carried the designs in their heads on their skins or on parchment. The patterns may have been coloured with charcoal, red clay or vegetable dyes.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the validity of Source B in explaining the nature and purpose of symbol stones.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely rehearsing the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking a clear structure; points made randomly; indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and well structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

### **Question 3**

**How helpful are the differing views in Sources C and D as perspectives on the rise to power of Kenneth mac Alpin?**

The candidate compares the views in Sources C and D on Kenneth's rise to power and offers a structured explanation of the two perspectives in terms of;

#### **Points from Source C**

##### **Origin**

Secondary source; a modern historian working in England, excellent writer but sometimes hard to follow!

##### **Purpose**

Countering the view that there was some dramatic “out of the blue” takeover by the Scots of the Picts.

#### **Points from source which can then be developed with additional explanation from recall**

Kenneth did replace the old Pictish kingdom in the South East. Several Pictish kings before his time had Gaelic names and probably Scots blood, in the late 8<sup>th</sup> century, the century before Kenneth's floruit, and several Pictish kings not only had royal fathers from Dal Riata but ruled the two kingdoms simultaneously. Oengus II and his son Boganan, who ruled both kingdoms from Fortriu in modern Perthshire, were Scots first and foremost, as were their names. They were thoroughly Scots Gaelic in their culture.

#### **What extra may be added by way of wider contextualisation of the view in Source C?**

Kenneth did become King of Scots and Picts eventually; there must have been compelling political and military reasons for the blending of the two kingdoms, which did take place and in which process the Scots' culture predominated; it was not just a matter of genealogies and succession rights. Smyth disputes the view that the Picts dominated the Scots in the 8<sup>th</sup> century; he argues that in fact there was a gradual infiltration of the Picts by the Scots, coming from the West. There are several Pictish kings listed after Kenneth's take over; he may have slaughtered them.

#### **Points from Source D**

##### **Origin**

Secondary Modern Scottish Historian.

##### **Possible Purpose**

Emphasising that whatever dynastic/genealogical claims Kenneth may have had the warrior side of him was very important.

### **Points from source which can then be developed with additional explanation from recall**

The Norsemen/Vikings did attack all round the coasts of Northern Britain and put pressure on the Scots in Dal Riata to save themselves/seek pastures new by expanding East, they had already pushed into Pictland a generation before Kenneth's time, when there was intense Viking raiding on Argyll. Pictland was not one united kingdom and there were different sub-rulers to deal with. Kenneth was a warrior leader, he did not succeed peacefully but was helped by his own aggression; though he must have been from a royal line he also gained a lot of experience from fighting the Vikings.

### **What can be added by way of wider contextualisation of Duncan's view?**

Some major catastrophe befell the men of Fortriu in 839; they were slaughtered by "gentiles"/Vikings, creating a power vacuum into which Kenneth and his war band were somehow able to step at the expense of Pictland and the house of Fergus, son of Eochaid of Dal Riata. Kenneth may possibly have had some Pictish royal blood but it is wrong to see him becoming king of the Scots/Picts/Alba purely on succession/dynastic rights.

### **Possible new points from recall to offer wider contextualisation of the views in both sources**

Kenneth must both have been from a royal line and must have had a power base which enabled him to attract noble clients. He took advantage of the Western movement of the Scots away from the Vikings and of the experience he must have gained fighting them to take advantage of the disaster which befell the leading Picts of Fortriu in 839. There must have been further fighting against Pictish kings/leaders before his position was consolidated. He was named as the son of Alpin and obviously he had a father, presumably of that name; later accounts/genealogies wrote that this Alpin was king before his son for a year or two; there seems to be no contemporary evidence for this, it was propaganda to legitimise the dynasty which Kenneth founded. Stalin airbrushed away his rivals for power; Kenneth's dynasty's supporters sneaked people into the family tree!

The candidate is therefore able to come to a structured conclusion, using a range of evidence, about how far a comparison of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on Kenneth's rise to power.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely rehearsing the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the different views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonably developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide ranging, and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of materials and well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Scottish Independence (1286-1329)

### Part 1

Each question is worth 25 marks

#### Question 1

**To what degree was Alexander III master of his own kingdom?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should show familiarity with aspects of royal authority such as: reasons why kings of Scots like Alexander III before 1286 found it necessary to increase and consolidate their authority, eg the geographical and ethnic diversities of their kingdom, the need to resist encroachments from beyond, eg Norway, England; influences from the continent, the workings of royal government under Alexander III, eg at local level, the development of sheriffdoms and royal castles, and their functions; at central level, the functions of key officials such as the steward, the chancellor, the marischal; attempts to enforce a uniform system of law; the role of the king's justiciars, baronial, burgh and sheriff courts; the existence of traditionally 'difficult' areas, eg Galloway, Moray; the existence of powerful local magnates, eg the Comyns, the extent of their influence at both local and central level; their role in the minority of Alexander III; their monopolisation of key offices; their role in decision-making, eg the evolution of the king's council, the tailzie of 1284; external threats to the king's authority, eg the Norwegian presence in the west and the north; Alexander III's winning of the Western Isles and Man; the relationship between Alexander III and the kings of England, in particular the issue of English overlordship; efforts by both Henry III and Edward I to secure recognition of overlordship from Alexander III; his responses; Edward I 'reserving' his rights in 1278. An essay merely *describing* some or most of these aspects would not warrant a pass. There should be at least minimal attempt at analysis and consideration of the issue highlighted in the question. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would be expected to be more wide-ranging, with much better analysis of the issue, and a greater readiness to identify restrictions on royal power. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would show a thorough understanding of the nature of government under Alexander III, perhaps allude to the nature of feudal kingship, and appreciate the real and potential limitations on royal government due to the existence of powerful local magnates and external powers, notably England. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

## Question 2

**“He was king but for a little while.” To what extent were his own subjects to blame for the short duration of the rule of King John?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would show familiarity with key aspects of King John's reign: in particular the active involvement of Edward I, traditionally seen as the significant factor giving King John problems, eg the nature of King John's enthronement at Scone, the subsequent request by Edward for performance of homage at Newcastle; his request that Birgham should be cancelled; the issue of legal appeals held outwith Scotland, the details of these and the consequences for King John; the request for military service in France; but there should however be familiarity with the role of the king's own subjects in bringing problems, most obviously references to those seeking legal redress outwith the kingdom, whether actively encouraged to do so or not by Edward I, eg Macduff; the role of the political community would also be relevant; did they give King John good advice how to handle Edward's demands; their political experience contrasted with his lack of political experience; the role of discontented magnates, in particular the Bruce family; their decision in 1296 to fight alongside Edward I; the alleged 'removal' of executive powers from King John by the council of twelve; the alliance with France; the failed invasion of northern England by the Scots; Edward's capture of Berwick and the Scots' defeat at Dunbar; King John's subsequent humiliation. Answers in this range might be inconsistent in their treatment. A mere narrative of some or all of the above would not warrant a pass grade. There should be some attempt to assess the part played by Scots in creating problems for King John, either by badly advising him or exploiting Edward I's determination to interfere actively in the government of Scotland; there should also be some attempt to balance the role played by the Scots against that played by Edward, with some attempt at a conclusion.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would be expected to display more consistent and even handling of the materials in order to apportion blame, perhaps attempting to reach a balanced decision. There might be some attempt to show that there were positive aspects to King John's reign, eg elements of continuity with the Guardianship and the reign of Alexander III, eg using the same 'team' of advisors, extending sheriffdoms into the recently acquired western territories, suggesting that given the opportunity King John's reign might have worked out very differently.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be expected to be more thorough and wide-ranging in the analysis of the issues, eg stressing that some initial positive aspects of King John's reign emphasised continuity with the past, eg King John having access to much the same 'team' as Alexander III and the Guardianship, offering some attempt to interpret Edward I's motives, considering whether any alternative individual, ie Bruce of Annandale, would have fared any better. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

### Question 3

**Discuss the view that William Wallace's contribution to the struggle for independence has been exaggerated.**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would be expected to show some familiarity with the existence, and possibly the development, of the Wallace 'myth', with at least minimal reference to the likes of the early chroniclers, or Blind Harry, or even 'Braveheart'. There should be basic familiarity with the key aspects of Wallace's career, in particular the events of 1297-98, eg the murder of Hazelrigg, the pursuit of Ormsby, Stirling Bridge, the revived Guardianship, raids into northern England, Falkirk; there might be some reference to Wallace's career post-Falkirk. The coverage and treatment might be patchy and uneven, but there should be some attempt to assess the role played by Wallace in the events described above, as well as his overall significance, measuring that against the Wallace of the chroniclers and early narrative writers. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) should show a more considered assessment of Wallace's contribution to the independence struggle; there should be a greater readiness to question the Wallace myth, by more careful examination of key events, eg Stirling Bridge: Moray's victory as much as Wallace's? The role of good fortune at Stirling Bridge? Falkirk - a misjudgement on Wallace's part? Or was Edward's victory less clear cut than sometimes portrayed? Wallace's relationship with other Scots might also be referred to: did the absence of leading nobles and the apprehension and reluctance of others leave the way open for Wallace to emerge as a leader? There might be some attempt, too, to place Wallace's role in a wider context, eg in the period 1297-1304, or even beyond. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be expected to consider the wider significance of Wallace: inspiring and strengthening the resistance movement, provoking leading nobles into revolt, reviving the guardianship, paving the way for others, adopting strategies that others might follow, eg raids into northern England. There should be awareness, too, of the gulf between the sketchy nature of Wallace's career and the development of Wallace as some kind of cult figure, possibly with some explanation of the reasons behind this. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

#### **Question 4.**

#### **What were the main reasons for the changing fortunes of the Comyns and their Scottish allies in their struggle against Robert Bruce?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would be expected to show familiarity with some of the following: the traditional prominent role played by the Comyns and their allies in Scottish politics, in particular in recent history, eg the war post-Wallace, the revived guardianship, the settlement of 1304-5; their geographical spread; their 'alliances' with other families; associated discontent on the part of some Scots with the settlement of 1304-5, notably Bruce; the murder of the leading Comyn member at Dumfries; initial successes with English help against Bruce; possible complacency; failure to capture Bruce post-Methven and post-Dalry; Bruce's return to the mainland; his adoption of 'secret warfare'; sources of support for Bruce, eg disaffected nobles such as Douglas, members of the clergy; the impact of Edward I's death, and the attitude of Edward II to Scottish affairs; Bruce's campaigns in the north; Bruce's truces with the Macdougalls and the earl of Ross; lack of co-ordination between and lack of leadership from the Comyns and their allies; Bruce's capture and destruction of enemy strongholds; Inverurie and the 'herschip' of Buchan; Edward Bruce's campaigns in Galloway; the Macdougall defeat at Brander; the flight of Comyns and allies to England, and their subsequent identification with the English cause. At this level, the treatment might be patchy and uneven, but there should be at least some attempt to move beyond a mere narrative of the events of 1306 and 1309, and introduce even minimal analysis in terms of the issue set. A candidate might choose to interpret the question in such a way as to consider the struggle between the Comyn family and Robert Bruce over a longer period, drawing on material before Bruce's seizure of the kingship. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) might not only be better informed but might also be better organised into 'factors' rather than just a listing of events. The analysis, too, would be more considered. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be expected to benefit from much better analysis and structure. There might be consideration given as to whether the Comyns and their allies were ultimately the cause of their own downfall, and/or whether credit should be given to Bruce and his allies in the civil war. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

## Question 5

**Do you agree that a settlement was made possible in 1328 because by that time both sides had become desperate for peace?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would be expected to make some comment on the limited impact of Bannockburn on the war with England, in particular its failure to bring peace and why: Edward II still having great resources at his disposal; his stubbornness and unwillingness to recognise King Robert; why King Robert needed peace: economic pressures; suggestions that continued warfare endangered his regime; what King Robert's war aims were post-Bannockburn in order to pressurise Edward II, eg assaults on Berwick, continuation of raids into the north of England, campaigns in Ireland. There should also be some reference to the social and economic impact of such strategies, eg the nature of the attacks on the north of England, and why they failed to secure a lasting settlement; settling for truces. There should be clear reference to what changed by 1328, ie the political circumstances in England: the deposition of Edward II; the need for the new administration to seek a settlement, largely due to financial pressures; King Robert's adoption of a new strategy to put pressure on that administration: the suspicion that he intended annexation of English territory. Candidates should reach some kind of conclusion which should have some reference to what had changed by 1328 that now made both sides share a desire for peace. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) might show awareness of the strategic thinking behind King Robert's strategies after 1314, eg the varied reasons given to explain his involvement in Ireland; there might be evidence, too, of the frustration of dealing with Edward II's stubbornness, including his indifference to raids in the north; and Edward's treatment of Harcla seen as symbolic of his reluctance to give in to the Scots. There might some attempt at this level to give some thought to assessment of the notion of 'desperation', ie linking the desire for peace with the seriousness of factors such as economic or political problems on either side. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be expected to be more thorough and wide-ranging in its treatment of the issues which prevented an earlier resolution, eg at the time of Bannockburn, and would certainly show greater awareness of the role played by Edward II as an obstacle to any settlement, and the significance of events in England in 1327-28; there might be some assessment of the general failure of King Robert's military strategies post-1314, apart from the impact of his latter military pressures on the new English government. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

## Question 6

### **Assess the social and economic impact of the wars on Scotland.**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) might choose to sample the social impact of the war over the entire period or might limit the coverage in terms of the period or geographical extent. The detail at this level might be uneven and the structure weak. There might be reference to the importance of the burghs to economic life and their trade with European markets and the consequent disruption to that trade; Edward's treatment of Berwick and the occupation beyond 1296; the strategic value to Scots and English alike of occupation of burghs like Aberdeen and Dundee; the efforts of William Wallace and later Robert Bruce to revive burgh contacts with northern Europe; new privileges extended to the burghs by Bruce; the use of economic warfare and consequent social disruption by Wallace and especially Bruce; his harrying of Comyn and the allied territories 1307-09; eg the 'herschip of Buchan'; the campaign of Edward Bruce in Galloway; drawing 'blackmail income' from the north of England. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would be expected to have a better structure, with a genuine attempt to quantify the impact of the wars, and be more wide-ranging in its time-span and geographical coverage, or more comprehensive in its treatment of specific areas of social and economic life, eg the conservative nature of Bruce's approach to the feudal set-up in Scotland, his retention of feudal military service, the growing significance of the burghs. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be expected to show much better structure and analysis, perhaps differentiating between general consequences of the war on society and economies and the deliberate use of economic warfare for political ends. There might be reference to the importance of burghs to Robert I after Bannockburn; his effort to restore Berwick as an economic centre; the growing role of burgesses in Robert I's parliaments, and why. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## **Scottish Independence (1286-1329)**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

#### **How helpful are the differing accounts in Sources A and B as perspectives on the issue of Edward I's claim to overlordship in 1291?**

The candidate compares the different views in Sources A and B on the development of the issue of Edward's claim to overlordship and offers a structured assessment of their value in terms of:

#### **Source A**

##### **Origin**

Modern biography of Edward I.

##### **Possible purpose**

- English-based author
- benefit of modern research
- to offer a considered assessment of Edward's behaviour.

##### **Points from the source which can then be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- marriage first seen by Edward as means to extend his influence over Scotland
- guarantees regarding Scottish independence offered at Birgham
- the need to re-think following the Maid's death
- reasons why Edward sought recognition of overlordship at Norham before continuing
- the author's notion that Edward's actions can be justified
- Norham provided Edward with a 'splendid opportunity'
- his own subjects would have expected him to behave in this fashion.

##### **What extra can be added by way of wider contextualisation of the source?**

- Edward's initial reaction to Alexander's death: apparent disinterest
- Edward's letter to the pope seeking dispensation for the marriage
- details of the guarantees offered at Birgham
- references to Edward 'reserving' rights in Birgham.
- Edward's preparations pre-Norham: seeking chronicle evidence of possible overlordship; arms, money
- how Edward by-passed the Scots' response by addressing the issue to the claimants.

## **Source B**

### **Origin**

Secondary source; newest synthesis of historical interpretations, by a recognised expert in this field.

### **Possible purpose**

To pull together latest thinking and interpretations.

### **Points from the source which can then be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- suggestion that the Scots' response to recognition of overlordship was evasive
- denial of knowledge of Edward's right to overlordship or their authority to reply to such demands
- references to the oath of 1286 and guarantees given by Edward at Northampton
- the suggestion that the Scots were being 'disingenuous' and their response 'weak'
- the suggestion that the Scots still hoped Edward would show them 'good will' and not throw them into 'disgrace'
- the suggestion that the Scots were willing to 'accommodate' Edward
- the comment that at this stage they still hoped Edward would act as arbiter.

### **What extra can be added by way of wider contextualisation to verify this view?**

- the issue of overlordship during the reign of Alexander III, in particular the details of 1278
- Edward's I's reluctance to pursue the issue of overlordship while Alexander III was still alive
- the details and significance of the oath of 1286
- possible reference to the 'good people' in whose name the Scots' response was made
- the lapse in time between Edward's initial demand of recognition and the Scots' reply
- Edward's determination to act as judge rather than arbiter
- non-mention of the Scots' response on the English record of the Great Cause, and reasons for omission.

### **Possible new points from recall to offer wider contextualisation of the views in the two sources**

- the wider historical context of the issue of overlordship
- references to earlier examples of the issue before the reign of Alexander III: eg Falaise
- quitclaim of Canterbury, requests made by Henry III to Alexander III
- historians' views as to the possible imperial objectives of Edward I
- did Edward I see himself as a new 'Arthur'?
- was Edward little more than an opportunist?
- examples of Edward undermining the Birgham guarantees, eg the appointment of Bek as lieutenant to Edward of Caernarfon and the Maid, occupation of Man.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a comparison of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on Edward I's claims to overlordship.

## **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonably developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of the material, and well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

### What light does Source C shed on the state of the Scottish political leadership in 1300?

The candidate evaluates **Source C**, in the light it sheds on the state of the Scottish leadership in 1300 in terms of:

#### Origin

Contemporary English commentary on the Scottish leadership.

#### Possible purpose

To describe the existence of disagreements within the Scottish leadership.

#### Points from source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- government still functioning under the renewed guardianship: parliaments being held
- existence of 'discord' within the Guardianship itself
- John Comyn in disagreement with the bishop of St Andrews
- John Comyn unwilling to continue working with the bishop
- Bishop of St Andrews had allies within the political community in the Steward and the earl of Atholl
- differences resolved, and third guardian introduced in place of the departed Bruce
- suggestion of problems in Galloway
- Earl of Buchan not present
- decision to meet later when all magnates would be present.

#### What extra can be added by way of wider contextualisation to verify the view that the source offers?

- the elevation of Comyn and Bruce to the guardianship: possible reasoning behind this
- the uneasy relationship between Comyn and Bruce
- Bruce's growing frustration with the situation
- outbreak of violence at a previous meeting at Roxburgh
- The recruitment of the bishop of St Andrews as a mediator within the guardianship
- Bruce's resignation or dismissal from the guardianship
- Bruce's growing fears regarding a possible Balliol restoration
- Bruce's subsequent abandonment of 'the patriotic cause'
- Bruce's subsequent agreement with Edward I
- later changes in personnel, eg emergence of John de Soules as sole guardian in 1301, Roslin, 1303.

### **Possible new points from recall to offer wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- the concept of Guardianship, eg with reference to 1286-91, or its re-emergence in 1297
- the re-emergence of traditional leadership following Wallace's fall in 1298
- the traditional pre-eminence of the Comyn family in Scottish affairs
- the ambitions of the Bruce family
- the idea that familial rivalries may have taken precedence over a patriotic agenda
- the guardians' ability to maintain resistance to Edward despite evidence of disagreement.

The candidate is therefore able to reach a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which the source casts light on the state of the political leadership in Scotland in 1300.

### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

#### How adequately does Source D explain King Robert's victory at Bannockburn in 1314?

The candidate offers an assessment of the usefulness of **Source D** with reference to:

#### Origin

Contemporary English chronicler.

#### Purpose

- to record events of the reign of Edward II
- possible anti-Edward II bias.

#### Points from source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- evidence of discord within the English army
- rejection by Edward II of advice offered by the earl of Gloucester
- suggestion that English army needed time to recuperate
- suggestion that earl of Gloucester was prepared to fight against his better judgement
- suggestion that Scottish army was better prepared: 'marshalled', 'equipped', enjoyed 'bread and wine', 'cheered' by its leader
- English had already 'occupied' the field
- King Robert chose to give battle on that site
- King Robert's force allegedly numbered 40,000, and divided into three divisions
- description of armour and weaponry of the Scots
- King Robert's use of schiltroms.

#### What extra can be added by way of wider contextualisation to verify the view that the source offers?

- size of Scottish army exaggerated
- many English earls failed to respond to Edward II's summons
- domestic disaffection added to Edward II's problems
- English expectations that King Robert would not stay to fight
- over-confidence on the English side.... English force larger and better equipped
- lack of discipline and direction on the English side
- Bruce's selection of a site favourable to infantry
- Bruce's pre-battle preparations, eg digging pits
- the effect of the Bruce-Bohun encounter on Scots' morale
- the effect of the failed Clifford-Beaumont encirclement on Scots' morale
- the effect of both on English morale
- fear in the English camp of a night attack by the Scots. Failure of the English army to rest
- Bruce's decision to stay to fight, possibly on receipt of information on the state of the English force
- the constricted nature of the battlefield
- the failure of the English archers to deal with the Scottish infantry
- the dispersal of the English archers by Sir Robert Keith
- the deaths of key English leaders, eg Gloucester
- the inability of the English rear to help the vanguard
- King Robert's launching of his fourth division into battle
- the appearance of the camp followers and its impact on the English force
- the abandonment of the battlefield by Edward II signifying English defeat.

### **Possible new points from recall to offer wider contextualisation of the view in the source**

- domestic disaffection added to Edward II's problems
- Bruce's previous strategies of avoiding pitched battle
- comparison of Bruce's tactics in 1310 with the 1314 situation
- the risks Bruce was taking.

Possible reasons for Bruce taking these risks, eg the importance of a victory to consolidate domestic situation.

The candidate is therefore able to reach a conclusion, using a wide range of evidence, about the extent to which the source is useful in explaining the Scottish victory at Bannockburn.

### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries**

### **Part 1**

**Each question is worth 25 marks**

#### **Question 1**

**How innovative was Florentine art in the first half of the fifteenth century?**

The question asks candidates to discuss the nature of the stylistic innovations, which transformed the characteristics of Florentine art during the early fifteenth century. This is set against a range of influences which shall be discussed as genuinely innovative or merely adaptive of previous styles. Illustration will be given from a range of projects created in Florence.

#### **Points to be considered in the answer:**

Individuals such as Brunelleschi (architect), Donatello (sculptor), Masaccio (painter) and Ghiberti (sculptor/bronze panels) were the initiators of the shift from the International Gothic to early Renaissance style. Wider artistic debate over assumed innovation being as much an evolution of late medieval art as a true 'rebirth'. The innovative work of Giotto and Cimabue predate this period by 100 years.

Competition helps drive innovation eg between Ghiberti and Brunelleschi for the North Doors of the Baptistery. This feature is particularly strong in Florence during the period according to sources eg Vasari.

Physical classical remains act as an inspiration eg Brunelleschi and Donatello visit Rome to view ancient building and sculpture. In strict terms the innovation emerges almost by default from a desire to ape the achievements of the classical world.

Brunelleschi supervised the construction of the Dome of the Cathedral, the Pazzi Chapel at the Church of Santa Croce, the reconstruction of the Church of San Lorenzo (Medici Chapel), and Church of Santo Spirito.

There was increased interest in optics and perspective and the setting of detailed guides for use in art emerge from Brunelleschi and Alberti. These were widely adopted during the period alongside rules of geometry and rational proportion eg Donatello's St George contained bas-relief panel with perspective image of St George slaying the dragon Donatello.

Masaccio's Trinity in Santa Maria Novella acted as a model for the period in use of perspective.

There were strong classical influences eg Brunelleschi gained commission to construct the Hospital of the Innocents, which has a loggia done in a 'Roman' style, the first ever in Florence. Donatello produced statues of David and various Prophets and Saints in a 'Roman' style for the Duomo and Orsanmichele.

Human realism is said to arrive in art through innovations combining modelling by light with new mathematical perspective to create a naturalism hitherto unseen eg Masaccio joined Donatello and Brunelleschi to execute frescoes illustrating Miracles of Sts Peter & Paul in the Brancacci Chapel of Santa Maria del Carmine and Trinity in Santa Maria Novella.

There were new links with contemporary humanists: Leonardo Bruni tried to provide a programme for Ghiberti's Doors of Paradise and Leon Battista Alberti took their ideas and codified them in his treatises on painting, architecture and sculpture, giving a humanist slant to their creativity.

The period saw innovations in how artists and patrons related to each other in creating major works of public art: role of commission contracts and increasing status of individual arts in society eg state funeral afforded to Brunelleschi and personal sponsorship of Donatello by Medici family.

There is increased recognition given of the continuity with medieval Tuscan styles well established before 15<sup>th</sup> century.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will show awareness of the range of Florentine art projects and establish a context where innovation can be seen to initiate some of these works. The scope of discussion and examples will be limited. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will discuss the topic in greater detail, perhaps illustrating a more direct link between a range of innovations and their origins in varied sources. There will be a range of examples provided. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will layout clearly the scope and impact of Florentine art of the period. There will be clear use of examples to support the analysis and this will be balanced by consideration of factors not influenced by innovation but rather continuity from prior developments. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 2

### To what extent did the character of humanism evolve over the course of the fifteenth century?

The candidate will illustrate an awareness of the changing concerns of humanist writers from the 'civic humanist' to 'neo-platonist' outlook of the later 15<sup>th</sup> century. The candidate will also consider common themes through the period.

#### Evolving Character

- candidates should be aware of the development of humanist studies and pay particular attention to that of 'civic humanism' and 'neo-platonism'
- early 15<sup>th</sup> century humanists such as Salutati and Bruni are characterised by Hans Baron as Civic Humanists who promoted the involvement on active politics
- the debate over the character of humanism studies being that of 'moral philosophy' between Garin and Kristeller may be considered
- the development of neo-platonist studies in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century shows a movement away from the active life towards the contemplative and a corresponding diminution of the involvement in political and social activity.

#### Common Character

- continuing preoccupation with textual criticism and application of grammatical correction to establish truth behind text
- the interest in developing a lay education around the 'studia humanitatus' abides
- service of humanist learning to the state seen in both republics and courts
- the transference of ideas beyond merely a scholarly elite continues and the practice of engagement with artists, architects etc flourishes.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will be aware of the general civic context of fifteenth century humanism especially in Florence. The evolution from the traditions of civic humanism with Salutati and Bruni will be acknowledged. Candidates should go on to discuss the move towards neo-Platonism. They may mention Pico and Ficino. There may also be recognition of certain common themes that continue in terms of the activities of humanists during the period. The scope of discussion and examples may be limited, but if there is no discussion of the sense of evolution, then it cannot pass. Some account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will be as above, but will identify a fuller range of characteristics which illustrate the evolution of the humanist learning. There will be a greater recognition of the common themes that continue in terms of the activities of humanists during the period. There will be a range of examples provided and greater account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will analyse the main themes of development and provide detailed examples of the significant individuals and ideas at the heart of this evolution, and recognise the common themes in humanism over the period. There will be clear use of examples to support the analysis and this will be balanced by consideration of various factors. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of historians.

### **Question 3**

#### **What were the principal achievements of Lorenzo the Magnificent?**

The candidate will display a range of knowledge linking the political, cultural and possibly economic contribution of Lorenzo the Magnificent to the Renaissance.

#### **Political**

- Lorenzo is identified by all external powers as the significant individual in Florentine political affairs
- Lorenzo is credited with maintaining a balance of power between the 'big 5' Renaissance states (Florence, Milan, Venice, Papal States and Naples) for most of his leadership of the Medici family
- Lorenzo was identified with ruthless and tyrannical politics over Florentine territory after the bloody 'Sack of Volterra'
- Lorenzo manipulated and altered the traditional government structure of Florence to increase the Medici influence on politics eg creation of 'The Council of Seventy'
- Pazzi Conspiracy indicated dissatisfaction with Lorenzo's dominance in Florence
- the aftermath however illustrates the closeness of the personification of the Florentine State with the personage of the Medici.

#### **Cultural**

- personal involvement in the creative process eg Lorenzo's use of verse in the vernacular
- Lorenzo was active in support for humanists such as Poliziano and the growing neo-platonic school around Ficino
- many artists such as Botticelli and Verrocchio received regular commissions
- family art collections were thrown open to help train young artists eg Michelangelo
- Lorenzo patronised lavish public festivities within Florence to mark significant Medici family events eg his own wedding celebrations
- Lorenzo is widely regarded as a leader of artistic taste and was consulted for his opinion by other significant patrons
- Lorenzo's patronage of his country villas promoted a new style of domestic refinement adopted by later generations
- however in relation to his predecessors Lorenzo was increasingly private in his support for culture
- reference to his library.

#### **Economic**

- Lorenzo was much less successful than predecessors in running the family business. He lost money. Business contracts and branches closed. The Florentine economy mirrored this general downturn in prosperity
- Lorenzo was accused by opponents of stealing public funds for his own use.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should show some awareness of the general areas of activity of Lorenzo in terms of his political and cultural contribution to the Renaissance. Limited exemplification may be given in each area. The scope of discussion and examples might be limited. Some account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) should develop the above with greater detail and analysis, providing fuller examples and considering the value of the contribution as well as the scope. There will be a range of examples provided and greater account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will add to the above criteria by providing a full and detailed assessment of the achievements of Lorenzo. The answer will give due consideration of items which are both positive and negative in impact. There will be clear use of examples to support the analysis and this will be balanced by consideration of various factors. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of historians.

#### Question 4

#### **How far was the political success of Italian city-states dependent on their economic strength?**

Candidates should account for the level of political success seen in the Italian States. They will link this to the economic developments of the period. Examples should be drawn from a range of city-states.

Economic success linked to political success and vice versa:

- the role of mercenary armies to settle interstate warfare necessitated the generation of sufficient wealth to pay for the largest and most successful companies. Economic prosperity secured the military arm of the political state
- banking networks eg Medici and importation of raw materials and products from N Europe & the Mediterranean; establishment of a pan-European network of economic and political links
- economic activities established a sizeable body of lay, literate, educated characters from which political leadership sprang
- Byzantine trading links and contact with other classical cultures influenced the political power-broking of the period. Disastrously seen in terms of the Milanese support of the French claim to the Kingdom of Naples
- significance of Guilds in managing trades and role in supporting communal government
- critical in Florence but seen elsewhere to lesser degrees
- Venetian patriciate although defined by the 'Golden Book' was subsequently bolstered by new money based on economic success
- wealth generation for commercial enterprise was reinvested into the community through cultural activity often in support of political purposes
- leading families supported by their role in economic activities were linked to significant roles in political elites eg Medici (Florence)
- there is debate over the relative economic success of the period in overall terms
- however the principal states of the period were all sustained by successful economic activity, even in terms of Papal revenues generated from Church taxation
- recognition of the need for favourable political circumstances being required to support economic success should be given. This is seen in terms of internal stability within the state and advantageous trading positions acquired through land, seaports and the use of arms.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will contain a basic account and analysis of the economic activity of leading Renaissance states. Linked to this will be a broad recognition of the political successes of these states with some attempt to link the two. The scope of discussion and examples might be limited. Some account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will contain more detail explanation of the economic and political successes of Renaissance states. There will be clearer recognition of the manner in which these facets are linked. There will be a range of examples provided and greater account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will provide clear use of examples to support the analysis for economic and political successes. This will be balanced by consideration of various factors which make clear the relationship between success in one leading to success in another. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of historians.

## Question 5

### **Did the Renaissance influence society in Italy beyond a small social elite?**

The question asks candidates to consider the variety of ways in which the Renaissance can be seen as impacting on the whole of society. An understanding of the form of the social elite suggested should be considered but the candidate should acknowledge through the public nature of art, architecture and political figures that Renaissance ideas were disseminated beyond that elite.

- in terms of defining a Renaissance elite reference may be made to political, economic and social figures who are said to influence society
- the aspect of an elite should consider the scope of an educated elite who direct, finance and contribute to the humanist learning of the period
- the artistic elite of the period may be defined by the work of Peter Burke on the origins of a Renaissance elite. The observation that over half had no traceable origin suggests that the leading individuals of the Renaissance came from a diverse and socially mixed background
- specific reference may be made to various cities to suggest the respective openness or not of political structures eg Florence through the guilds, Venice through the patriciate, Rome through the Church
- Renaissance society was not so dominated by feudal aristocracies as most of Northern Europe
- consideration should be given to aspects of Renaissance life which were overtly public and populist eg architecture, paintings, vernacular literature, religious activities.
- discussion about the extent and style of education in the Renaissance, and development of secular schools eg Vittorino da Feltre in Mantua.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will provide a range of details relating to Renaissance life and the origins and impact of these on a social elite. There may be consideration of the impact of Renaissance culture, politics and learning on wider society but the level of analysis will be limited. The scope of discussion and examples will be limited. Some account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will contain more detail explanation of the extent of a social elite within Renaissance life in terms of culture, politics and learning. Consideration will be made of the overall impact of these facets upon wider society. There will be a range of examples provided and greater account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will reflect a detailed knowledge of the origins and cause of developments in the Renaissance relating to culture, politics and learning. These will be considered in a balanced manner against the presented view and the opinion that influences can be traced throughout Renaissance society. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of historians.

## Question 6

**“More princes than religious leaders”. How accurate is this description of the Renaissance Papacy?**

The candidate will display an understanding of the dual role of the Papacy (temporal and spiritual). Through use of specific examples, the institution of the Papacy during the Renaissance will be analysed.

### **Temporal considerations of the Papacy**

- the legacy of the Great Schism meant that the Papacy for most of the period focused on regaining political and economic control of Rome and the surrounding Papal States
- the Papal States' role as a significant player in peninsular politics drew them into regular conflict with their neighbours
- Renaissance Popes also wanted to be cultural leaders so they invested some funds in the support of humanism and in the construction and decoration of both churches and other religious buildings, eg Basilica of St Peter and the Vatican apartments
- Renaissance Papacy was widely characterised by worldliness; note views of contemporaries and historians: Savonarola, Machiavelli, Erasmus.

### **Spiritual considerations of the Papacy**

- until the religious crises of the sixteenth century the Papacy seemed inclined to become a major Italian state rather than pursue its medieval role as the head of the universal Christian Church of the West
- the character of the Renaissance Papacy varied considerably from Pope to Pope. Those with clear temporal ambitions such as Julius II are contrasted by the more religiously focused Pius II and his crusading goal
- there was a growing clamour for spiritual and doctrinal renewal within the church. This was regularly ignored, most notably by Leo X.

However all Popes of the period were compelled by their office to consider their position as both spiritual leaders and temporal rulers. Arguably this conflict of roles gave rise to the religious opposition to the Papacy which led to the Reformation. The creation of a 'New Jerusalem' as the physical and administrative centre of the church tended to reduce other considerations. This can be seen as a hybrid of spiritual and temporal concerns.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should show some awareness of the changing political situation of the Papacy in the period. Through limited examples both facets of the Renaissance Papacy will be considered but the structure of argument will be limited. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will consider in fuller detail both the temporal and spiritual considerations and actions of the Renaissance Papacy. A clear attempt to reconcile the two will be made. There will be a range of examples provided and a supporting historiography offered. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will go into some detail about the concerns faced by the Renaissance Papacy. There will be clear use of examples to support the analysis and this will be balanced by consideration of various factors. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## **The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

**How helpful are the views in Sources A and B as perspectives on the role of patronage in promoting Florentine culture?**

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Sources A and B in terms of:

#### **Points from Source A**

##### **Origin**

Secondary source; an art history critique of the motivations for patronage during the Renaissance.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- 'head of that family, Cosimo de' Medici...' a significant individual in terms of patronage in Renaissance Florence
- 'pay for....' providing the money seen as a central role for patrons
- 'had long been expected of wealthy individuals....' the habit of patronage was not in itself innovatory to the Renaissance
- 'buying themselves a reduced attendance in purgatory....' motivation for patronage was not purely cultural
- 'but for one man to donate an entire monastery... was unprecedented...' the level of patronage illustrated is innovative and not typical of the period
- 'commissions to be administered by the city's trade guilds and paid for out of public funds' illustrates alternative sources of patronage beyond simply individual sources; these traditional corporate sources remained and continued to play a highly significant role in the Renaissance.

#### **Points from Source B**

##### **Origin**

Primary source; autobiographical in style and as was the case in this type of writing, designed to be self-promoting in terms of opinion offered.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- 'I have also spent a great deal of money...' wealth is identified as central to patronage action
- 'on my house...' a personal and secular focus
- 'on the facade of the church of Santa Maria Novella ... on the gold brocade vestments' an ecclesiastical focus and illustrates the diversity of patronage actions
- 'given and give me the greatest satisfaction and pleasure...' self-gratification illustrates the personal involvement of patrons in the course of cultural development through patronage
- 'serve the honour of God... honour of the city... commemoration of myself..' the third and final motivation can be seen to be a feature in individual Renaissance patronage as the act is seen as worthy and will bring honour. Linked to wider considerations of virtuous actions in the Renaissance. Humanist writers and patrons drew on classical models as examples of the value in patronage of the arts.

### **Possible points providing wider contextualisation**

This should draw on recalled knowledge of the nature of Renaissance patronage. Consideration may be given to issues of:

Motivation and style as well as the role of patrons as a creative partner in the process of cultural development.

Consideration of the wide range of patronage sources such as government, guilds, lay confraternities, ecclesiastical and private individuals.

Acknowledgement of the role of individuals in the process of patronage during the Renaissance such as those indicated by the sources Cosimo de Medici and Giovanni Rucellai.

Understanding of the cultural development of the period, the preoccupations of patrons and the relationship between artist and patron from which nearly all pieces of cultural importance emerge during the period.

Reference to a wider body of knowledge relating to either of these individuals and this will be set against an acknowledgement of other factors which affect Florentine culture during the period.

Assessment of the range of opinion over the extent to which the individual role of the patron can be seen as a significant detriment in the actual outcome of any given cultural deposit arising from a commissioned work.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonable developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

### What light does Source C shed on the Renaissance revival of classical values?

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source C** in terms of:

#### Points from Source C

##### Origin

Primary Source, autobiographic. Aimed at explaining a life long preoccupation and gift.

#### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- 'assemble as many books as I could on every sort of subject...' shows range of interests that were expressed as part of the cultural revival during the Renaissance
- 'I copy... buying books...' effort to collect works seen in personal time, commitment and expense
- 'no more noble... no treasure more useful or valuable...' high value placed in the process of acquiring the texts and books
- 'seeking out Greek books...' Greek learning was seen as being of particular value
- 'consumed with terror - lest all those wonderful books... be brought to danger...' concerns shown over what was newly discovered might be lost once again
- 'assembled ... especially those which were rare and difficult to find...' value expressed more on the rarity of the work rather than the content.

#### Possible points providing wider contextualisation

The action of gift giving of acquired works for public access was already an established pattern in the Renaissance.

The late 1460's had seen an increased interest in the works of Greek authors arising out of the wave of manuscripts that had arrived in Italy over the preceding couple of decades.

The actual content of the works is omitted from discussion and can be considered in terms of the historiographical debate on the nature of humanist studies during the period. Were the humanists truly philosophers or merely copyists?

The preoccupation with manuscripts in itself does not account for all aspects of the Renaissance revival of classical values. There were many other physical arts which expressed this.

#### Marks

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

#### How fully does Source D account for the achievements of Michelangelo during the Renaissance?

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of the completeness of Source D in terms of:

#### Points from Source D

##### Origin

A contemporary biography of Michelangelo. Vasari is not neutral in his consideration, rather a friend and fervent admirer of Michelangelo and his praise is unremitting.

#### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- 'He... to send to earth a spirit...' refers to the divine intervention ie Michelangelo seen to be chosen by God
- 'able to demonstrate ...perfection' Michelangelo seen as the master in all fields
- '...design/paintings - drawing, tracing, shading and casting light sculpture architecture...' exemplifies the range of artistic activities for which Michelangelo is known
- '...join to this spirit true moral philosophy and the gift of sweet poetry...' wider interests and writings of Michelangelo recognised
- '...so that the world would admire ... example of his life, his work, the holiness of his habits, and all his human undertakings...' suggest that Michelangelo was a model for human existence
- '... something divine rather than mortal...' Michelangelo said to achieve Godlike status.

#### Possible points providing wider contextualisation

- Vasari as a personal friend and admirer of Michelangelo was less than objective. His depiction of the great artist was consistently praiseworthy
- for Vasari, Michelangelo was the culmination of a process of evolution in the arts which is traced through the various lives considered in his 'Lives of the Artists', thus his consideration of Michelangelo does not stand alone. Scope to acknowledge the longer term developments in the arts that Michelangelo is seen to bring together "to perfection"
- the range of Michelangelo's works was very varied, reflecting painting (fresco and oil), architecture, drawing but his personal expertise was seen to be in sculpture
- Michelangelo did write letters and limited poetry but it is not highly regarded
- Michelangelo, although aware of moral philosophy, was increasingly concerned by theological considerations throughout his life
- the source fails to consider his anatomical and engineering interests.

#### Marks

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## France in the Age of Louis XIV

### Part 1:

Each question is worth 25 marks

#### Question 1

**“Louis XIV made the nobility an impoverished and useless class.” Do you agree?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would discuss the nobility at Versailles and how courtly life and royal patronage reduced the French aristocracy to subservience to the monarchy. It would look at some evidence regarding the financial strains on the traditional nobility. It might also consider the provincial nobility and how the king attempted to reduce noble power locally, through such means as the assizes. It would show awareness of the fact that the *noblesse de robe* are within the scope of this question, too, and that they were certainly neither impoverished nor useless. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would be more detailed, bringing in not only the courtly life at Versailles, but might focus more on provincial life where 95% of the nobles actually remained. While offering a discussion of the various means by which the king reduced the great nobility to dependence at Versailles, it would also point out that Louis still needed the aristocracy, not only at the centre as ministers and advisers, but also in the provinces and in the armed forces, as officials, judges, governors and officers. It would, therefore, discuss the various ways in which the king and the nobility co-operated and in which the latter, therefore, still proved their utility to the state. It would also discuss to what extent there was growing financial stress on noble families, and how far this could be due to social pressure rather than to economic conditions. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would offer a wide-ranging discussion of the various ways in which the nobility were affected by Louis XIV's regime, focussing on the issues of both impoverishment and usefulness. It would not ignore the impact of life at Versailles – it might, for example, debate the notion that Louis promoted ‘bourgeois’ subjects to high-ranking position, pointing out that many of these people were in fact scions of the lesser nobility. Yet it would also discuss in detail the role of the majority of the nobility, perhaps emphasising the provincial nobles not as people cut off from the crown, but as part of a wider, if less direct, web of royal patronage. It would discuss the nobles' role not only in politics (eg the provincial estates and the parliaments), but also the persistence of their social influence (not least in the church, as members of the upper clergy) and the opportunities which Louis XIV provided for their enrichment through economic activity (for example, he abolished *dérogance* – loss of noble status – for nobles who engaged in seaborne commerce [1669] and wholesale trade [1701]). The essay might also consider the role of nobility in maintaining the quiescence of the wider population and, on this point, it might, none the less also discuss how the local nobility could – and did – lose their prestige among locals when they proved unable or unwilling to provide effective opposition to the advance of the royal state into local life, particularly in the form of taxation. It might also emphasise that Louis' relationship with his nobility was one based not entirely on royal self-confidence, but on fear – with the memory of the Fronde weighing heavily on the king's behaviour – suggesting that the king himself never believed the nobility to be as powerless or as impoverished as nobles such as Saint-Simon complained. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians; (eg Bohanan, who criticises historians' ‘excessive emphasis’ on Versailles).

## Question 2

**Is it fair to say that “the policy of Louis XIV failed in its approach to the religious questions of his reign in every aspect”?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would discuss the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 and explain how about 200,000 members of the Protestant church fled the country during the persecution, and discuss the impact which that might have had on France. It might also consider Louis XIV's response to other forms of religious dissent, such as the Quietists and the Jansenists, and how he failed to extirpate those forms of religious dissent. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would examine a wider range of religious policies, offering a balanced discussion of ways in which Louis coped with the challenges posed by religious dissent. While considering the shortcomings of Louis's policies towards the Huguenots, it might also point out that his persecution of the Protestants, including the *dragonnades* as well as the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, was popular among a wide cross-section of the French Catholic population. It might also, however, consider how Louis's policy damaged France's standing abroad. It would also discuss the potential, ideological challenge which Jansenism and Quietism posed to royal authority and how Louis, arguably with some success, managed to contain, if not entirely eradicate, the danger. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations; this might include Bluche's defence of Louis' policies.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would show a detailed awareness of the religious questions of the day, discussing not only religious dissent, but also problems of church-state relations (including the Gallican Rights of the Catholic Church in France, and the troubled relations with Rome). On religious dissent, it would consider the failures of Louis's policies towards Huguenots, Jansenists and Quietists, but might also attempt to see these actions in Louis's own terms: if one sees Protestants as potentially disloyal subjects, then arguably, the exile of 27% of them and the forced conversion of up to 400,000 to Catholicism might, perversely, be regarded as a success. On Jansenism, the essay might look at Louis's mixed success in dealing with the heresy: on the one hand, he never extirpated it entirely from the French clergy, or indeed from the laity, but, on the other, the Papal bulls against Jansenism, which gave him and the French church the authority to suppress the heresy, were issued by Rome on his advice. On church-state relations, it would consider Louis's efforts to extend his powers over the church. The essay might emphasise the king's (and the French clergy's) failure to defend against the Pope the four definitive – and controversial – principles of the Gallican church issued in 1682 (the Pope excommunicated Louis and refused to confirm all bishops whom Louis nominated, therefore leaving thirty-five French bishoprics vacant by 1688). At the same time, however, it might stress that the Pope at least compromised to end the deadlock: while the Pope secured the withdrawal of the four principles, he agreed to recognise Louis's rights to nominate all bishops within France. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians; (eg Sturdy: was Louis too obsessive in trying to establish his orthodox credentials?)

### Question 3

#### **Did royal cultural patronage under Louis XIV have greater political than artistic impact?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would discuss how Louis XIV exploited various forms of culture as a means of representing and glorifying his power. Such an answer would tend to focus on Versailles, but might also consider other forms of culture, such as literature and theatre. Overall, the essay would offer a basic evaluation of the political impact of these endeavours, balanced with some brief references to their artistic influence. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would offer a wider-ranging discussion of the various forms of cultural life in Louis XIV's France, discussing the various means by which the king offered patronage to the arts, and discussing both the political and the artistic influence in each case. In doing so, it could consider Versailles as both a cultural masterpiece and as deliberate attempt to represent the power and the glory of Louis XIV, but it would also have to give substantial space to the other aspects of French culture. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations; these might include the ideas advanced by Peter Burke.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be more comprehensive: it would consider architecture (including Versailles), art, drama, literature and possibly other forms of intellectual endeavour, such as science. It would explore the various ways in which Louis XIV sought to patronise and control these media, showing a detailed knowledge of the various academies, the role of universities and colleges and the system of censorship. While discussing the political impact which these efforts and control and patronage undoubtedly had, these effects would be balanced by careful discussion of the artistic influence of the forms of cultural expression patronised by the government. The crown also sought to control the *quality* of the work produced by artists and scholars, suggesting that some recognition was given to intrinsic artistic merit, and not just to political impact. The essay might also consider the way in which France began to exert a form of cultural hegemony over Europe, helped in no small part by the emergence of French as the new *lingua franca* of the continent. Besides language, the essay might place these developments in the context of the artistic movement of the Baroque, and the notion of a 'republic of letters' – all of which permitted the transmission of French ideas and tastes across Europe. The essay could argue either that this cultural influence had primarily a political impact (witness the imitations of Versailles and the academies which sprung up in many countries in order to copy the political glorification of the ruler), or it may chose to emphasise the wider artistic impact which this influence had on the Baroque and on the direction of ideas. The essay might also emphasise that not all cultural expression was patronised by the king directly and these writings, while permitted by the censorship, did not always have politics as their primary purpose. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians; (eg Is Briggs right to emphasise the overtly political purpose of cultural endeavour under Louis XIV ['soulless temples to the cult of monarchy'], or is Sturdy closer to the mark in emphasising Louis XIV's nurturing of the best creative talent?)

#### Question 4

**How important was the role of the commercial classes in France in the second half of the seventeenth century?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would discuss in general terms the role of merchants, master-craftsmen and financiers in policies such as mercantilism and government efforts to develop trade and manufacturing. It would most likely tend to focus primarily on Colbert's measures to encourage these activities. A conclusion would offer a general assessment as to the importance of commerce and manufacturing in seventeenth-century France. Some account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would discuss in greater detail the ways in which merchants, master-craftsmen and financiers responded to Louis XIV's commercial and manufacturing policies. It might also discuss the ways in which the commercial classes contributed to the development of towns, but also show an awareness that many of their activities, such as manufacturing, still took place in rural areas. It would show some knowledge of the kinds of enterprises in which the commercial classes engaged (eg the *manufactures royales*, government monopolies, trading companies, overseas commerce, but also small-scale, artisanal production, etc). It might consider the role of the Huguenots in commercial activities and discuss how far their persecution affected the economic development of France. Greater account would be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks), in addition to the above, would consider the political role of the commercial classes in their representation of towns in the provincial estates and their defence of corporate privileges and the guild structure. It would assess how the commercial classes were affected by Louis XIV's fiscal policies, in terms of their share of the burden of taxation, their role as tax farmers and the impact of war and mercantilism on trade. The answer might show an awareness of regional variations in the privileges, prosperity and opportunities enjoyed by the commercial classes: for example, differences in the application of customs and the salt tax. It would consider whether the commercial classes represented an emerging 'capitalist bourgeoisie', or whether, through such institutions as the guilds, royal patronage and control of large manufactures and the protection afforded by mercantilist policies, these groups of people were more conservative in their outlook. There would be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians. These may include debate such as:- did the commercial classes represent an economically-dynamic *France du mouvement* as against a conservative, backward *France de la résistance* (Labrousse), or has this been exaggerated (Meuvret)?

## Question 5

**“The condition of the peasants under Louis XIV is the product of an exceptional convergence of unfavourable factors”. Discuss.**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would discuss the various problems which afflicted the French peasantry under Louis XIV, including subsistence crises, disease and harsh climatic fluctuations. It might also make reference to the demands of the state for taxation and recruits, as well as noble and clerical privilege, which shifted these burdens onto the shoulders of the peasantry. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would offer more nuanced and detailed discussion of the problems which faced the peasantry. The discussion of natural crises, such as the major subsistence crises of 1693-4 and 1709-10, and of wars, which were frequent but not continuous, might suggest that the ‘unfavourable factors’ did not always converge with the same intensity, but varied in effect from year to year. The peasant’s relationship with the state (taxation, recruitment, the *corvée*) and the church (the tithe) would be discussed alongside the burdens imposed by seigneurialism. The essay might try to show that the conditions of the peasantry fluctuated, rather than being determined in a static manner by the same, consistent factors. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would offer a comprehensive discussion of the factors which determined the conditions of the peasantry. While considering factors such as natural phenomena, seigneurialism and the state, it would emphasise not only that circumstances varied over time, but also that their impact was different from one place to another. Burdens of taxation, particularly indirect taxation, varied between provinces, depending upon the extent of privilege. The answer might also differentiate between different types of peasant, from the landless labourer to the well-to-do *laboureur* and between men and women. It might include a discussion of patterns of landholding, which varied from region to region, and the nature of peasant indebtedness. It might also try to balance the picture of unfavourable conditions with the efforts, however inadequate, of the state to alleviate some of these problems, particularly in times of crisis and particularly by local officials, including the control of the grain trade and the role of the church, particularly the parish clergy, to use its wealth to alleviate the worst of peasant pauperism. It might also comment, more broadly, on the limits to the productive capacity of the old regime economy, which was restricted by lack of innovations in agriculture and by the stagnation in population growth over the course of the seventeenth century. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians: (eg were the difficult conditions of the peasantry due to the demands of the state, which mishandled the economy (Goubert), or was the economy itself the problem, because of its ‘feudal’ nature (Labrousse)?)

## Question 6

### How effective was domestic opposition to Louis XIV?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would identify one or two forms of opposition, such as aristocratic resistance in the provinces, intellectual and literary critics of the monarchy, religious dissent and peasant unrest. It would offer a basic analysis as to the strength and weakness of the forms of opposition discussed. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would be more detailed and would cover more of the main sources of opposition to the regime. It might balance the nature of the opposition with the strengths of the state, possibly pointing out how the different forms of opposition, dissent and protest could not form any common front against the king. It might point out that certain forms of criticism and protest emerged strongly at certain times of crisis, such as war and harvest failure. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be more comprehensive, including a detailed analysis of the variety of forms of opposition to Louis XIV's regime. It would discuss peasant unrest, intellectual critics, religious dissent and aristocratic resistance. In each case, it would consider both the extent of the threat and the limitations of this opposition (for example, the restricted support which aristocratic critics of royal absolutism may have acquired). It might explore how these different forms of opposition varied in intensity over time. It might discuss whether or not peasant unrest or religious dissent could be construed as opposition to the king himself, or may rather have been protests or opinions directed against either a specific abuse (in the case of peasants, for example, taxation, recruitment), or against the prevailing religious orthodoxy, rather than a general assault on Louis's government. It would balance the depth and limitations of opposition with the strength of the government response to potential opponents, such as control of ideas through the state academies, the ability of the king to control the nobility through state patronage and the use of the military to crush peasant unrest. It might also emphasise that dissent was not widespread and that Louis pursued policies which were frequently popular, such as his early assault on corruption within the administration and the judiciary. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians; (eg is there anything in Rothkrug's view that criticisms by writers from 1700 was a sign of gathering 'opposition' to the regime, or is Sturdy correct in arguing, instead, that such criticism was offered not in the spirit of resistance, but stemmed from a tradition, accepted by the monarchy, of 'constructive criticism'? How far did officials respond to peasant unrest 'with a shrewd mixture of retreat and aggression' (Briggs)?)

## **France in the Age of Louis XIV**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

**Compare the views of Sources A and B as perspectives on the personal monarchy of Louis XIV.**

The candidate assesses the differences in the views expressed in Sources A and B on the personal nature of monarchy under Louis XIV, in terms of:

#### **Source A**

##### **Origin**

Memoirs compiled by Louis XIV for the instruction of his son and heir, the Dauphin. Put together in the late 1660s by a team of secretaries, but very much an accurate account of the king's own views.

##### **Purpose**

Louis summarises the deathbed advice given to him as a young king by his First Minister and mentor Cardinal Mazarin, that he should take over personal responsibility for and control of policy-making in the French government.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

The king should be personally in charge of the government

- should select his officials wisely, choosing men of ability and loyalty
- should use them in areas that fitted their talents
- should retain personal control of patronage [“favours”]
- should seek advice from his councillors, but make all decisions himself
- should make sure they all remembered the king was “master”, and accepted his decisions as final.

#### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

Louis did try to live by these rules from the time of Mazarin's death in 1661.

- never appointed another First Minister
- worked very hard on a daily basis with his small circle of chosen ministers
- governed through a series of small councils: only the king attended them all, so only he knew the whole picture
- deliberately chose ministers and council members from a small group of mainly noblesse de robe families whose ability and loyalty he trusted, never from the traditional nobility
- very sensitive to any challenging of his decisions, witness his famous letter of rebuke to Colbert.

This was all in complete contrast to the situation prior to 1661. For the past 4 decades, control of government had been left by the king in the hands of successive chief ministers in the persons of Richelieu and Mazarin.

## Source B

### Origin

The Duc de Saint-Simon, a French aristocrat who lived at Versailles during the last 20 years of Louis XIV's reign, and compiled copious memoirs of his life at court.

### Purpose

To demonstrate how Louis' ministers manipulated their royal master to achieve their own ends, by exploiting his obsession with maintaining his own authority.

### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

If Louis thought his authority was being challenged

- he became unreasonable and pig-headed.
- he would refuse to consider any evidence or arguments against his point of view.

So Louis' ministers were able to use this in order to "manage him"

- they could make him believe anything they wanted
- they were able to control him absolutely (like "despotic masters")
- they were able to exclude people who might have given him other points of view.

### Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation

Saint-Simon is excessively obsessed with the power of Louis' ministers to influence the king. It is a recurring theme in his memoirs.

This is because he was also obsessed with what he saw as their rise to power at the expense of his own class, the *ducs et pairs*, in their total exclusion from royal councils.

Consequently his comments here have to be treated with caution.

Elsewhere in his memoirs he slightly contradicts himself by saying that ministers could not always count on getting their own way with Louis, because he was on the lookout for their manipulating tactics.

Saint-Simon also attributes similar powers of deception and manipulation in political matters to Louis' second consort, Madame de Maintenon.

Comparing Sources A and B: Source A is a valid statement of the personal manner in which Louis XIV tried to run the government of France from 1661 and for the rest of his reign. Source B suggests that in this aim he failed completely, as his ministers "managed him with such art" that they controlled him and not the other way round.

The truth probably lies somewhere in between: Louis was indeed heavily reliant on his chosen ministerial team for advice and implementation of policies, as well as for information and feedback; but he did make every effort possible to retain personal control in the hands of the king.

## **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonably developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of the material, and well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

### How valid is Source C's analysis of the policies and achievements of Jean-Baptiste Colbert?

Candidate assesses the views of the author of **Source C** on Colbert's policies and achievements, and evaluates their validity in terms of:

#### Origin

Modern historian, specialist in early modern French history, and generally very critical of Louis XIV's government.

#### Purpose

To support revisionist interpretation of Colbert as a government minister of limited vision and achievement, as opposed to the traditional view of Colbert as a radical economic reformer.

#### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

Dismisses the older view of Colbert as a "genius" who could have radically reformed France's economy if his policies had been backed by his fellow ministers and adopted by Louis.

Admits that Colbert worked with remarkable dedication to promote French economic development.

But makes Colbert himself fundamentally to blame for his failure to achieve real economic progress.

- his policies were seriously flawed
- his attempts at state control and direction did not achieve the intended aims
- his tariff war against the Dutch harmed France
- the Dutch War ruined his overall economic policy.

His successes were limited to the development of the French navy and the promotion of luxury industries.

#### Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation

Candidate could discuss points such as:

Colbert's "misapprehensions", such as

- followed mercantilist principles (but so did most contemporaries)
- believed in existence of a 'war of money'
- believed in fixed limits on supply and demand.

And his "limitations", such as

- lack of understanding of importance of agriculture within French economy
- promotion of luxury industries for export instead of cheap goods for local consumption.

“dirigisme”, state direction of the economy

- Colbert’s strict regulation of industrial production stifled initiative.

“tariffs .... backfired”

- French exporters suffered due to Dutch retaliation.

Dutch War halted Colbert’s programme

- economic development and financial surplus were sacrificed to the needs of war (which Colbert supported, rather than opposed as historians once said).

However, the source says nothing about Colbert’s significant success in managing royal income and expenditure much more efficiently than before.

Nor does it discuss his other areas of achievement, in directing royal building works and the promotion of culture.

His encouragement of overseas colonial ventures also achieved some long-term success.

### **Conclusion**

Briggs’ analysis is valid enough as far as it goes. Older historians like Lavissee took an anachronistic view of Colbert’s aims and successes.

Briggs, like other recent critics of Colbert, while placing him in a more realistic 17<sup>th</sup> century context, could perhaps give him greater credit (as does Goubert) for his undoubted achievements at least in the short-term.

### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

#### **How accurately does Source D reflect public attitudes within France towards the monarchy of Louis XIV?**

Candidate gives a structured evaluation of the accuracy with which Source D reflects how the French public regarded Louis XIV, in terms of:

#### **Origin**

A 'simple parish priest' writing in France at the time of Louis XIV's death.

#### **Purpose**

A damning epitaph on the dead king, attacking the nature of his rule and what he has done to France.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

Few Frenchmen will mourn Louis' passing

- he taxed his people excessively
- he left his kingdom massively in debt
- he ruled absolutely, and his will was law
- he oppressed and disempowered the traditional elites
- his policies feathered the nests of the tax-farmers and *rentiers*
- he has been the target of massive public criticism.

#### **Possible points from recall providing wider textualisation**

Louis certainly came in for increasing criticism in the latter part of his reign.

- his last two wars placed a huge strain on France's resources, and required extraordinary tax-demands which naturally were unwelcome
- French setbacks and defeats in the last war took the gloss off the victories celebrated by the French public in earlier years
- within the privileged classes, there was resentment of their loss of political influence, voiced by a few like Saint-Simon
- critics like Vauban and Fenelon attacked the policies of Louis and his ministers that had impoverished France.

But public attitudes to Louis had been very different in the first half of Louis' reign.

- In the 1660s, the charismatic young king was the object of widespread adulation
- almost everyone accepted without question the rightness of absolute monarchy, with its divine origin
- easy victories in the early wars increased public pride in their king
- the great nobility were only too eager to serve their king at court
- there was little resistance from the Parlement as Louis restricted their power to delay royal edicts
- public loyalty was deliberately encouraged by government propaganda, notably the public memorials set up to the glory of Louis XIV
- churchmen like Bossuet had led the way in advocating public loyalty and obedience to Louis as king.

## **Conclusion**

When Louis died, a tired and saddened old man of 77, he left his kingdom in an exhausted state. Blamed for the disasters of the past 20 years, Louis' passing was regretted by few and welcomed by many. Had he died in 1680, public attitudes would have been very different to that represented by the writer of Source D.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland 1715-1800**

### **Part 1**

**Each question is worth 25 marks**

#### **Question 1**

**How different were the short term and long term effects of the Treaty of Union on the Scottish economy?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would be able to compare short and long term economic consequences of the Union in a reasonable number of areas – trade, agriculture, and manufacturing being the obvious ones. There would be some use of statistical evidence to support conclusions. There would be some awareness that the traditional interpretation – that in the short term some aspects of the Scottish economy suffered but in the long term Scotland benefited – has been rigorously tested by historians in the last two decades.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would improve on the above mainly in terms of thoroughness. Regional differences, and differences between industries would be considered. Less obvious areas of economic importance such as institutions (from banks to improvers' clubs) might be discussed. There would be a fairly thorough grip of relevant statistical material in at least some areas. The discussion of the historiography would make use of some specific arguments of more than one specific historian.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would, in addition, handle the concepts involved in economic history with confidence and understanding, and would certainly touch also on the economic condition of Scotland before the Union – which is clearly relevant and a source of controversy. Until recently most historians accepted the contemporary view of English travellers that the state of Scotland before the Union was pitiful. Recent scholarship has discovered many strengths. The debates would be handled in a judicious and balanced way – though a less balanced, more polemical argument would be acceptable in a school pupil if well supported by evidence and not blinkered.

## Question 2

**Discuss the judgement that “If, in the eighteenth century, agriculture became a passion in England, in Scotland it became almost a mania”. (William Ferguson)**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would be able to analyse the enthusiasm for “improvement” in Scotland and discuss whether it was as extensive as the title suggests. The ideas of Cockburn of Ormiston and of Lord Kames might be discussed, for example, the early Clearances or the development of the Argyll estates.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would partly do the same, but in greater detail. But it should also certainly pick up the word “mania” – the suggestion that the desire for what was new went beyond reason and produced undesirable results (such as Cockburn’s bankruptcy, to give but one example).

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) should be able to add to the above some assessment (as indicated by the title) of the English (and possible European) context, so that a judgement can be made as to whether the enthusiasm for agriculture in Scotland was exceptional by contemporary standards.

As far as historiographical debate is concerned, the main question is the extent to which the enthusiasm of a few famous individuals really affected Scots practices all that much. Ferguson’s quotation, in the title, can be set against Smout: “Prior to 1780 the improver was still an exception among landlords...” The best candidates would certainly be able to grapple with this, and refer to specific historians, for example Devine’s recent rehabilitation of “the agricultural revolution” as a valid description of what was going on. One would not expect pass answers to deal with the historiography in more than fairly general terms.

### Question 3

**Why did the Jacobite army move so conclusively from swift victories in 1745 to crushing defeat in 1746?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would be able to make some straightforward, reasonably thorough, comparisons between the reasons for Jacobite victories in 1745 – especially Prestonpans – and the reasons for the defeat at Culloden. Such factors as speed of movement, the fierceness of the Highland charge and the relatively poor quality of Cope's army, on the one hand, and the quarrels amongst the Jacobite leaders, the breakdown of their commissariat, and the superior numbers, training and equipment of Cumberland's army on the other. The treatment must be analytical; narratives of the battles would not by themselves pass. Some awareness would be shown that there is more than one interpretation of why the Jacobites lost at Culloden, some historians regarding the defeat as inevitable whilst others stress particular causes that might in fact have been remedied.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would be able to develop the above approach in far more depth. There would be an analysis of more engagements than the two obvious battles and the treatment would show an ability to handle the various causes in more detail. There would also be more analysis of the relevant non-military factors, such as the level of support within the population and the wider diplomatic context. It should be clear that the candidates have considered more than one historian's account of the battles – such as Black, Chandler Prebble – and that they can give grounds for selecting one interpretation.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would, in addition to the above, pick up the words "swift" and "crushing" in the title, and be aware that there is a bit more to the problem than victory and defeat – in particular why Culloden was so conclusive, given that there were plenty of Jacobites still in arms. This opens up whole areas of historiographical controversy, such as the quantity and quality of support for the Jacobites and the quality of Charles Edward as a leader. The massive question of whether the '45 was a crazy venture that had some good luck early on or something that might well have succeeded could be considered.

#### Question 4

**“Confidently, Scots expressed their identity through local history, song, poems and philosophy.”  
How far do you agree with this recent assessment of the Scottish Enlightenment?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should do more than merely give some examples. They need to use examples to draw a relevant conclusion. The question gives wide scope for candidates to use the knowledge that they do have, since examples of art and architecture can be used to point out that there was more to the Enlightenment than writings. They should certainly attempt to grapple with the concept of Scottish identity, though a candidate should not fail solely because of a failure to make all that much of it.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) should handle the concepts with more assurance and be able to use more precise detail from a wider range of examples. To reach this level candidates should be able to focus reasonably precisely on the issue of Scottish identity, considering such things as the discussion of accent or the question of “North Britain”.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) should add to the above the ability to weave different examples into an integrated whole (a very hard thing to do with cultural history) and use a range of examples, handled with understanding, to come to an effective conclusion as to how the Scottish Enlightenment might be summed up, and the extent to which it was about a confident assertion of Scottishness.

It is notoriously difficult to sum up the Scottish Enlightenment, and all the various historians who deal with the period give slightly different emphases. Phillipson and Daiches are two that candidates might well have come across, but all the standard works on the period have chapters on the Enlightenment whose angles vary. The best candidates should be able to link their discussion to some historians by name, and show that they have thought about the problem. Pass candidates could be expected to be aware that there were different ways of summing up the Enlightenment, but without going into much depth.

## Question 5

### **What were the most difficult problems that faced the government in managing Scotland between 1715 and 1800?**

Candidates should pick up the point in the title that it is problems that faced the government that are particularly relevant here, not the problems of Scotland in general. Problems of law and order, rebellion and foreign invasion were what loomed largest in the government's mind, as can be seen, for example, by the vast proportion of the revenue spent on Fort George; a great deal could be said about this from the Jacobites to Thomas Muir via the Porteous Riots. Politically there were the problems of fitting Scots MPs into the Westminster patronage system – so ably achieved by Islay and Dundas. In terms of fiscal policy there was the problem of making Scotland a net contributor to the Revenue rather than a drain, but without provoking rioting. Governments did not usually deal with economic problems directly, but they did support various initiatives. To quote Christopher Whatley: “Insufficient attention has been paid to the role of the state in Scottish economic development in the eighteenth century.” On the other hand Bruce Lenman frequently emphasises that gross neglect of Scottish affairs was one of the main reasons why the Jacobites were able to mount a serious threat. The decision to do without a separate Scottish Privy Council after 1708, for example, should be discussed. There might be discussion of the government's management of the Highlands and detail on the Act for the Pacification of the Highlands.

There is no shortage of material for candidates to work on, especially if they think in terms of short, medium and long term problems. They might also dispute the assumption of the question that the government actually ‘managed’ and that the main charge against the Westminster government was lack of interest in Scottish affairs, not active intervention.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would give a reasonably thorough analysis of a range of problems, covering more than one area of government concern. There would be a clear structure and some specific examples. Some account would be taken of the writings of different historians.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would definitely provide a thorough survey of a range of problems and would cover the whole period under discussion. The structure would pick up the phrase “most difficult” in the title and argue a case about priorities, not merely list a series of problems. Some of the points would be amply supported by detailed analysis. Specific use should be made of the different emphases of different historians.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would handle a wide range of problems thoroughly and confidently. Arguments would be based on substantial evidential detail. In addition to points already made, candidates might consider what successive Westminster governments were actually trying to achieve in Scotland. There will be evidence of knowledge of the views of a range of historians.

## Question 6

**To what extent did the many divisions in the Kirk during the eighteenth century reflect wider social tensions within Scotland?**

The disputes over patronage clearly reflected a division between the lairds who were patrons and the rest, who were not. Callum Brown had recently argued that the Evangelical clergy were mainly rural, where the Moderates were mainly urban. On the other hand there were genuine divisions of doctrine – emphasised by David Bebbington, amongst others, as Calvinist churches all over Europe grappled with the problem of salvation. Was it only by election, or was the love of Christ available to all? The power of individual preachers to arouse enthusiasm should not be ignored (for example, when George Whitefield, the English Methodist, preached at Cambuslang), as various ecclesiastical historians have pointed out. The suggestion that Dissent, by the end of the century, was ceasing to be the mark of the rural poor but more a declaration of intent by those “with a strong social and economic aspiration to get on”. The broad historical debate as to whether innovations in religion are caused mainly by socio-economic factors or mainly by the intellectuals and preachers who come up with the new ideas goes back to Tawney and Weber. The best candidates who have gone into depth on this aspect of the syllabus may well be aware of these issues.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would be able to take the main divisions in the Kirk and write a structured answer in answer to the question with some appropriate supporting detail. Some use would be made of the work of different historians.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would show a good understanding of a wide range of the divisions that affected the Kirk. The structure would reinforce a definite argument about the relative importance of social divisions, as opposed to other factors, in causing these divisions. There would be a fair quantity of supporting detail. There would be specific references to the views of more than one historian.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would be able to handle confidently and thoroughly all the various disputes and schisms – correctly placing the New Licht Anti-Burghers, for example. The theological concepts required to handle church history would be well understood and used. The argument would be supported with a range of appropriate evidence across the whole century, with an awareness of the possibility of change over the period (as towns grew, for example). There would be well-informed references to the views and research of a range of historians – not necessarily the ones suggested above.

## **Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland 1715-1800**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

**How far does Source A contribute to an accurate understanding of why so many Scots came out in support of the Fifteen?**

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of the usefulness of Mar's arguments as to why men should join the rebellion in terms of:

#### **Origin and Purpose**

Written by the leader of the rebellion three days after he formally raised the Jacobite standard. He will have been trying to put into words what he believed potential supporters would respond to, in order to persuade waverers to join. Mar ("Bobbing John") is generally regarded as untrustworthy, but his calculation as to what his fellow Scots thought is interesting evidence.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- James Edward Stuart's claim to the throne compared to George I's
- the effects of the Treaty of Union and the extent to which they were perceived as "a foreign yoke too heavy to bear". For example the increases in taxation
- the extent to which those who supported the Fifteen were concerned with Scotland's "ancient, free and independent Constitution". For example the irritation of those peers who had failed to gain a seat in the House of Lords
- one motto on the standard that had been raised three days earlier was "No Union".

#### **Points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

##### Religion

- the vital importance of Episcopalianism, especially in the North East of Scotland as a cause of Jacobitism. Also the importance of Roman Catholicism, though the numbers were fewer.

##### Self-interest

- the disappointment of ambitious politicians who had failed to find favour with the new king. Mar himself is the supreme example, but all Tories faced a bleak future after the death of Anne. Detail on the motives of any number of individuals (Huntly, Lockhart of Carnwath, Nithsdale) could be used.

##### Failure of the government

- since the abolition of the Scottish Privy Council in 1708, the government had done virtually nothing to win friends in Scotland or to repress rebels effectively.

##### Coercion

- Mar's famous instruction for burning the houses of his tenants if they were slow to come out puts his appeal to ancient liberties in context.

## Optimism

- in September 1715 it seemed reasonable to hope for substantial support in England, notably from Catholics in Lancashire, from disappointed Tories and from sections of the army led by the Duke of Ormonde.

## Marks

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely paraphrases the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well written, with some relevant points but little structure. No more than a basic sense of context.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured. Reasonably developed analysis that uses a range of points from re-call and shows a good grasp of the facts of the topic.
- 9-12** Well developed levels of relevant analysis; solid grasp of the significance of the source and a thorough use of a substantial range of reasons why men joined the Fifteen to construct a convincing argument.

## Question 2

### How adequately does Source B explain the growing importance of Glasgow in this period?

The provenance of the source is not particularly relevant to this question, though an intelligent comment about this type of memoir as a source would enhance an answer. There are two areas that are particularly relevant. The first is a precise reading of the source that distinguishes, as the source does, between the mid-eighteenth century prosperity and the habits of mind of the burgesses that permitted the massive late eighteenth century growth. The second is knowledge of the context so that the adequacy of the source can be assessed: in particular, candidates should be able to add other reasons why Glasgow grew in importance, such as the flourishing university.

#### Points from the source, which can be developed from recalled knowledge

- prosperity of the 1740s based on tobacco, sugar and rum, not on exports. This should be reinforced with statistics and points about the way the “Glasgow store system” operated
- entrepreneurial culture of the merchants enabled them to take advantage of the products of the new industries – iron, textiles, engineering – as they developed
- rapid realisation of potential of steam power in the 1790s – an example of “every new object”.

#### Points from recall, providing a wider and more critical contextualisation

- there was a tradition of textile industries in the Clyde Valley – linen and textiles – that enabled cotton to take off very fast. Also there were perfect natural conditions in climate and water-power
- the debate about the extent to which illegal methods were used by Glasgow merchants to get ahead of Whitehaven
- the availability of a labour force from the Highlands and from a surplus in the rural Lowlands
- the population of the city grew from 13,000 to 84,000 during the period, with all the implications of this for economic importance, service industries and so on
- the fact that Adam Smith, William Cullen and Joseph Black, to name but three, contributed to the reputation and eminence of Glasgow university.

#### Marks

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely summarises the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well written; some relevant points of assessment made; a basic sense of context without detail; lacking clear structure; points made randomly.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; points from the source developed fairly well in context; good factual grasp of the topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

**Compare the assessments in Sources C and D as perspectives on the causes of social problems in the Highlands and Islands in the later eighteenth century.**

#### **Origin**

Source C is by a contemporary observer. It was written in 1785 before some of the developments to which Source D refers. Clearly written by someone sympathetic to the chiefs and mingling with the authorities (the sheriff substitute). Some candidates might know that Johnson was a Tory in outlook and Boswell a Lowland laird in origin. Source D is a very recent assessment by an eminent historian. Candidates might consider that the role of the elites in the Highlands is still very much a live political issue and the fact that a historian is writing in 2001 does not necessarily make him a detached commentator.

#### **Purpose**

Both books set out to inform an educated readership. However there are points about the phrases used that suggest a political purpose. Compare Source C “the chiefs generally acted right” with Source D’s references to “gravediggers”, “windfall profits” and “racked rents”, which suggest that Lenman’s account, though secondary, is by no means neutral.

#### **Points from Source C, which could be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- changed status of chiefs. The Act against Heritable Jurisdictions might be explained in more detail
- lack of authority. The work of sheriff substitutes might be rather obscure for candidates at this level, but the Appin murder and its aftermath might be relevantly used
- lack of planning by the government to “bring any positive good”.

#### **Points from Source D, which could be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- Celtic society was not destroyed by the legislation following the '45. The banning of Highland dress and bagpipes – and the later lifting of the ban – could be discussed
- external demands for Highland products in the late eighteenth century swept other considerations aside
- the main damage to society was done by the way the chiefs tried to exploit the new economic conditions: numerous examples, though note also examples of well-intentioned ventures that were unsound or not sustained.

### **Further points from recall, offering wider perspectives, could include**

- variations between individual great landowners – for example Glengarry and Sir John Sinclair
- the possibility that some of the social problems – rigid hierarchies, inflexibility of outlook, economic insecurity – pre-dated the '45
- the possibility also that the economic problems that underlay the social problems had deep geographical roots
- the work of interventionist agencies such as the Highland Society (founded 1784) and the British Fisheries Society (1786) in endeavouring to improve the infrastructure – culminating in the commissioning of Telford at the very end of the century
- the importance of the integration of Highland regiments into the British army as a new social factor
- the Presbyterian evangelical missionary efforts in previously Catholic- Jacobite areas.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the different views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely describes the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views of the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking a clear structure; points made randomly indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several sensible points and set material in context fairly accurately. Shows a fairly good factual grasp of the topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources and a reasonably developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of the context and the significance of the material, and uses analysis to come to a developed conclusion in answer to the question.

## **“The House Divided”: USA (1850-1865)**

### **Part 1**

**Each question is worth 25 marks**

#### **Question 1**

**Explain the reasons for the break up of the two party system by 1855.**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would look at the reasons for division between the Whigs and the Democrats – the former a believer in strong central government, endorsing federally funded improvements, and the latter more a believer in the primacy of the individual states. There will be coverage of the issues confronting both parties in the early 1850s, including territorial expansion and the issue of the extension of slavery; the rise of nativism and the response of the parties to that; the rise of anti-Catholicism and the general mood of moral reform eg temperance movement and abolitionism. An assessment of the impact of the Kansas-Nebraska Act would be expected. There will be some awareness of differing historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would, additionally, develop the above themes to explain how and why the Democrats were able to adapt to changing circumstances, whilst the Whigs could not. Analysis of voting patterns, showing how issues such as nativism and anti-Catholicism hurt the Whigs more than the Democrats would be expected. The candidate might also note the impact of the Free Soil Party on the electoral fortunes of the Whigs in the late 1840s. There will be analysis of the reasons why the Democrats became more pro-Southern in this period. There will be greater awareness of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would show how Northern Democrats in particular became more pro-Southern in this period and also why the party was prepared to include immigrants and Catholics in the body politic. The Whig failure to adapt and the crisis, initiated in 1848 with the Wilmot Proviso following from their opposition to the Mexican War, their failure to win control of the Executive branch of government and the internecine warfare over Kansas-Nebraska would be analysed. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

These may include:-

- Craven – politicians encouraged conflict for own political ends
- Donald – volatile democratic electorate at this time  
Party leaders responded without policies or principles
- Randall – politicians used excesses of propaganda, intolerance and hate
- Holt – local ethno-cultural struggles determined voting patterns
- Benson – local issues, not national ones of slavery and sectionalism, were important
- McPherson – Kansas-Nebraska was the final nail in the coffin of the Whig party.

## Question 2

### Examine the motives in the Southern States in seceding for 1860/1861.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) may confine discussion to the immediate reasons for secession – election of Lincoln, fear for Southern way of life and local institutions, defence of states' rights and the role of the 'fire-eaters'. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would, additionally, place these themes in a longer historical time frame eg debate over Kansas-Nebraska and Southern delight at outcome of Dred Scott case. The candidate may also analyse Southern fears re the rise of the Abolitionists and the Republican Party and how both were perceived as threatening the Southern way of life, leading to support for secession in 1860 and 1861. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would take Lincoln's election as the trigger for Southern secession due to the former's opposition to the extension of slavery and the threat posed to the continued predominance of the planter class. Greater understanding of the linkages of the above themes will be shown to illustrate why compromise had been possible in 1850 but impossible by 1860-1861. The leading role of South Carolina in the crisis could be analysed as a catalyst for further Southern action. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

These may include:-

- Davis and Stephens – secession as defence of states' rights
- Schlesinger – defence of states' rights as means of protecting slavery
- Beard – Southern refusal to become economically subservient to North
- Owsley – Northern long-term conspiracy aimed at Southern agrarian values
- Reid – North hated Southern people; Southern approach defensive and secession was an alternative to war.

### Question 3

#### Assess the impact of developments in technology on the conduct of the war.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will take the question at face value. Discussion may centre on the impact of new weapons and artillery, (Spencer Carbine, minie ball) the use of percussion caps etc and naval developments (iron clads). These will be used to show how effectively the killing range had increased. This may be exemplified by statistics covering range of musket rifles and the number of casualties for particular battles. There may be reference to wider aspects of technology such as the impact that developments in photography had on people's perspective of war, and how the North in particular used printing technology (ie newspapers) as propaganda. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would place the above issues in the context of how technological change influenced the tactics and strategy of battlefield commanders eg the view that Pickett's charge was the last of the great Napoleonic charges in warfare. The drawbacks of new technology, including dependence on the railway and telegraph, should also be mentioned at this level. Good candidates may exemplify developments in photography with the work of Matthew Brady, and how Lincoln used the press as a way of addressing northern people in an unofficial capacity eg his reply to Greeley's criticism of his policy on emancipation in August 1862. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) could argue that the Civil War was a transitional war from the era of Napoleon to that of twentieth century total war. Assessment of the lack of decisiveness of new technology would be used to explain why new technology did not end the war more rapidly and why both sides (but particularly the North) lacked the killer edge. Assessment of the composition of the armies (mainly volunteers, not professionals, so not necessarily familiar with even basic weaponry) and that having new technology and using it are not one and the same, could be expected. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

These may include:-

- Roland – South handicapped by lack of resources
- Luraghi – South responded quickly in the creation of a war industry
- Fuller – Grant's concept of total war
- Hart – application of new technology to break immobile warfare
- Thomas – inadequacy of Southern rail network
- Hattaway – new weaponry too primitive, too unreliable and too few in numbers to influence outcome.

#### Question 4

##### **To what extent did the war prove to be a liberating experience for Blacks?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would include reference to the Acts of Congress (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> Confiscation Acts, Militia Act etc) to improve the status of runaway slaves; the work of the Freedman's Bureau; the impact of the Emancipation Proclamation; and the recruitment of Blacks into the army and the effect Union occupation of Southern territory had in bringing freedom in its wake. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would develop the above themes into a more coherent critique of the actions of the Union. Discussion re the limited freedom given under the Congressional Acts; the fact that the Emancipation Proclamation did not apply to the Border Slave States; and the discrimination which Blacks faced in the service of their country could be cited as evidence of a less than liberating experience. Candidates might also reflect on Northern fears of an influx of freed Blacks. Greater account will be taken of the views of different historians.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) might challenge the premise of the question by showing how little commitment there was to freedom and equality for blacks in US society, pointing to continuation of discrimination despite Black efforts in the war and the limited amount of federal aid to the Blacks. Conversely it could be argued that the war did set America on a new road to freedom and that what started in the war was the beginning of a long struggle to achieve equality in the USA. Although limited at first, the movement gained momentum from Black participation in the conflict. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

These may include:

- Tulloch – Lincoln adopted emancipation for practical as well as idealistic reasons
- Quarles – Black contribution to war came at a vital time
- Parish – Black freedom threatened to divide the North
- Grant – Blacks treated as second class citizens
- McPherson – Blacks played vital and active part in Northern war effort
- Paludan – Blacks saw military service as way of gaining citizenship.

## Question 5

### Why did Confederate foreign policy fail?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will concentrate on defining why the aims of Confederate foreign policy were not fulfilled. Mention will be made of the following issues: King Cotton diplomacy; the problems caused by the Union blockade; the Trent Affair; commerce raiders, the Laird Rams and the attitude of the European powers. Some mention would be expected of the role of Union diplomacy. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would develop the above themes to a greater extent – emphasising the calculations of national self-interest on the part of Britain (benefits of a divided Union; defence of Canada; the ‘wheat famine’ etc). Evidence of French attitudes should also be explored with their involvement in the Mexican affair. Criticism of the policy of King Cotton diplomacy may be included (wrong pressure at wrong time in wrong way) and the impact of the Emancipation Proclamation will be assessed. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) might challenge the whole King Cotton diplomacy of the South, arguing that its foreign policy was undiplomatic and based on a fundamentally flawed assumption. The position of neutrality adopted by Britain aided the stronger side (the North) and that Britain was prepared to sell to both sides for profit. Mention could be expected of lack of understanding on the part of Britain as to the nature of the various issues at stake in the USA which undermined support for the Confederacy. Analysis could also include the roles of Charles Francis Adams, Mason and Slidell and the restraining of Seward by Lincoln in 1861. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

These may include:-

- Owsley – violently anti-British as she pursued policy for her own ends
- Jordan and Pratt – Britain pro-North
- Crook – diplomatic considerations dictated British policy eg Russian support of North to act as counter-balance to British naval supremacy
- Hurmon – strong anti-Northern and anti-democratic, pro-Southern support in Britain
- Ellison – questions extent of working class support in Britain for North
- Jenkins – British policy dictated by calculations of national self-interest
- Graebner – key role of Seward in preventing foreign recognition.

## Question 6

**“God and the mighty battalions.”**

**How useful is this as an explanation for Northern victory by 1865?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will look at the reasons for Northern victory in terms of: population, size of armies, industrial indices, strength of political system; role of Lincoln; emergence of Grant and Sherman and the grinding down of the South in a war of attrition. Some account may be evident of Southern perspectives on this issue. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would attempt to match the above points with a greater analysis of alleged Northern superiority and ask why it took the North so long to win. Mention of divisions in the North and the crisis of mid-summer 1864 could be used to illustrate how close the South came to victory. Role of military successes in Northern victory would be included. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would make a detailed analysis of the reasons for Northern victory and Southern defeat and synthesise the results to explain Northern victory. The issue of why the war lasted four years would have to be addressed, given the apparent Northern superiority in 1861. The most able candidates might be expected to see the phrase as a stock explanation for Southern defeat, an idea rejected by Grant in his ‘Memoirs’. There will be clear understanding of the views of different historians.

These may include:-

- |                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Current           | – | God and the strongest battalions                                   |
| T. Harry Williams | – | military leadership of the North                                   |
| McPherson         | – | chance and circumstance  |
| Owsley            | – | states’ rights and failure of King Cotton diplomacy                |
| Donald            | – | South too democratic   |
| Fuller            | – | superior generalship of North and Grant                            |
| Hesseltine        | – | emergence of strong Federal government driving war effort in North |
| McKittrick        | – | central role of Republican party in uniting the North.             |

## **“The House Divided”: USA (1850-1865)**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

#### **What light does Source A throw on the attitude of the Southern States to the Union?**

The candidate evaluates the attitudes of the Southern States to the Union in terms of:

#### **Origin**

Primary document from Southern States.

#### **Purpose**

To state reasons for Southern opposition to the omnibus Bill of Henry Clay.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- denies Congress right to exclude slavery from any US territory
- any Act so passed is regarded as unconstitutional
- South will not agree to any restrictions on movement of slaves in territories
- South will oppose any such legislation.

#### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- details of 1850 crisis
- Henry Clay omnibus Bill
- role of Stephen A Douglas
- results of Nashville convention of December 1850
- attitude of South Carolina to possible future disputes
- conditional nature of Southern loyalty to Federal government
- issue of states' rights
- impact of Dred Scott case on perceptions of both sides.

#### **Conclusion**

- highly significant document
- Southern support for Union conditional on South getting her way
- portent of action by South Carolina in 1860 crisis
- South saw Union as a compact under which sovereignty was retained.

#### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; Sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **Question 2**

**How helpful are the differing views in Sources B and C as perspectives on the problems of command of the Northern armies?**

### **Source B**

#### **Origin**

Primary document from Commander-in-Chief to new head of Army of the Potomac.

#### **Purpose**

Crisis in command after failure at Fredericksburg and the 'mud march'.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- given post on merit
- Hooker's role in undermining Burnside's command
- asks for success.

#### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- self-belief of 'Fighting Joe'
- Hooker failed at Chancellorsville
- politically very active
- suggestion of military dictator to ensure success.

### **Source C**

#### **Origin**

Secondary source on life of Lincoln.

#### **Purpose**

Explain problems in command of the Army of the Potomac.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- need to reconcile political differences between government and generals
- Lincoln inexperienced at first
- later able to judge who was best suited to job
- absorbed by role of commander in chief.

### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- lack of clear command structure
- succession of generals
- issue of political generals
- limited usefulness of Halleck as military adviser
- problems created by Congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War
- problems of communication between commander in chief and generals
- in-fighting between generals eg Grant and McClelland.

### Views of historians:-

- T Harry Williams – on the struggle Lincoln had to find a general to fight the kind of war Lincoln wanted
- Catton – failure of early appointees to deliver victory when it counted created problems for president [eg McClellan]
- McPherson – contribution of Grant as commander not fully recognised at the time
- Reid – the resource and finesse of Grant.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding the differing views of the sources, and a reasonable developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and well developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

**How much light is shed by Source D on the problems faced by the North in dealing with conquered Southern territory?**

#### **Origin**

Primary document from President Lincoln.

#### **Purpose**

To explain his veto of Wade-Davis Bill.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- to remain flexible in approach
- no Congressional competence to abolish slavery in States
- seeking constitutional amendment to outlaw slavery in US.

#### **Possible points from recall which provide wider contextualisation**

- Lincoln's plan of reconstruction
- 10% loyalty threshold
- Wade-Davis Bill: 50% loyalty threshold
- reconstructed states in Tennessee and Louisiana
- attempts to ditch Lincoln as 1864 Republican presidential nominee
- pressure on Lincoln to get issue right due to forthcoming election
- evidence of widespread racism in North
- Article 4: section 4 'That the federal government should guarantee to every state a republican form of government' was stretched to breaking point to give constitutional authority for policy of reconstruction.

#### **Views of historians**

- |         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
| Current | – | President and his party differed over where political power should reside in post-war South                    |
| Parish  | – | problems were not just administrative but constitutional, and turned upon the legal character of the Civil War |
| Belz    | – | reconstruction a constitutional problem from the outset  |
| Foner   | – | Radicals saw the conflict as a chance to effect a far-reaching transformation of Southern society.             |

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; Sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Japan: From Medieval to Modern State (1850s-1920)

### Part 1

Each question is worth 25 marks

#### Question 1

##### How powerful was the merchant class in Japan in the 1850s and 1860s?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will give a basic account of the hierarchy of society in 1850s Japan whereby the Bakufu set out a rigid class system fixed at birth. It will highlight the unique features of the merchants as a class of townspeople in their position near the bottom of the structure. The role that the Sankin Kotai system played in the Daimyo and Satsuma classes borrowing from merchants to sustain their fashionable lifestyles will be outlined. The merchants' role in buying, storing and re-selling rice will be explained and the power that grew with this role. Some account will be taken of different historical perspectives.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will analyse the feudal structure of the 1850s more competently showing a clear understanding of the hierarchy and the obligations it entailed, showing that merchants were socially and culturally different from the Samurai and peasantry as money-making was their life goal. The Daimyo and Samurai were dependent on income from peasant-based agriculture but expenditure was outstripping revenue. Comment will be made on the role of the Daimyo who wished to increase their own financial resources encouraging ordinary townspeople to engage in trade/craft/arts to sell to other domains. Growth of the castle towns like Edo meant a market for merchants' goods and no ties to land meant freedom of movement. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+marks) will be as for good answer but will have a full analysis of the hierarchy showing detailed understanding of the growth of wealthy merchant houses like Mitsui and Konoike whose business ventures continued into the post-Tokugawa era. An awareness of the differences of power associated with the class system and the power developed due to economic gain will feature. Awareness of financial difficulties of mid 19<sup>th</sup> century and that the merchants were vital in maintaining the economy, their role in trading with foreigners being the vital interface of foreign trade – and the skills they developed. There will be clear understanding of the views of different historians.

Possible perspectives from historians:-

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Benson & Matsumura | – other forms of prestige, based on the wealth of the merchants, were beginning to compete with martial virtues  |
| Hunter             | – [Osaka & rice] there, merchants would undertake its storage, marketing, sale and distribution. Osaka merchants became increasingly specialised in function and their number expanded rapidly |
| Macpherson         | – the merchants were the lowest class, but they were growing in wealth and power   |
| Pyle               | – within the merchant class that grew up there was of course a great deal of disparity. It was not a homogeneous group.  |

## Question 2

**With how much success did the Japanese pursue a programme of economic and social modernisation in the second half of the nineteenth century?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will largely dwell on the government's role (eg Iwakura Mission) and the achievements it made with only a suggestion that others had role in the modernisation process. Positive changes will be referred to like creation of an infrastructure of communication using the railway and telegraph, schools and universities, banking and commerce the setting up of textile mills and the support given shipbuilding, iron and steel mills. Brief mention may be made of the Tokugawa era providing the building blocks for modernisation, resistance to modernisation with reference made to the Satsuma uprising in 1877 and peasant protests against land tax. The candidate may emphasise more social reforms, eg Civil Code 1898 denied women freedom, therefore society was not modernised. Reform of Education System – low attendance till 1907 then an improvement may also be cited. There will be some account taken of different historical perspectives.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will provide a sound account of the modernisation that took place in all areas of Japanese society. Some detailed description of the Tokugawa legacy will be evident. The candidate should also be aware that the Meiji era inherited a system with highly developed agriculture, extensive inter-regional marketing, and a population who were relatively well educated and receptive to economic incentives. One interpretation is that the Meiji era brought the fundamental political and institutional changes which improved the environment for Japan's economic modernisation. Thus an awareness will be shown of the inter-reliance on the past for future modernisation. The candidate will competently discuss the major role of the Zaibatsu in modernisation. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will effectively focus on the issue in the question developing fully the argument of others outwith the government who contributed to modernisation. The role of private enterprise and big business in modernisation which still required substantial government support will be commented on. Japan also had an abundance of human labour with enterprising businessmen and managers and they were successful as they had the ability to substitute foreign experts for natives due to high levels of education. Agriculture provided surplus capital for investment in the early period. Some reference will be made to the Marxist interpretation of modernisation. This evaluation will highlight the cost of the modernisation on the environment, real wages, standard of living and welfare. The candidate will provide a highly appropriate evaluation of the issue set out in the essay title in a way that will show clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

Possible perspectives from historians:-

- Jensen – belief that modernisation due to 'a modernising elite emerging' – 'a modernising oligarchy'
- Storry – role of education in modernisation – 'idea of Japanese modernisation grew in proportion to the spread of mass education'
- Macpherson – 'The role of the government was crucial...in its moulding of society to conform to its military and therefore economic objectives'
- Hunter – modernisation did have a cost – 'many urban workers continued to work for long hours for meagre wages in unhealthy and dangerous environments and live on inadequate nourishment in slum conditions'.

### Question 3

#### **What were the most significant political developments in Japan in the years following the Meiji Restoration?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will cover the main political changes brought about by the Meiji restoration, including the effects of the restoration of the Emperor and the decrees issued in his name, the Charter Oath of 1868, the voluntary abolition of the Han system, the Daimyo restoring their domains to the Emperor. Candidates should be aware that political authority extended from the centre to governors to local leaders and that control was transferred to Tokyo. Other aspects include the new bureaucracy for justice, foreign affairs, war, the imperial household, public works and home affairs. The candidate may refer to the end of the Unequal Treaties and Imperialist policy as opposed to previous closed policy. Education was used as a state tool. Political stability threat came from the peasants during the various rice riots. Some attempts at an analysis of the significance will be attempted and there will be some account taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would show a greater knowledge of the above changes and either of some of the personalities (Ito and Yamagata) involved or some of the detailed terms of the changes made to the political dimension of Japan. Significance of the new tiered system of government will be discussed and that Japan implemented a cabinet system of government. Attention will be drawn to the appearance of political parties in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, namely the Liberal Party and the Progressive party led by Hagaki and Okuma respectively; both with the aim of a representative assembly with government accountability. Further emergence of progressive left-wing groups in the 20<sup>th</sup> century will be analysed as will the use of bribery in the Taisho era. Awareness shown of the first commoner to become Prime Minister (Hara Kei) in 1918. Clearer attempts will be made to comment of the most significant political changes in this time period. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) may add that the two prominent political characters went on public speaking tours to engage with the public but failed to combine to combat the oligarchy. Government authority started being exercised when press censorship was introduced 1875 to combat a rise in support for the popular rights movement plus removal from Tokyo if perceived to be a danger to public order; yet majority of the public were not politically active. Government use of commoners against the Saigo uprising showed an important political change. This answer will also engage with the debate that the real political power during the Meiji era lay in the hands of men from Choshu and Satsuma and the emperor was merely a puppet. Still by 1920 all men did not have the right to vote and there was no female suffrage either. Further details on politics in the Taisho era; such as the use of police intimidation to persuade people to vote. Detailed evaluation of the political changes made and there will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

Possible perspectives from historians:-

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Megarry            | – ‘effective political opposition by liberals let alone any party that genuinely attempted to represent the interests of the masses, was banned for most of this period’ |
| Benson & Matsumura | – ‘by 1920 universal manhood suffrage had come to be viewed as a sort of panacea’  |
| Hane               | – ‘the Diet did not become an institution which provided the people with a voice in the government’  |
| Pyle               | – ‘the most noteworthy change in the political system was the growth in the power and influence of the parties’.   |

#### Question 4

#### **Assess the objectives of Japanese foreign policy from the Restoration to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902.**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will be aware of the elementary aims at the start of the Meiji era of freeing Japan from the Unequal Treaties, to end extra territoriality, end tariffs on imports and to increase her status in both Asia and the greater world. The initial success of Foreign Ministers Okumu and Mutsu will be commented upon as will the fact that Japan harboured imperialistic designs on Korea in the early Meiji era. That Japan did successfully gain revision of the Unequal Treaties, and extra territoriality was ended in 1894 and she gained full control of setting tariffs in the Taisho period (1911), will be made clear. The role of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty in ending diplomatic isolation will be detailed. There will be some discussion as to whether the actions taken in the dealings outwith Japan met their aims and some account will taken of different historical perspectives.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will go into greater depth than a pass answer adding the reasons/thinking behind the disputes involving China and Korea and their subsequent outcomes. The relationship with China key was a feature in Japanese foreign policy, Japan needed colonies in Asia for population resettlement, raw material sources and as a gauge to western intentions and treatment of Asia. It would also need to be generally aware of the nationalistic desire for equality with western powers and colonial empire was seen, as a mark of civilisation. Knowledge of dealings with Russia and the reasoning behind them will feature as will a more sequential commentary on the achievements of foreign policy goals. Greater account will be taken of different historical perspectives.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) answer may be aware of Japan's paramount feeling of insecurity and vulnerability due to the frailty of its position and how foreign policy in China had another strategic aim in that instability there might mean control transferring into western hands, thus Treaty of Shimonoseki did not totally crush China. Demonstration that after Sino-Japanese victory foreign policy became more aggressive and chauvinistic with superior planning and readiness being striven for. Comment on Yamagata's 'Line of Advantage' and its role in foreign policy and imperialism maybe given with additional details on the importance of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and how it influenced future decisions especially in relation to Russia. There will be a clear and fully developed answer giving an evaluation of how far Japan had met her Foreign Policy objectives in a structured and coherent manner. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

Possible perspectives from historians:-

- Tsurumi – 'Japan's career as a colonial power began when China ceded the island of Taiwan to Japan'
- Bonnie B Oh – argues that 'for Japan, imperialism was a means of attaining equality with the west'
- Conroy – 'Meiji imperialism was ad hoc rather than planned until 1905'
- Harrington – 'unless she achieved equal status with the western powers Japan thought she would be unable to maintain her independence'
- Beasley – 'by 1890's Japan was militarily and economically strong enough to assert her independence, bringing the "unequal treaties" to an end'.

## Question 5

### **“Superior understanding of modern warfare was crucial to Japanese success in the Russo-Japanese War.” Discuss.**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will set the war in context by commenting on the fact that at the start of the conflict the statistics were against Japan yet their weaponry was technically more capable due to modernisation funded mainly by an indemnity payment from China. Overall general details of the superior training of Japanese troops due to training techniques and superior logistical organisation adopted from Prussia will be highlighted as will the fact that Japan had an ally in Britain to bolster her morale and ensure that if she fought a war with Russia, her ally France would not intervene. Japan had also utilised British naval expertise for shipbuilding and officer training. Japanese also introduced conscription in 1873 therefore had built up a reserve; also Japanese soldiers were well educated in comparison to their Russian counterparts. Some account will be taken of different historical perspectives.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will be aware of some of the more detailed technological advantages like army doubling in size and being equipped with better rifles for the infantry and the self-sufficiency of Japanese industry to produce army and navy armaments like howitzers. Such superiority in both sea-borne forces and land armies will be illustrated by mentioning Japan's seizure of Darien and successful blockage of Port Arthur, mainly with mines and the help of tidal conditions, and her march into Manchuria capturing Mukden. The candidate may highlight a possible feature of these successes in that Japan demonstrated a determination, bravery and impressive discipline within her forces plus strong patriotism. Some comment will be made on the celebrities of war like Admiral Togo and that the Russian General Staff seriously underestimated Japanese capabilities. Greater account will be taken of different historical perspectives.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) the candidate will comment on the fact that at the start of the war with Russia Japan had the advantage of having established a base in Korea from which to co-ordinate her land operations. The element of surprise will be detailed eg Japan breaking off diplomatic relations on the 6<sup>th</sup> Feb 1904 and then they attacked Russian naval forces at Port Arthur on 9<sup>th</sup> Feb yet did not formally declare war until the 10<sup>th</sup>. Evidence of other tactical advantages like better camouflage, naval intelligence with good use of wire communication will feature. Japan also had protected dockyards and dry-docking facilities, which Port Arthur lacked. Such an answer would also need to emphasise the Russian dimension more fully like their communication problems, low morale and pay among the Russian officers and that they often drank to excess. Russian domestic situation will feature in that this was a war they could not afford and 1905 saw them on the brink of a Revolution. There will be clear understanding of the views of different historians.

Possible perspectives from historians:-

- Bonnie B Oh – ‘the Meiji leaders had goals and plans for national strength and international equality but carried them out with characteristic flexibility and realism as each situation demanded’
- Hane – ‘Japan was in a more favourable position to fight because it had a well-trained army close to the battle zone’
- Beasley – ‘Russia was facing a revolution at home’
- Storry – ‘two men on the Japanese side captured the imagination of the world – among the soldiers, Nogi; among the sailors, Togo’
- Connaughton – ‘Russia embarked upon a limited war but for Japan it was total’.

## Question 6

### To what extent had Japan still retained a distinct cultural identity by 1920?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will be aware of the priority to achieve Western-style national strength through cultural borrowing after 1860. It will superficially highlight the changes made to Japanese identity, for example in the areas of education, legal system, commerce and trade, government bureaucracy, public life, religion eg 1873 legal to spread Christianity (but few converted), and society in general commenting on the image and identity of Japan in 1920. Some account will be taken of different historical perspectives.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will analyse the changes in depth, drawing attention to the regional and social differences in the cultural changes with more marked differences evident amongst the upper classes in the growing urban centres, and the likes of education framework still being organised along hierarchical lines and the ability to pay. Changes in rural Japan were minimal. It will illustrate that in the 1920's Japan retained her financial independence due to avoiding foreign debt and the fact that the West had no part in the ownership or management of industry and commerce allowing the Japanese freedom to implement a distillation of ideas. Role of the state in the 'invention of tradition' with emphasis on state Shintoism, family and filial loyalty, ideology of industrial harmony, the ideal image of Japanese womanhood and loyalty to the Emperor to retain cultural identity. Greater account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will fully develop issues from the good answer but also comment on essentially borrowing without violating a sense of tradition, which Japan carried into the modern era. It will know something about the debate surrounding the relationship between tradition and modernity and the protection against undue westernisation eg retention of the Japanese language and the role of personalities like Kuzakawa. There will be a clear awareness of the increase in insistence that her unique traditions and culture had virtues of their own in the 1880s and 90s, which influenced her development in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

Possible but not definitive perspectives from historians:-

- Hane – 'a popular children's song enumerated ten most desirable things including gas lamps, steam engines, horse-drawn carriages, telegrams, lightening conductors, newspapers, schools, postal mail and steam power. All these soon became common'
- Fahs – 'Japan's strong feeling of national identity was helpful in preventing blind acceptance of everything western. To it is due Japan's success in retaining so many of her own rich traditions'
- Havens – 'The revolution in "higher culture" [was] among privileged urban class familiar with both the Japanese artistic heritage and western ideas'
- Hunter – commenting on patriotism – 'the establishment worked hard to ensure that allegiance to the nation transcended allegiance to any other group or individual'.

## **Japan: From Medieval to Modern State (1850's-1920)**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

#### **How helpful are the differing perspectives in Source A and B on the reasons for the Meiji Restoration of 1868?**

The candidate compares the views in Sources A and B on the Meiji Restoration and offers a structured explanation of the perspectives in terms of:

#### **Origin**

The candidate should recognise that both Sources A and B are from the writings of modern professional historians. Historian's interpretations can differ.

#### **Purpose**

Both sources have the purpose of trying to persuade an academic audience of their particular findings and viewpoints.

#### **Points from the sources which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- Source A's author argues solely that the Son'no Joi/loyalist movement was responsible for the downfall of the Bakufu
- new government 'insinuated' into power: author implies underhand methods
- new government of Restoration had its power base in the Samurai ranks particularly from Satsuma, Choshu and Tosa
- Source B's author is in agreement with the author of Source A in that the Son'no Joi had a role to play in the Restoration BUT
- it also argues that Japanese society had internal weaknesses contributing to the end of the Tokugawa regime AND that there was a lack of unity in taking a stance against foreign intervention.

### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- the role of internal pressures/decay and other contributing factors to Tokugawa decay
- clarification and development of Son'no Joi [revere the Emperor, expel the barbarians] slogan attracted great popularity
- developed point of internal weakness eg Nationalism as a sense of national pride and devotion to the Emperor helped to doom the Bakufu rule. The failure of the Tempo reforms
- peasant discontent weakened the Tokugawa domains as people had developed a sense of national consciousness and identity
- rapid economic growth had produced an advanced economy capable of ready transformation into an entirely new political and social order
- restoration outcome of coalition of merchant class with lower Samurai, merchants of Osaka and Kyoto contributed finance
- emphasis that the whole regime had been under pressure from many directions prior to the arrival of Perry
- the Catalyst Theory – role of the United States and other countries in undermining the authority of the Tokugawa Government and so they were the final impulse making collapse unavoidable
- Choshu-Satsuma Alliance of 1866. This group were gaining experience of the West and building up modern armaments, seen as formidable. They also had control of the court.
- 1867 Death of Emperor Komei and his successor Mutsuhito age 15 [not so hindered by traditions and hostility of the past]; timing ripe to push Shogun aside and re-establish role of the Emperor
- imperialist ideology, 'Expel the Barbarians' spirit of the young lower ranking Samurai Shishi [men of spirit]
- dynamic personalities like Okubu Toshimichi, Saigo Takamori and Iwakura.

Candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a comparison of the two sources is helpful in offering a full perspective on the reasons for the Meiji Restoration.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonable developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

### How much light does Source C throw on the impact of foreigners on Japan?

#### Origin

Contemporary source of evidence of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century Japan in the form of an entry from a travel journal.

#### Purpose

To inform sister/others of their findings and experiences of their journey. To raise awareness of Japanese society.

#### Points from the sources which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- impact of foreigners made by references to a remote Treaty Port open for foreign trade and the German firms
- few foreign ships visited the port
- there were few foreign personnel present in this area, which includes missionaries. Impact on education with reference to an English school, American and English teachers who shaped the curriculum. Science equipment is of the latest and newest variety.

#### Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation

- ports established after Treaty of Kanagawa [Unequal Treaties]
- impact varied depending on the location as the lack of ships implies that Niigata not as important port as Osaka and Nagasaki
- inland areas of Japan remained relatively untouched by Westernisation, whereas the likes of Tokyo and the upper classes had more evidence of foreign impact
- Eastern Ethics: Western Science; view that foreign experts were to be used for training and once expertise mastered they were replaced by Japanese workers eg railways and British engineers and Lancashire cotton mill technology
- impact on military – weapons and ships purchased from Aberdeen, French, German and British experience drawn upon
- impact on Education – American-led the development of texts and teacher training, German ideals for developing student's moral character. Students abroad to study
- impact on politics – constitution broadly in line with Germany; legal system along French lines; Western style cabinet system
- impact on other areas of society – red mailboxes, European military uniform, European saddles and harnesses, art and music emulated, works of literature translated eg Dickens and Tolstoy. Men copying hairstyles and methods of dress eg suits. Banking and insurance frameworks implemented
- Iwakuru mission and what Japan achieved from it
- impact on religion – Christianity
- believed foreigners to be barbarous – therefore exclusion.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

#### **How useful is Yamagata's analysis in Source D, in explaining the nature of the military changes in Japan?**

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of the usefulness of Source D as an explanation of the Japanese military changes in terms of:

#### **Points from the source**

##### **Origin**

A contemporary source from the year prior to conscription, by an author who had a strategic role in the changes and had direct experiences of military reforms. [Army Chief of Staff, Field Marshall, Japanese Prime Minister who had direct access to the Emperor].

##### **Purpose**

Thoughts on Conscription two months prior to its inception in Jan 1873. Justifications for the need for compulsory military service and the possible structure it should take.

#### **Points from the sources which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- draft plans and ideas
- changes should be made based on a survey of past, present and current needs with a distillation of the best western techniques and tactics. Once done these should be added to the current Japanese style
- suggests all males irrespective of class over 20 should be trained for emergencies in both navy and army.

#### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- Imperial Precept to sailors and soldiers issued to stress the loyalty to Japan and not independence as individuals aimed at creating a truly national army loyal to central government
- replacement of separate Samurai armies, as they could be fractious and more loyal to clan than the Emperor
- conscription, January 1873; males serving 3 years from age 20 plus 4 years in the reserves [1883 increased to 9 years in the reserves]
- exceptions to conscription - sick or small in stature or senior official or skills were needed by the state
- initially changes in army were based on French techniques but later influence came from Germany
- opposition from conservatives that Samurai class should retain their military elite
- resistance to the military changes from farming families, who disliked losing the potential labour of their young men
- new army used to suppress the internal revolts
- naval changes based on Britain's development but maritime defence was initially viewed as less vital, especially as it was expensive; by 1894, 28 modern ships in the fleet
- foreign currency was needed for the purchase of three ironclad warships from UK as initially Japan was unable to produce acceptable quality in shipbuilding
- top naval positions occupied by Satsuma men
- naval training was long and technical
- by 1875 Japan had an Officer Training School, a gunpowder factory, an ordnance yard, an arsenal and a practice range for artillery

- educational system promotes military
- self-sufficiency in 1894 as modern rifles and artillery manufactured at home
- changing role of military forces – to supplement the work of the police in keeping order within Japan and then developed to have an involvement in disputes in mainland Asia.

### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

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

### Part 1

Each question is worth 25 marks

#### Question 1

**How far was opposition to the Versailles Treaty maintained across the political spectrum in Weimar Germany?**

The subject matter of the Versailles Treaty is doubtless familiar terrain to the candidates. They can be expected to write securely on key clauses of the peace settlement in terms of territorial, economic, military and war guilt.

- in particular, Article 231 was fiercely resented by all Germans. But was such unanimity superficial? The best essays can be expected to explore and evaluate the depth and degree of rejection across the political parties, discriminating between the ‘Hobson’s Choice’ of fulfilment, and the defiant postures adopted by the ultra-Nationalist right. Such essays might explore how the Nationalists fused rejection of the *diktat* with the ‘stab in the back myth’, thereby creating a wide channel dividing them from their liberal and socialist opponents
- essays can be expected to point up the dashing of expectations built up in Germany by Wilson’s 14 Points. A tidal wave of anger thus greeted the draft terms of May 1919. There was no political advantage to be gained by swimming against the stream... as politicians as different as Erzberger and Eisner were to find.
- the question clearly indicates that candidates should display a sound knowledge and understanding of the political parties and forces active in the new Germany, viz:
  - KPD’s slavish adherence to Lenin’s line of the Treaty as one dictated by ‘imperialist robbers’.
  - SPD moving from Scheidemann’s gesture politics to a stance of ‘there is no alternative.’
  - DDP rejectionist –withdraws from the coalition, felt betrayed by Wilson.
  - Centre Erzberger’s courageous realism, ‘*bold and pragmatic*’ (Margaret Macmillan)
  - DVP and DNVP both these conservative parties were rejectionist in order to reap the advantage of opposing an unpopular peace.
  - Parties/movements of the extreme Right; a stance of diehard rejection.

Candidates may outline and explain the origin among moderate opponents of Versailles, of a policy of fulfilment, opting for negotiation to obtain revision of the Treaty’s key clauses. Top quality answers will be well grounded in the historical perspectives provided by a vast range of scholarship across two generations.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should bring to bear some measure of relevant political analysis and an understanding of how Germans of all political classes viewed the Carthaginian peace. Such answers might be sketchy and inconsistent in their review and analysis of Germany’s political parties and the views of their leaders. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will contain the basic material for a PASS answer but displaying superior knowledge and analysis of the political spectrum, in a more effectively organised essay. Greater awareness will be shown of the perspectives on Versailles and responses of Germans to its terms. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will contain all the elements of a GOOD answer but will demonstrate confident assured knowledge of the subject matter, ably displaying both familiarity and facility with historiographical material. Such an essay will be clear, well structured and well argued.

## Question 2

### What were the causes of the economic and political crises which faced Germany in 1923?

Candidates can be expected to write assuredly about the origins, nature and gravity of the crises confronting Weimar's leaders in 1923.

#### Chronology

January	Mark/dollar exchange rate 17792 occupation of Ruhr by French and Belgian troops met with a campaign of passive resistance.
July	exchange rate 353412 there was steeply rising unemployment and declining tax revenues.
September	exchange rate 98,860,000 Stresemann became chancellor, ended passive resistance; forms grand Coalition.
October	'Germany on the brink of civil war' [Jonathan Wright] Food crisis; KPD insurrection in Hamburg; conflict between Bavarian separatists and the Reich.
November	exchange rate 200,000,000,000 Munich The Beer Hall Putsch; new currency, the Rentenmark; the end of inflation.

Crisis may be swift or prolonged and exacerbated by uncertainty. *'The experience of the Weimar republic is very much the latter.'* [Stephen Lee] who continued *'the burden of military defeat made Germany additionally vulnerable'*.

Most historians affix labels to the period 1919-23 and candidates may be expected to show familiarity with these – eg 'The Time of troubles', 'Germany in Turmoil'.

Candidates will be able to isolate and analyse the causes of the hyper inflation, exploring issues such as pre-1914 economic trends, the inflationary curve 1914-18, the contributory factor of the reparations burden, Weimar govt's fiscal policies. Better essays may distinguish between the cantering pace of inflation c1910/1918 and the galloping rate of 1919-1921, which then stampeded. The primacy of politico-military events in causing the final collapse of the mark should be established. *'The economic consequences of the Allies' occupation of the Ruhr were catastrophic'*. [Michael Burleigh].

In isolating and explaining the origins of the political crisis of 1923, candidates may be expected to refer to the Republic's origins and the elusive compromise between those forces pledged to republicanism and those of the *Ancien Regime* temporarily hog-tied in November 1918. There ensued a *'constant trade-off between continuity and reform'* [Detlev Peukert].

Would the new regime be strong enough to see off the threat posed to it by movements of social protest and resurgent nationalism? 1918-1923 can, in political terms, be viewed as five years of the Republic being on the defensive.

Candidates may be expected to isolate and analyse the series of threats to the legitimacy of Weimar state power such as:-

- Kapp
- the KPD's ultra left period
- the culture of violence
- extreme nationalism [the Feme murders].

A political malaise existed which converged with acute economic crisis to create the crisis confronting Weimar democracy in 1923.

Candidates can be expected to draw from a wide range of historical writings, from biographies of leading figures such as Hitler and Stresemann, to historians of Weimar such as Bookbinder, Kolb and Peukert, while the best textbook writers such as Evans and Jenkins, Lee and Hite and Hinton provide students with plentiful material on the background to the crisis year of 1923.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should bring to bear some measure of relevant factual information, in chronological sequence, although this might be incomplete and imbalanced. Some attempt will be made to provide an overview of the causes of the crisis and account for its political and economic dimensions and linkages. In doing so, some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will contain the basic material for a PASS answer, but the factual information will be more complete and accurate, it will be more effectively organised and the analysis will be deeper. Historical argument will be more sophisticated (eg in assessing the relative weight of the threatening forces and interpreting their convergence in 1923). Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) should demonstrate all the elements of a GOOD answer but in doing so will demonstrate a much higher degree of familiarity and facility, with both factual and historiographical material, which will be presented in a clear, well structured and well argued essay. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

### Question 3

#### **“The Weimar Republic is too frequently described as a failure.” Do you agree?**

This title lends itself to the cut and thrust of debate. Candidates may well be expected to write on how hindsight frequently affects evaluation of Weimar history – a tragedy of which we already know the last act – to paraphrase the description by one historian. This essentially negative analysis of Weimar was the perspective of many early commentators (eg AJP Taylor’s encapsulation of it as ‘republican interregnum’). Their balance sheet pointed up that Weimar, born of defeat, experienced an infancy of crisis, followed by five years of comparative stability, and four years of moribundity before the catastrophe of 30<sup>th</sup> January 1933.

But Weimar has found its defenders, such as Paul Bookbinder (1996) and Stresemann’s biographer (Jonathan Wright 2002). Bookbinder celebrates frequently obscured success stories such as the democratisation of civic life in Prussia, while Wright argues that it is the ethos and values of Weimar that underpin German democratic life post 1945.

#### **Weimar: a failure?**

1919-23 the unfinished revolution? eg the survival of the conservative elites and a chilly distrust of the military

1924-29 a false dawn? Economic historian Borchhardt’s view of Weimar as a state living beyond its means – an economic recovery over reliant on foreign loans

1930-33 the state was unable to withstand the impact of economic depression – constitutional weaknesses depleting democracy. Unscrupulous machinations by the conservative elite.

#### **Weimar: not a failure?**

- the emergence of a new breed of politicians as epitomised by the transformation of Rathenau and Stresemann
- historians such as Bookbinder pointing to the practical successes of democracy in Prussia
- foreign policy successes of Stresemann
- social and cultural achievements (social and economic advancement of women, working class progress eg free collective bargaining and welfare state).

#### **Weimar: a limited success story?**

*‘an overstrained welfare state’* the economic growth of the recovery period insufficient?

*‘recovery was highly fragile.. a [system] struggling to find an internal equilibrium between a series of conflicting developments.’* Stephen Lee

*‘little inspiration from political leaders and little encouragement for democracy from the pulpit or the teacher’s desk.’* Bookbinder.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will be based on a reasonably firm review of the three component time periods identified. Such essays will investigate the different evaluations which can be made of the history of Weimar, but with shallowness/generalisations/omissions imbalance evident. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will contain the basics of a pass answer but will display deeper, more consistent knowledge and understanding of the balance sheet: success/failure of the Weimar Republic. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will be notable for its comprehensive and coherent overview of the question under debate, demonstrating familiarity and facility with both factual and historiographical material. Such an essay will be well structured and well argued. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

#### Question 4

##### Assess the impact of the economic depression of 1929-32 on German political life.

An image doubtless to most candidates is two graphs. One is of the unemployment that was the direct consequence of economic depression. And – mimicking the behaviour of the first graph – the second shows the rising popular vote for the Nazis. While it is commonly accepted that *'The Nazi advance would hardly have been significant but for the depression.'* [Piers Brendon], candidates must go beyond this potentially mechanistic explanation of the rise of Nazism.

While mass unemployment was the most obvious feature of the Great Depression that hit Germany; its impact on businesses - both on the mighty and on the *mittelstand*, was hugely significant. In the chiasm of despair, millions of conservatively minded Germans deserted their existing political homes for a fatal flirtation with the Nazis. The political climate of Germany had been immeasurably radicalized. Political thuggery returned to the streets of the cities and reared up for the first time in the 'sleepy hollows' of Germany such as Northeim.

Better essays might eschew any interpretation viewing Nazism as a product of capitalism in crisis opening the road to the Chancellery (a view epitomized by the montage created by the Stalinist artist John Heartfield, 'Millions are Behind us'). Instead, they ought to reflect on the views of historians such as Conan Fischer (1995): *'The worsening economic situation triggered the slide towards some form of authoritarian government.'*

Such perspectives enable candidates to understand the historic role of Brüning. In the political crisis of March 1930, with the SPD pulling the rug from under Müller's coalition in a wrangle over the financing of unemployment benefits, Brüning was levered into power. A precedent had been set. Candidates might proceed to evaluate Brüning's attempt to override sectional interests – in the name of national unity.

A perceptive candidate might refer to Brüning's political ineptitude in calling for what were at that stage wholly unnecessary Reichstag elections in summer 1930. Unwittingly he had set the Nazi bandwagon rolling – only in November 1932 did its wheels start to wobble.

It would be reasonable in this question, to expect candidates to dissect the German body politic into its component parts and assess the impact on them, of the key features that they identify of the economic depression, viz:

- KPD - expanded its votes but even in the crisis winter of 1932-33, the SPD comfortably out-voted it. KPD, as "Stalin's lick-spittles" – eagerly swallowing the fantasies of 'the third period' in its hostility to the SPD the "social fascists".
- SPD - struggled, not always successfully, to retain its core working class vote. No popular front was formed with KPD.
- Centre - the 'confessional vote' remaining largely unchanged.
- DDP/DNVP – the haemorrhaging of the conservative vote – transfer of their vote to NSDAP?
- NSDAP - energised by the crisis – the changes in its fortunes were reflected by the election results, 1930-32.

In this new political landscape wrought by the Great Depression, no single party could wield authority. In this political flux, the opportunities opened up. The potential existed for the re-establishment of the old power structure but on a new authoritarian base. However, in 1932/3 the traditional elites were weak and fragmented and had no base in the masses. Thus, in what Kershaw has labelled the 'power cartel' of the earliest period of the Third Reich, effective power rested with Hitler. The most perceptive essays might evaluate the factor of intrigue in this way, drawing attention to the roles of von Papen, von Schleicher and Oscar Hindenburg in influencing how the political executive operated in its last days.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) ought to effect a reasonable correlation between the key features of the Great Depression and Germany's voters and their parties. Such essays might omit some of the more subtle and sophisticated consequences above outlined. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) should manifest a sound interpretation of the question's component parts, doing so with clarity and competence. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) can be expected to show both assured command of a very sound knowledge base, and incisive skills of historical analyses. Such answers will be noteworthy for their fluency and their high degree of familiarity and facility with both factual and historiographical material. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 5

### How significant was the use of terror by the Nazis in the consolidation of their power by 1936?

By 1936, Hitler and the Nazis had seemingly brought 'good times' to Germany:

- economic revitalization
- order
- prospects of prosperity
- restored national pride.  
(the list is Kershaw's)  
The regime was therefore firmly entrenched.

The wording of the question requires candidates to evaluate the relative weight of terror as against the aforementioned [and other] factors.

A secure answer ought to examine and explore the meaning of the many dimensions of 'terror', beyond the criminality of the Night of the Long Knives, viewing the concept within the larger framework of *'the demise of the rule of law'*. (Burleigh)

The time scale in the title is significant. A good essay will be securely rooted in the events of 1933-1936, eg:

- 1933 - Hitler becomes Chancellor; Dachau is opened within 8 weeks of this; the Enabling Act, boycott of Jewish businesses, disbanding of trade unions; Gestapo established; first restrictions on gay rights groups
- 1934 - Rohm murdered, SA purged; von Schleicher murdered; Hitler became Fuhrer; start of nationwide arrests of homosexuals.
- 1935 - Purging of bible scholars (Jehovah's witnesses); Nuremberg laws
- 1936 - first roma and sinti sent to Dachau, Masonic lodges closed.

The best essays will display a knowledge and understanding of historical perspectives across two generations of scholarship, viz:

- what might be termed the 'traditional' view of the terror; its prime function in a totalitarian state, the notion of an omnipresent Gestapo, the jaws of the Nazi behemoth
- the revision of such a notion by historians such as Robert Gellatly's studies of the importance of political denunciation in Nazi Germany, with an over-stretched state, reactive rather than proactive in its work, in a populace approving of terror. Such historians, in describing the Nazi technique of rule, note that most Germans in 1936 were able to retreat into private life benignly accepting Nazi rule
- the most recent writing, as exemplified by Eric Johnson (1999) while accepting that *'the great majority of German citizens did not suffer personally from Nazi terror during the Third Reich'* reminds us that Nazi Germany was a police state. Terror was not indiscriminate but pinpointed selected targets. Germans were well aware of the limits of their scope for criticism.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should display a sound understanding of the time scale of events and show awareness of discrete features of Nazi terror 1933-36. Such answers should assess the significance of terror in the process of the consolidation of Nazi power, but analysis may be uneven. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretation.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will display the above features but from a more secure knowledge base and with a more confident analysis. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will integrate assured, highly informed narrative with knowledge of historical perspectives. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 6

### How crucial were foreign policy successes to Hitler's popularity before 1939?

This question requires candidates to review the nature of German foreign policy 1933-1939, but in relation to those other factors under-pinning the growth of Hitler's charisma; factors such as economic policy, social engineering, the effectiveness of Nazi propaganda.

Candidates ought to provide a review of German foreign policy 1933-39, as it moved from revision to expansion. Given that many students will have previously studied this at Higher, a high level of familiarity can reasonably be expected. Perceptive answers should note that foreign policy was very much Hitler's domain, far more so than what many historians regard as his chaotic disinterest in domestic policies.

The integral relationship between foreign policy and economic policy might be addressed; *'the nimbus of the Fuhrer was enhanced by every success, especially in combating the economic crisis and in the field of foreign policy'*. (Lothar Gall)

Candidates might argue that between 1933 and 1936, solving the problem of mass unemployment took precedence over foreign policy goals. By 1937, unemployment was less than 1 million, as the regime intensified its rearmament policy.

Essayists might point up the resultant overheating and imbalance as larger scale enterprises in the armaments sector led to the neglect of consumer goods industries. Hitler's delivery of a series of bloodless diplomatic triumphs might, it could be argued, have headed off popular discontent of his policy of 'guns before butter'.

Candidates might explore peculiar features of life in the Third Reich, noting the argument advanced by historians such as Geary and Kershaw, that the cult of the Fuhrer was the glue, the necessary adhesive in an otherwise ramshackle structure. Adulation of the Fuhrer increased, fuelled by the Nazi propaganda machine's trumpeting of his diplomatic genius. This was in direct contrast to ordinary Germans' contempt for the corruption and self-interest of the party functionaries. In this adulation, foreign policy successes were crucial *'because they were won without war'*. (Geary)

In exploring the Fuhrer cult or Fuhrerprinzip, candidates can thus be expected to assess the relative weight of Hitler's status as a re-builder of Germany's strength and bulwark against the nation's enemies, set against such factors as:

- Hitler as guardian of national values against enemies such as Communists and Jews
- Hitler as architect of the 'economic miracle'
- Hitler as embodiment of national unity.

Hitler *'had evoked in extreme measure and focused on himself many... feelings of selfless devotion, sacrifice and passionate commitment to a national ideal'*. (Ian Kershaw)

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) should bring to bear an understanding of the extent and nature of foreign policy successes 1933-1939, and attempt to place these in perspective, set against other key components of Hitler's undoubted charismatic status with the German people. Such answers might, however, be sketchy and contain gaps or omissions. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will contain the basic material for a pass answer but the factual information should be more complete and accurate, and better organised. Historical arguments should be recognizably more sophisticated (eg in assessing the relative weight of Hitler's foreign policy triumphs in establishing his charismatic status). Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will display all the elements of a good answer, but in so doing should demonstrate a higher degree of familiarity and facility with both factual and historiographical material in a clear, well structured, well argued essay. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

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

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

#### **How useful is Source A as an explanation of the nature of the German Revolution of 1918-19?**

The candidate provides a structured evaluation of the value of Source A in explaining the key features of the German revolution, placing it in perspective and in the context of an overview of the revolution, in terms of:

#### **Points from source**

##### **Origin**

Memoir.

##### **Purpose**

To explain the aims and ideals of Ebert and Scheidemann, from a sympathetic viewpoint

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- Spartakists seen as physical force communists
- Ebert and Scheidemann were non-communist leaders of the working classes
- the majority of the working class supported Ebert (ie they were moderate)
- these leaders also believed in moderate revolution.

#### **Points from recall providing a wider contextualisation**

Candidate makes reference to wider perspectives and explanations such as:

- 9<sup>th</sup> November 1918 – Berlin, Scheidemann (SPD leader proclaims republic from Reichstag, in order to forestall the later attempts by Marxist Spartakists to bolshevise [radicalize] the revolutionary situation that then existed [following the abdication of Kaiser])
- Oct-November 1918 – defeat, abdication of Kaiser (and High command) strikes, mutinies, workers and soldiers councils; power vacuum. This results in the moderate socialists attempt to take power (handed to them by Prince Max)
- emergence, post 1914 of split in socialist movement (SPD, USPD and Spartakists [led by Liebknecht and Luxemburg])
- wider context of Russian revolution of October 1917 – Lenin and Bolsheviks seize power in the name of the workers and poor peasants, ruling Russia through worker councils (soviets)
- situation on Western Front – German army defeated, allies on the borders of Germany- the need to secure peace. Ebert's fear of an allied invasion if 'hard' left seizes power
- home front - a war weary and exhausted population. Blockade, Spanish flu etc
- their own ideals, something on the political perspectives of the Majority SPD leadership
- the Ebert-Groener phone call its significance and implementation, the role of Noske: 'someone must be the bloodhound'
- the aims of the revolutionary left- but their unreality in the period 1918-19. A premature revolution?

## **Historical perspectives**

A host of sources, both primary and secondary exist; eg the Diaries of Harry Kessler, the proclamations of the revolutionary left, materials pertaining to the Ebert-Groener pact. The writings of the English scholar AJ Ryder, though now in print for 4 decades, remains succinct and lucid, while candidates may well cite the views of popular historical authorities such as Bookbinder, Burleigh, Kolb and Peukert.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; Sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

### How well does a comparison of Sources B and C illustrate differing perspectives on the appeal of Nazism?

Candidate should compare the views in Sources B and C, as perspectives on the appeal of Nazism to Germans, in terms of:

#### Source B

##### Authorship

Storm trooper, lieutenant, veteran of the Great War.  
Veteran Nazi. ('We old National Socialists') – forged in same crucible as Hitler

##### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- why he became a member of the SA ('not from any rational considerations' nor, 'after much contemplation')
- admiration for Hitler as fellow war veteran
- admiration for Hitler's mission 'pleading... for us Germans' and for Hitler's unselfishness.

#### Source C

##### Authorship

British historian, writing in 1994, over 60 years after Hitler came to power.

##### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- no direct mention of Hitler
- writes on work of Nazi propaganda at local level – focus on local issues
- 'Woolworths' one aspect of 'crisis of modernity'? Fear of Americanism?
- roots of Nazi success able to address 'immediate material concerns'.
- sloganising or mass irrationality.
- Candidates may note that the two sources refer to different time periods/circumstances that would influence different types of person to support Nazis. Source B refers to reasons for becoming a Nazi, Source C refers to reasons for voting for them.

##### Point from recall providing a wider contextualisation

Elsewhere in his monograph, *'Hitler and Nazism'*, Geary provides his reader with an encapsulation of the complexities of the appeal of Nazism. *'That only some, and not even a majority of enfranchised Germans voted Nazi, makes it imperative to discover which groups within the nation were most susceptible to Nazi propaganda and to Hitler's acknowledged talents.'*

Likewise, Conan Fischer points up the inadequacies of many previous explanatory models of Nazism as *'a predominantly protestant, middle class rassemblement.'* In this long standing consensus, working class Nazi activists and voters were regarded as an appendage to the Nazi core. Such interpretations are now regarded as simplistic, consigned to the dustbin of history along with Marxist analyses of the incorruptibility of the German proletariat and the venality of the petty-bourgeois recruits to Nazism.

There is considerable historiography in this area; candidates may mention:

- regional studies of Nazism
- case studies of towns – WS Allen’s pioneering classic on Northeim, though now in turn shown by Fischer to have limitations
- impact of propaganda from ZAB Zeman to the modern German scholar Jurgen Falter
- see also generational profiles, confessional profiles, analysis by social class and perceived status, gender, region, ethnicity
- reasons for joining/voting Nazi eg anti-Marxist, national community ideal, Hitler cult, anti-Semitism, disillusionment with existing parties
- degrees of class consciousness especially in working class and in lower middle class
- success of Nazism in appealing to those of low/limited political consciousness
- previous political commitments.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonable developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and well developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

**What light is thrown by Source D on attempts made by the Nazis to create a “national community” [Volksgemeinschaft]?**

The candidate evaluates the view in the source about this part of the development of a people’s community, and considers the light it sheds on the wider perspectives of *volksgemeinschaft*, in terms of:

#### **Authorship**

Ley was leader of the Nazi Labour Front and speech is from 1938.

#### **Purpose**

Launching the people’s car. (Volkswagen).

The creation of the ‘National community’ may be seen as a notable example of Nazi radicalism. Having destroyed the trade unions and the process of free collective bargaining, the Nazis sought to replace such institutional structures with *volksgemeinschaft*. This is the context in which Ley’s speech may be placed.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed using additional recall**

- saving programme minimum 5 marks weekly
- refers to KDF “Strength through Joy” movement
- all Germans were to be able to get a car; no distinctions of class
- optimistic reference to the project [‘is what we shall achieve’]
- linked into Fuhrer worship [‘our way of saying thank you...’].

#### **Points from recall providing a wider contextualisation**

Analysis and development of the source by candidates can enable them to make an evaluation of the success, or otherwise, of the Nazi’s ambitious social engineering project. Candidates can be expected to draw on a wealth of historical scholarship to inform their perspectives.

A world view of ‘struggle infused Nazi thinking. They replaced the rhetoric of class struggle with a series of national campaigns (winter aid campaign *winterhilfswerk*) and national prestige projects such as the People’s Car. In the battle for production, workers were soldiers. If the Adolf Hitler highways were to be created, then the workers would have their reward- the People’s Car.

Some candidates might point up the continuation between the fundamentally backward looking vision of a people’s community in a society committed to modernization and technological advance. (A part of the ‘crisis of modernity’ depicted by historians such as Peukert.)

Strength through Joy might be seen as the Nazi’s rewards to the lower classes. Answers may refer to earlier schemes of cruises, trips, holidays and cheap radios.

There is a wide range of opinion among historians on the success or failure of Strength Through Joy and *volkscommunity*. Thus, the Marxist historian EJ Hobsbawm, writes, '*Nazism certainly had, and partly achieved, a social programme for the masses.*' By contrast, Mary Fulbrook argues that '*the national community was created neither in reality nor in popular social conceptions*'.

Text book historians Evans and Jenkins argue '*the people withdrew from political involvement... persuaded that politics should be left to Hitler, their rewards were a radio, a promise of a car, holidays and leisure activities*'.

### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **South Africa (1910-1984)**

### **Part 1**

**Each question is worth 25 marks**

#### **Question 1**

**Discuss the significance of the constitutional settlement of 1910 for the different ethnic and racial groups within South Africa.**

The candidate should be able to comment on the significance of the constitutional settlement of 1910 for at least the following groups: Britons, Boers, Africans and the Coloureds. The very best candidates might consider the Indian community separately.

There are no particularly recent works on the constitutional settlement, with Leonard Thompson's 1960 study of the motives of those involved remaining the key work. Candidates should however be aware of Thompson's views, since these are summarised in 'A History of South Africa' which is likely to be available to all students. Constitutional history is not particularly fashionable today but the implications of this settlement have left indelible marks on South Africa to this day. Marxist historians in particular interpreted the constitutional settlement as a means of safeguarding British economic interests; imperial interests have also been stressed.

Candidates would be expected to be knowledgeable about the terms of the 1910 settlement, and able to indicate the impact that these terms had on subsequent developments within South Africa.

The 1910 settlement made very significant concessions to the Boers, just eight years after the end of the Boer War. For the British the settlement brought an end to the possibility of further strife within South Africa. Political unity, and a placated Afrikaner community, offered very considerable economic advantages to the British and it is argued by Worden and others that the settlement was pushed through primarily to protect British economic interests. Union was also central to Milner's imperialist philosophy, and after Milner's departure from South Africa, his so-called 'kindergarten' of bright young men, ensured that his vision was kept alive. (Cf the arguments of Marks and Trapido regarding the role of Milner). British mining and agricultural interests were well served by the settlement of 1910.

The Afrikaners won significant concessions, as well as security, should there be another native uprising such as Bamabtha's. The electoral system, and the provisions for review of electoral divisions, favoured Afrikaners, ultimately ensuring their victory at the polls in 1948. Although the non-racial franchise in the Cape was protected, and there were in-built safeguards to avoid alterations of the 'protected clauses', it would be Afrikaner pressures in the future which ended the Cape non racial franchise, and removed the last vestiges of black representation. Dutch was recognised alongside English as the official language of the country, thereby granting both cultural status and job opportunities to Afrikaners. When Afrikaans replaced Dutch just over ten years later, the economic advantages were already becoming apparent. Candidates would be expected to point out that Afrikaners dominated all of the administrations after 1910, and that every Union Prime Minister came from an Afrikaner background, although there may have been some significant differences in their background.

The settlement was a disaster for Africans, as Plaatje pointed out in 1916 in *Native Life in South Africa*. Excluded from politics, the African had to sit and watch as his rights were removed by an all-white parliament. The Natives Land Act of 1913 forbade Africans to purchase or lease land outside designated areas known as reserves. Although recent historians (ie van Onselen) have questioned how effective the Land Act was in practice, it was an early example of the segregationist legislation which was implemented with greater intensity between the wars. The Cape franchise was abolished legally in 1936 and the Native Representation Council, established at the same time, contained the seeds of that 'separate representation' which was to be central to the policy of separate development after 1959.

Disenfranchisement came later to the coloured community. When the issue was raised in the 1950s, it aroused very considerable opposition within the English-speaking community. Nevertheless, it was achieved through quasi-legal manipulation of the constitution and by 1956 the total white monopoly of parliamentary power had been achieved. After 1948, the Nationalist government withdrew the token enfranchisement offered by Smuts to the Indian community in 1946.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will identify some of the key aspects of the constitutional settlement of 1910 and attempt to relate these to the Afrikaner, British and African communities. Answers will give consideration to a range of developments after the passing of the Act of Union, showing awareness of events until at least 1948. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will show greater awareness of the significance of Union for all four of the major ethnic and racial groups mentioned above. There will be greater evidence of understanding of the longer-term implications of specific aspects of the settlement, and of the ways in which the constitution failed to protect the interests of the black majority. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will provide an analytical examination of the significance of the constitutional settlement for each of the major ethnic/racial groups. In particular, candidates can be expected to show an awareness of the ways in which the settlement benefited the white communities at the expense of Africans and the Coloured community. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 2

**Evaluate the importance of the ANC compared with other African resistance movements between 1910 and c. 1948.**

The question requires candidates to analyse the contribution of the ANC to African resistance between 1910 and 1948, and to evaluate its significance in relation to other forms of resistance in the same period.

ANC historians and activists (notably Meli in *South Africa Belongs to Us*, 1988, and fairly widely available) have inevitably tended to concentrate on the ANC when considering aspects of African resistance. Much has therefore been written, most recently by Dubow but by many English, American and African historians before him, about the history of the ANC. Members of the ANC leadership have also commented on the achievements and weaknesses of the movements earlier years.

There has been much criticism of the ANC, at least before the 1940s. The early leadership was deferential and elitist. Above all they were disdainful of popular agitation and so failed to link up with other aspects of resistance. The 1920s exposed the divisions within the ANC and for much of the 1930s the leadership was fragmented and divided with Africanists and Communists attempting to pull the movement in different directions (Dubow). Despite involvement locally with some popular radicalism in the Transvaal and the Western Cape, the ANC remained a small, ineffective movement throughout the 1930s. It was only in the 1940s, under the leadership of the subsequently maligned Dr Zuma that the first attempts at renewal and radicalisation occurred. The movement had 4000 members by 1945, a Youth Wing had been established and *African Claims* (1943) was written in terms of demands, not polite appeals. In 1940 and 1944 some of the ANC backed the popular Alexandria bus boycotts, although the leadership still had problems in its response to popular struggles. By 1948, however, there had been significant changes within the ANC, most notably the establishing of the Youth League and the commitment of those involved in the Youth League to a much more radical and confrontational approach. In 1949 – a year after the election of the NP to power – the Programme of Action signalled the changed approach of subsequent years.

Over the last twenty years historians have started to take a much greater interest in other manifestations resistance, concentrating less on political resistance and more on those social and economic resistance in urban and in rural areas. A full consideration of these forms of resistance would include:

- **Trade Union activity**, which was particularly significant in the period between c. 1915 and the early 1920s, leading to the formation of Kadalie's ICU and its successful appeal to both urban and agricultural workers. In the 1920s the ICU seems to have had a membership of over 100 000. Unofficial trade union activity was to emerge as very successful again in the 1940s, when – for example – the Congress of non-European TUs had 150,000 members in 1945, and in 1946 70,000 mineworkers went on strike for improved pay and conditions
- the **CPSA**, including its co-operation with the ANC for a brief period in the later 1920s, which as Dubow points out, marked the beginning of a much longer-term link-up between the ANC and the Communists
- the **All African Convention**, established to oppose Hertzog's Native Bills
- **popular and community resistance in urban areas**, including the Alexandria bus boycotts and the squatter movements (for instance, near the later the site of Soweto)

- **rural resistance** which has been the focus of more recent research, including the work of Beinart and Bundy, with localised studies revealing the widespread involvement of ordinary Africans in attempts to resist the extension of government intervention (ie resistance to taxation, sheep dipping)
- **the involvement of women**, and the specific nature of their involvement has also been the focus of recent interest
- **cultural resistance** is now also recognised as being of significance ie the spread of *maribi* in the townships; the growth of independent African churches.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would place considerable emphasis on the role of the ANC. Candidates answers are likely to display a reasonable knowledge of the history of the ANC during these years, and will make some attempt to assess the reasons why historians have concentrated so much on the ANC. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations – perhaps through an awareness that much of our understanding of the history of African resistance comes from the ANC and their supporters.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would show greater awareness of other forms of resistance in the 1920 and 1930s, and would also be aware of the significant changes that occur within the ANC in the 1940s, including the recognition of the importance of popular protest. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would show a detailed and comprehensive awareness of the different manifestations of African resistance during this period. At this level, candidates should also be able to comment successfully on the reasons why historians have until relatively recently, tended to concentrate on the history of the ANC. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

### Question 3

**“The 1948 election was not so much won by the Nationalists as lost by the United Party.”  
How accurate is this assessment?**

This question asks the candidate to assess a range of different factors which were involved in the NP's election victory in 1948 which heralded over forty years of National party rule.

Answers should consider both the appeal of the Nationalists and the reasons for the decline in popularity of Smuts and the United Party. The best answers should also be aware of the vagaries of the South African electoral system, and the alliance with the Afrikaner Party, which helped the Nationalists to power.

The political mobilization of Afrikaners has been well researched, most notably by Dan O'Meara in *Volkskapitalisme* (1983). After 1934 a conscious effort had been made to win power by mobilizing Afrikaners across divisions of class and region. Afrikaner culture had been emphasised by the FAK, the Broederbond and through Christian National Education. At the same time, Afrikaner working class support had been gradually shifted away from the Labour Party, partly through the establishing of Afrikaner TUs. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, Afrikaner capitalism had been encouraged and developed to meet the needs of the Afrikaner community, creating a form of ethnic capitalism which transcended class barriers. The appeal of this Afrikaner nationalism was enhanced by developments during and after the war which seemed to threaten the perceived social and economic status quo of the inter-war years. Among these developments, the apparent break-down of segregation and of the 'native policy' developed first by Smuts and then by Hertzog during the inter-war years, played a crucial part. Strikes and black protests, the war-time relaxation of pass laws and the growing numbers of Africans coming into the towns all revived fears of the 'black peril'. The Sauer report (1946) played on these fears and presented the National Party's 'apartheid' solution to these problems, promising consolidation of the reserves, rigorous controls over African urbanisation, increased segregation and the abolition of the white representatives of Africans in Parliament. Giliomee has argued that the message of 'putting the Kaffir in his place' and 'getting our country back' was to prove crucial in 1948.

Smuts position was vulnerable, ever since he had split the Fusion government in order to prosecute the war (Stultz). Although he had won the 1943 election, despite the Nationalists' earlier break away from the United Party, the NP had emerged as the official opposition, with 43 seats to the United and Labour Party coalition of 103 seats. Between 1943 and 1948 the Smuts government lost the confidence of many. Smuts in particular accepted that permanency of African urbanisation, as did the Fagan Commission Report. O'Meara argues that by 1948 the UP was in difficulties on all the major political issues of the day, including black urbanisation, the stabilisation of labour, pass laws, black trade unions, black housing, and the political rights of urban Blacks. Smuts, was increasingly out of touch, having spent most of the war years concerned with external affairs and defence. He was already 78 in 1948, and would clearly not remain leader for ever. His most likely successor, J H Hofmeyr, was regarded as dangerously liberal over the "native question". (One NP headline read: A vote for Jan Smuts is a vote for Stalin!). Finally, Smuts had alienated many farmers in the Western Cape and in Transvaal, partly because they had seen many of their potential seasonal workers leave the land and drift to the towns, thereby putting pressure on agricultural workers' wages, and partly because they opposed the government's food price control policy.

In these circumstances, the UP was no match for the NP, which mounted an effectively organised election campaign. The dramatic fall in support for the Labour Party added additional complications. But nevertheless the results came as a surprise to many. The Transvaal proved to be the key to the NP success. In 1943 the UP had won 53 of the 64 seats; in 1948 the succeeded in winning just 30 out of what were now 66 seats. The smaller size of rural constituencies also played into the hands of the Nationalists. The NP won more seats, although the UP gained more votes. If just 91 people had voted differently, the UP would have retained power.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would consider several of the main factors in involved in the NP victory in 1948. Some account will be taken of differing historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) would show greater understanding of a range of different factors involved, and there would be greater awareness of both the long-term and short-term significance of developments. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) would show a detailed, comprehensive knowledge of factors affecting both the NP and the UP. There is also likely to be awareness of the electoral process and how it favoured the NP. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical perspectives.

#### Question 4

##### **What were the consequences of the policy of Separate Development for black South Africans?**

The question requires candidates to use their knowledge of the National Party's policy of Separate Development, with particular emphasis on the period from 1959 to 1984, to consider the political, social and economic consequences of this policy for Africans.

The following provide the historical context of Separate Development:

- the Bantu Authorities Act, 1953
- the Tomlinson Report, 1955, and the subsequent decision to ignore its recommendations
- the Promotion of Bantu Self Government Act, 1959
- the Transkei Constitution Act, 1963
- the imposition of homeland citizenship on all Africans, 1970
- the granting of self-government to the remaining homelands, 1971
- the granting of independence to Transkei (1976), Bophutatswana (1977), Venda (1979) and Ciskei (1981).

The most obvious results of separate development were the loss of the last hopes of black political representation outside the reserves and the forced removal of 'surplus population' – those who were no longer wanted or needed in designated white areas. Some historians have gone so far as to describe these removals as tantamount to genocide. Between 1960 and 1983 over 3 million people were removed to the homelands as a result of either the Group Areas Act (which affected urban areas) or as a result of separate development legislation. These forced removals were the crudest sign of state power over black lives. The population of the Bantustans rose by 70% in the 1960s, while the proportion of Africans living in towns actually fell.

These 'surplus people', to quote the Catholic priest, Cosmas Desmond, were sent to live in barely planned rural slums without any prospect of acquiring farming land. What farming land there was, was over-farmed, resulting in severe ecological degradation and the demise of subsistence agriculture. Those who lived in the reserves were increasingly dependent on imported food; poor food supplies meant poor health and high infant mortality rates. For many, the only way of earning a living was to reside in one of the 'close' settlements constructed near to the borders of the reserve and then to travel daily to work outside the reserve, going huge distances daily by bus in order to work in the industries deliberately located on the edges of the reserves. As Beinart points out, this 'displaced urbanization' was to become a permanent feature of South African society with huge black urban communities placed in the middle of rural areas, and lacking all of the facilities which are normally associated with urban areas.

Worden identifies two further effects of separate development. The eight – subsequently ten – homelands deliberately entrenched ethnic divisions among Africans. The tribal identities on which the homelands were allegedly based were largely the creations of whites. Beinart argues that this emphasis on ethnic identity helped to fuel divisions within and between African communities – as indeed the NP had hoped it would. Ironically, however, in the longer term he believes that the strength of African opposition to the homelands actually helped to bolster a national African identity.

A second significant consequence of separate development emphasised by both Beinart and Worden was the creation of new African social classes in the homelands. In the independent homelands, in particular, there was a minority of administrators whose status, income and powers were enhanced by independence. Although not all of the regimes were as corrupt as that of Matanzima Kaiser, corruption and economic and political patronage were widespread. A black middle class emerged who also benefited from the homeland strategy. Writing in 1987, Stadler showed that loans and grants encouraged the growth of a black entrepreneurial class.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would display some knowledge of the policy of separate development and of how it developed during the years after 1959. At this level candidates are likely to concentrate largely on the socio-economic effects of separate development and on the impact on the standard of living of those forced to live in the reserves. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) is likely to reflect greater awareness of the policy of separate development and may be able to refer to developments in specific homelands. There will be greater understanding of the range of different consequences for Africans arising out of the policy of separate development. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will reflect a sound, detailed grasp of the policy of separate development and its implementation. At this level candidates should be able to provide relevant statistical evidence to substantiate argument, and exemplification should be offered to support generalisations. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical perspectives.

## Question 5

### Why was there a resurgence in black resistance during the 1970s?

This question invites the candidate to consider the different manifestations of black resistance which emerged in the 1970s and to explain why this resurgence happened, in contrast to the relative quiescence which had existed for much of the 1960s.

Black resistance in the 1970s included:

- an increasingly dynamic Trade Union movement. There were numerous strikes, mainly locally organised, involving large numbers of workers. Strikes were particularly prevalent in Natal, East London and parts of the Rand. By 1979 there were 27 illegal democratically organised African trade unions. In that year the Wiehahn commission recommended that African TUs should be recognised and appropriate legislation was subsequently passed. Radical historians, in particular, emphasise the role of the political struggle and of the TUs in forcing the government to change
- Inkatha (revived 1975), a movement based largely on KwaZulu ethnicity. By 1980, Inkatha claimed to have 300 000 members. There remains controversy about the role of Inkatha
- The Black Consciousness movement, including the South African Students Organisation and the Black People's Convention. The South African Black Consciousness movement was influenced by developments in the USA and by the student protest movement of the late 1960s
- the Soweto Uprising (1976) led to the growth of a protest culture. A new journal, *Staffrider*, published much of the protesters' work. By the end of the decade, increasing numbers of young whites were identifying with the movement
- beyond South Africa, the ANC and the PAC attempted to build external organisations directed against the South African government. Lodge has argued that the PAC had three characteristics which told against it; its ideological viewpoint was negative, its leadership relied on spontaneity rather than efficient organization, and because the leadership came from a less privileged background, they were more susceptible to the temptations and pretensions of politics in exile. More significantly, perhaps, China backed the PAC and when China lost interest, the PAC also lost its main source of aid. By way of contrast, the ANC received support from the USSR. It was also strengthened by the efforts of Oliver Tambo, based in London, whose leadership proved increasingly effective after he took over on Luthuli's death in 1967. The 1969 Morogoro Conference committed the ANC to revolutionary, armed struggle in order to achieve a South Africa which belonged to 'all who live in it' and in which a political/constitutional revolution must be accompanied by economic change. The role of the ANC is one of the most controversial aspects of this topic. ANC historians have tended to exaggerate the significance of the ANC. More recently, Dubow has argued that the ANC was completely out of touch at the start of the Soweto uprising, and taken by surprise by events. However, later student activists escaped from SA to join the ANC training camps in exile in the front-line states.

There are a number of reasons why black resistance re-emerged, more forcefully, in the 1970s. These include:

- the economic recession which contrasted with the relative prosperity, very low unemployment and rising standard of living associated with the 1960s. The years of prosperity had strengthened the position of those opposing the regime from the 'inside'
- the changing needs of manufacturing, which was increasingly demanding a more skilled, and therefore more educated workforce
- a more educated workforce was one of the unanticipated results of the Bantu Education Act
- the liberation of Mozambique and Angola followed by the collapse of the Portuguese Empire. Not only did this inspire radical movements but it provided more sympathetic 'front-line' regimes. The ANC in particular was able to benefit from these events
- after Soweto, the State police never regained the total control that they had enjoyed in the 1960s
- growing international opposition, fuelled by the international anti-apartheid campaigns.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will explain the resurgence of black opposition in general terms and suggest different reasons why this happened in the 1970s. Answers are likely to focus most on the ANC in exile and the impact of events elsewhere in Africa. There will be little attempt to make comparisons with the events of the previous decade. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will explain the resurgence of black opposition more fully and suggest a range of different reasons, both internal and external, to explain why this happened. There may be some comparative references to the 1960s. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD (18+ marks) will give a detailed explanation of the resurgence of black opposition, with reference to a wide range of different ways in which that opposition was made manifest. Candidates are likely to refer to the period of quiescence between 1963 and c. 1973 and to evaluate a range of possible explanations. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical perspectives.

## Question 6

### **How significant a threat did the other African states pose to the government of South Africa between c. 1970 and 1984?**

This question asks candidates to consider the part played by the so called 'frontline' African states in bringing mounting pressure to bear on the South African government as its apartheid regime came increasingly under attack.

By 1970 the process of granting independence to former British colonies in Africa was almost complete. Macmillan had noted that 'the winds of change' were blowing through Africa in a famous speech made in South Africa in 1960. This process of change had already started with the transfer of power to African nationalists in all of British territories in West Africa. In 1960, the French had relinquished control over their colonies in west and central Africa and the Belgians withdrew from the Congo. Between 1960 and 1964 Britain transferred power to Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya and Zambia. Only the declaration of UDI by the Smith regime in 1965 stopped a similar process in Southern Rhodesia. Between 1965 and 1968 Britain transferred power to Africans in Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland. By 1970, therefore, African led governments controlled much of Southern Africa – with the notable exceptions of Southern Rhodesia and the two Portuguese held territories of Angola and Mozambique. When the Portuguese granted independence to Angola and Mozambique in 1975, following the coup in Lisbon, South Africa was virtually surrounded by African states, all potentially hostile to apartheid. Only Rhodesia remained as an enclave of white minority rule, although by 1978 it was barely surviving a fierce civil war and international sanctions. South African control of Namibia had incurred the increasing hostility of the UN, culminating in the 1977 Security Council vote in favour of an arms embargo against South Africa.

On the face of it, therefore, the situation within South Africa appeared increasingly threatening to Pretoria from the mid 1970s onwards. Barbour and Barratt argue that 'Pretoria's regional policy was in tatters. From the tatters a new policy emerged but it was a reaction to adversity not the government's chosen path'. By 1977 the SA government was admitting that it had few diplomatic links in Africa and Vorster was forced to concede that 'some bridges had collapsed'. When Botha became Prime minister, the government's commitment to 'total national strategy' was at least partly a response to the deteriorating situation within southern Africa. Hopes, though, that the defiant South African government could create a peaceful anti-Communist 'constellation' of southern African states were dashed first by the refusal of Basotho, Lesotho and Swaziland to join and then by the transformation of southern Rhodesia into Zimbabwe, led by Mugabe (whom the South African government regarded as a hard-line Marxist and a terrorist), rather than Muzorewa, in early 1980. Barbour and Barratt argue that with the independence of Zimbabwe, 'security was now clearly the overriding factor in regional policies' and 'the influence of the military on policy was thus strengthened'. South African diplomacy in the 1980s became increasingly coercive. In Namibia military operations against SWAPO were stepped up and at the same time the government started to provide support for the anti-FRELIMO Mozambique National Resistance. By 1981 the MNR constituted a real threat to President Machel. By the early 1980s therefore, South African foreign relations were increasingly influenced by the threat posed by the Marxist, or apparently Marxist governments, in many of the frontline states, and Pretoria was following a harder line regional policy. As Leonard Thompson points out, between 1981 and 1983 South African commandos carried out undercover operations against every one of its neighbours.

However, the threat posed by the frontline states should not be exaggerated. In the first place, in the context of the Cold War, the West regarded South Africa as a valuable ally and after 1979 both the Reagan administration and Thatcher government shared the determination to oppose the spread of communism in Africa. Both leaders were therefore remarkably reluctant to impose harsh sanctions against South Africa. Moreover, the Republic of South Africa dominated the frontline states economically. Leonard Thompson emphasises the extent of that domination. The Anglo American Corporation of South Africa had substantial economic interests in Botswana, Zimbabwe and Zambia, and South African ports and rail networks dominated transport in the region. Migrant labour remained important with over a quarter of a million workers from other countries working in SA. The frontline states were therefore economically dependent on South Africa and this limited their capacity to threaten South Africa directly.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will show reasonable knowledge of developments in Southern Africa between c 1970 and 1984, including the final stages of decolonisation and the significance of both the end of the Portuguese Empire and the recognition of Zimbabwe as an independent African country in 1980. There will be some awareness of the implications of these developments for South Africa. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations, and of the problems of objectivity in an area in which much of the evidence is open to question.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will show greater awareness of the factors that limited the ability of the frontline states to threaten the South African government effectively. At this level, candidates should consider the wider, Cold War dimensions of the issue and the economic implications for African states. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will show a detailed and comprehensive understanding of the situation in Southern Africa between c. 1970 and 1984, including South African involvement in Namibia. Answers will be well informed about the clandestine support given to non-Marxist movements in Angola, Mozambique and in Zimbabwe and the possible aims of this involvement. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historians' views.

## **South Africa (1910-1984)**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

**What does Source A reveal about the objectives of segregationist policies implemented by successive South African governments between 1910 and 1939?**

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of the view of segregation offered by Smuts in Source A in terms of:

#### **Origin**

From a speech (made in London) by Jan Smuts, at that time a Cabinet minister in Botha's South Africa Party administration.

#### **Possible purpose**

To justify the South African government 'Native policy'.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- European political ideas are not applicable to African communities
- parallel institutions are being created for Africans
- the haphazard mingling of black and white has degraded Europeans, and so the two communities should be kept apart
- establishing separate areas for blacks and whites, with separate administrations, may be the solution to the 'native problem'.

#### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- the Botha – Smuts administration had already introduced segregationist legislation, most notably the 1911 Mines and Works Act and the 1913 Land Act
- the extension of segregation under Smuts; for example the Natives (Urban Areas) Act, 1923
- the further extension of segregation under Hertzog, including the so-called 'civilised Labour' policy
- the removal of the non-racial franchise in the Cape in 1936 by the Fusion Government formed by Hertzog and Smuts
- some historians (especially Legassick and Marks and Trapido) have traced the roots of this segregationist drive to the period immediately before Union when Lord Milner was High Commissioner
- possible different explanations of the objectives of segregation during the period 1910 – 1939, including: the concept of trusteeship, which was prevalent among so-called liberals (a line of argument explored by the historian Saul Dubow); the racist values of Afrikaners and their determination to protect the status and purity of the 'volk'; the 'reserve subsidy thesis' regarding cheap migrant labour put forward by Marxist historians, notably Wolpe
- more recently, historians (ie Beinart and Marks) have suggested that segregation was not simply imposed from above but was influenced and partly shaped by Africans themselves.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure ; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

**How well do Sources B and C illustrate differing perspectives on the policy of apartheid as it was implemented in the 1950s?**

The candidate compares the views of 1950s apartheid given in **Sources B** and **C** and offers a structured explanation of the two interpretations in terms of:

### Source A

#### Origin

The speaker is defending the policy of apartheid (to a London audience) at a time when the NP was implementing apartheid legislation. His view is typical of Afrikaners who supported the NP.

#### Purpose

To justify NP policies.

#### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall:

- White/Afrikaner fear that equality of the races would lead to the eventual disappearance of the white nation in South Africa
- apartheid is a policy of self preservation
- apartheid will not only safeguard the whites; it will also protect the Bantu, by allowing them to develop as a separate people
- political power will have to remain with the whites, since the Bantu are immature as a people.

#### Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation

- views of Afrikaner academics such as Cronje, who advocated complete racial separation in *A Home for Posterity* (1945) in order to ensure the long term survival of the Afrikaner people
- Omer – Cooper identifies the 1950s as a period of ‘baaskap apartheid’ which was designed to ensure white supremacy but there was no overall agreement about how this should be achieved
- details of relevant 1950s legislation, such as the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, the Population Registration Act, the Group Areas Act and the Bantu Authorities Act.

Candidates who are able to provide content detail and analysis on any of these aspects noted above, are showing that they can support for the wider picture of the view expressed in Source B.

## **Points from Source C**

### **Origin**

Secondary source, written by the current Rhodes Professor of Race relations at the University of Oxford.

### **Possible purpose**

To examine explanations of 1950s apartheid in the light of the views of 1970s Marxist political activists and historians.

### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- Apartheid was a means of extending the benefits of the migrant labour system to meet the needs of manufacturing industry
- influx control legislation would restrict the process of black urbanization, which had grown rapidly in the 1940s, and which threatened to create an urban proletariat
- influx control legislation would also protect the interests of white workers, who were threatened by the lower wages paid to urban Africans
- decentralisation of industry would enable manufacturers to exploit cheap labour from the reserves
- commercial farmers would also be guaranteed a ready supply of labour from the reserves.

### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- the views of Marxist historians who interpreted Apartheid in terms of the changing economic needs of white South Africa
- Wolpe's emphasis on the crumbling nature of the reserve economies and the need to restore them
- the interpretations of other 1970s historians, for example Frederick Johnstone who argued that apartheid and capitalism were mutually sustaining, thus undermining the views of liberals who believed that capitalism would eventually undermine apartheid
- the conflicting views of those demanding total separation and those advocating more flexible policies, in order to meet the needs of manufacturing industry
- knowledge of the 1952 Urban Areas Act, especially Section 10
- the gradual relocation of industry to the fringes of the reserves – a policy which was pursued with greater vigour after 1959
- Deborah Posel's analysis of influx control in the 1950s, showing Apartheid was a more flexible policy than was once believed.

Candidates who are able to provide content detail and analysis on any of these aspects noted above, are showing that they can support for the wider picture of the view expressed in Source C

Taken together, the two sources offer a contemporary, Afrikaner view justification of Apartheid and a recent re-examination of the view of 1970s historians, many of whom were also political activists and as such forced to live and work in exile. Either source takes cognizance (here) of more recent work which emphasise the extent to which 1950s apartheid contained differing viewpoints, and was not simply the implementation of an Apartheid blueprint.

## **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views of the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context but lacks clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of the topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonably developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging, and convincing argument; shows a clear grasp of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and a well developed level of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

#### How valid are the comments in Source D about the significance of the Treason Trial?

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of the comments about the significance of the Treason Trial given in **Source D** in terms of:

#### Origin

As a member of the ANC National Executive, Yenga was arrested and charged with Treason in 1956. Yenga gives a fairly typical ANC view of the impact of the Treason Trial.

#### Possible purpose

Writing retrospectively, Yenga appears to want to show that the NP's attempt to discredit the ANC served only to strengthen the movement.

#### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall:

- the Treason Trial served to heighten mutual understanding and awareness among ANC members who were arrested
- ANC leaders such as Tambo and Mandela were included among the accused
- elite members of the Congress of Democrats were also among the accused
- all of the accused were united in a spirit of common struggle against NP policies
- the government had made a big mistake by providing an opportunity for opposition leaders to be together.

#### Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation

- the Treason Trial brought together 156 members of those involved in the Congress of the People and accused them of being involved in a country-wide conspiracy inspired by 'international communism'
- the case against many of the defendants was dismissed over time and in 1961 the 30 remaining defendants were found 'not guilty'
- other African leaders, including Mandela, in 'Long Walk to Freedom', make the same point as Yenga
- others are more sceptical about the effects of the Treason Trial
- according to Lodge, the trial removed some of the ablest leaders from active political life; this meant that campaigning was more localised and uneven in impact
- others argue that the trial turned many towards violence
- according to Karis and Carter, the trial bought the government time during which the police could become more efficient at dealing with 'agitators'
- Paul Rich argues that after the dismissal of the Treason Trial defendants, government policy became more overtly oppressive
- internationally, the Treason Trial aroused sympathy and support for the accused.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **Soviet Russia (1917-1953)**

### **Part 1**

**Each question is worth 25 marks**

#### **Question 1**

**How important were the contributions of Lenin and Trotsky in bringing about the October Revolution?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will give a basic account and analysis of the events leading up to and surrounding the October Revolution including a discussion of the main areas involved. It should involve a discussion on Lenin's role; probably from his return to the Finland Station in April 1917 and his policies from that time: ie 'Peace Bread and Land!' and 'All Power to the Soviets!'. Candidates may go on to discuss his influence on the timing various events his role in July Days? His role in exile, the meetings in September-Oct on the timing of the coup.

Discussion on Trotsky may include his writings on the idea of world-wide revolution and 'weakest link' theory. His transfer to Bolsheviks by August 1917 and the influence of his role as chairman of the St Petersburg Soviet making him better known than Lenin and being the orator who could sway his audience. His role in planning of the details of October including the timing, setting up and controlling the Military Revolutionary Committee, reacting to Kerensky's mistakes. There will be consideration of the importance of each man compared to the other and to other factors. While the weaknesses of the Provisional Government can be considered it is important to focus on the two chief actors who helped stage the October Revolution. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will cover the events as above but will consider more deeply the nature of the revolution. There may be deeper historical knowledge of the part played by Lenin's writings in establishing his revolutionary credentials; and therefore respect as a revolutionary leader even from his exile in Zurich. This may include a discussion of his principal writings from 'What is to be done?' onwards.

Candidates will be more aware of detail on the extent of 'popular' revolution and the *coup d'état* by examining in detail precise events; this might include the chronology of the actual arrangements of the revolution, the moment being the Second Congress of the Soviets because they seize power in the name of the *Soviets* admitting and including all Russia not just Petrograd itself.

Mention should be made of Lenin's role in convincing the party to follow him (as from April Theses, through the blow of the July Days, his attitude towards Kornilov and dealing with possible defectors like Kamenev and Zinoviev). What 'policies' did he apparently offer; was it a true Marxist agenda? (ie stole the SR's land policy).

Candidates at this level will probably bring in more by way of wider comparison to other factors that are important and may include observations of others at the time, for example Sukhanov, and other factors in the 'making' of October, which help downplay the over riding role of Lenin or Trotsky. Factors involved in the general disintegration of the provisional government, Kerensky's role in keeping the war going and swinging to the right may be included. The changing popularity of SRs, Kadets, Mensheviks over the time of the Provisional Government might legitimately be examined. It was the power vacuum that was left by October, that allowed Lenin his chance. Greater account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will include all of the above but will provide a searching critique which really evaluates the relative merits of the roles of Lenin and Trotsky and shows how these may or may not be reflected in the actual detail of October. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of historians.

## Question 2

### Was the Civil War one conflict or many?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will probably rehearse the traditional military view by looking at the Reds, Whites and Greens. It will look at the main forces of the Whites – Yudenich, Kolchak, Kornilov, Denikin. It will probably show the main cause of conflict to be the Bolshevik actions of alienating the other groups, SRs, Mensheviks, liberals and conservatives. It should cover the cause of the Czech Legion hostilities, the motivation of the Greens and Makhno's Insurgent Army, and the issue of Allied Intervention. It will look at the political width of the war, and could look at the geographical. Its approach may at least look at the changes in the nature of the civil war within a chronological framework. There will be some account taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will cover the above but will show a greater awareness of the levels of political culture and will illustrate this through a clear understanding of the chronological phases of the War – 1918 to Kolchak's coup, the end then of right v left, the end of WW1 and the peace impact on white Generals and Allies and the Polish War. There will be a detailed consideration of the spectrum of political cultures as represented among the factions. The simple – resistance – with the Greens, peasants, soldiers. The more sophisticated - with the Allied powers each having their own agenda about what should be done with Russia and what should emerge; the Komuch and the possibility of a third democratic phase with the Czechs as natural allies (ie Geoff Swain's view about this being the 'forgotten civil war'). It will discuss the economic and social 'fight for hearts and minds'. Evidence of the institutions of Bolshevism as seen in the Red Army and how it was created (breaking local groups) and managed (health care, care of dependants) hence coping with resistance to grain requisitioning. Other institutions might be mentioned (Party, Cheka) allowing talent to flourish, winning allegiance and a desire not to return to the old order. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will lead the discussion of the War as not just the political but also social and economic in some cases not even political but local. There would be a full discussion of all points above. An excellent piece might mention warlordism - Cossacks, events in the far-east and setting up of fiefdoms: the degeneration of politics into a power game. The chronological break down of the types of opposition in the civil war may take it beyond the ending of the Polish war, and right up to Feb 1921, with Kronstadt and the Worker's Opposition being seen as part of the overall resistance to the Bolsheviks' policies. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

### Question 3

**To what extent were collectivisation and industrialisation introduced for practical rather than ideological reasons?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will provide a detailed account and analysis of the reasons offered for why these two interlocking processes were introduced under Stalin. Candidates may try to treat them separately. Candidates may cover the development of Russian Agriculture under NEP, its non-socialist agenda, the legacy of Lenin's concern with the *smychka*.

Then there is Stalin's role; his tactics in his rise to power of isolating opponents by pushing them to extreme or 'non-party' views, his realisation of the strength of peasants, 'holding the country to ransom' (requisitioning crisis of 1927), foreign war scare, the move towards 'socialism in one country', paying for industrialisation, making a more effective and efficient rural labour force to provide grain for urban areas and skim off the rural population as workers.

Evidence for the view of its ideological pretensions can be seen in the socialist nature of the agricultural reforms that were introduced: Sovkhoz, Kolkhoz, exile of kulaks, Machine Tractor Stations.

When a candidate tackles industrial changes and the Five Year Plan, they may offer evidence for their introduction in terms of position of Bolshevik party and declining 'worker base' by 1929, fears of foreign rivals (as seen in Stalin's 1931 speech) need for new socialist goals (Gill's view of revolution from above), attacking the complacency of the Communist Party, strengthening the control of central party apparatus in the regions. Candidates may also cover the view of the alleged non-socialist aspect of the organisation of the work force (pay differentials, bonuses, single managers etc – all capitalist aspects).

Evidence for the view of its ideological pretensions can be seen in the socialist nature of the industrial reforms that were introduced; the wide electrical power infrastructure that resulted, the socialist competition in the construction process, Stakhanovism, the utopian promises of the regime, the new industrial towns etc.

There will be some account taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) may tackle the question as above but will present a more developed and analytical argument which is more likely to deal with the agricultural and industrial developments as part of both the same ideological and practical process ie the two go together as part of the same 'great leap forward.' It will examine the nature of the Leninist/Marxist tradition in agriculture and industry looking at the retrograde steps with the Land Decree and NEP, and the success of War Communism in ideological terms as a way of producing class relationships more conducive to the establishment of a socialist state. A return to the revolutionary centrist and planned approach broke the relationship between the peasant and the land resulting in the proletarianisation of the peasant as a wage earner in an industry, and produced the relatively new worker as industry modernised, aiming overall to foster a large influential working class.

Answers on the 'ideological' v the 'practical' may discuss in some detail by what methods the Bolshevik government imposed its new economic programmes of collectivisation and industrialisation on the Russian people. Detailed discussion of methods might include the 'Twenty-five Thousanders', decrees, deportations and denouncement as part of class warfare. In agriculture there might be reference to the 'dizzy with success' moment as well as the elimination of Kulaks, bourgeois specialists and old Bolsheviks. State imposition of the Kolkhoz, Sovkoz, Toz and use of MTS can be used as examples of the physical process that this is not the 'mir'. The state imposed its set of norms and quotas with a central ministry deciding what to plant and how much. The phases of industrial growth might be discussed and evidence might include the number of people employed, extent of urbanisation, productivity of modern materials (electrification), Five-Year Plans, the move from extractive to manufacturing industries. The production of the proletarian worker as shown in allegiance with the Stakhanovites and in works such as Magnitogorsk. Better answers will consider the Komsomol generation raised by the State with its allegiance and its desire for self improvement. All these sorts of factors might be in the mind of a good candidate with a wider perspective on how you convincingly demonstrate that ideology can be shown to have been a key factor in practice. A balanced and reasoned conclusion will be drawn and greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will expand on this and constantly refer to the evidence available in weighing up the main issue of the ideological versus the practical. This will be considered both in terms of the origin and imposition of the policies, but also in terms of the actual achievement and the methods employed to bring the agricultural and industrial reforms about. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

#### Question 4

**“Comrade Card Index.” Was Stalin’s control over the party machine the crucial factor in his rise to power?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will demonstrate knowledge of Stalin’s growing role in the Party and State machinery. This will include a detailed discussion of the 1920s including his control of Party organisation and Party membership, his positions in the Orgburo and Secretariat, and his role as Party Secretary. A comparison with the other contenders should be made – Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev and Bukharin. It will also consider the struggle between Trotsky and Stalin, the policies adopted, NEP and ‘socialism in one country’ and the manipulation involved. The better answer will display a sense of debate, and some account will be taken of differing historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will do the above but will present a more developed and analytical argument. It will examine in a thematic and well-structured way the constituencies of support as well as the ideological differences. This will include a discussion of Stalin as administrator (Commissar for Nationalities), pragmatist (Lenin’s death, producing the cult of Lenin and Stalin’s self-adopted role as Lenin’s disciple), patron (as General Secretary) and the creator of the mass Party by 1925. It will also consider the relative weakness of his opponents. This will include Trotsky the intellectual who lacked any real power base and should highlight this for example by considering his action/inaction over the Georgian issue. There will be detailed discussion of Lenin’s Testament, the ‘Lessons of October’ (1924), NEP and Trotsky’s idea of ‘Permanent Revolution’ as compared to ‘Socialism in One Country’. Better answers will discuss factionalism and infighting, Stalin’s use of other contenders eg Zinoviev (sidelining Comintern) and Kamenev, plus the roles of other key figures including Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations. There may be discussion of schools of thought for example the structuralist approach, Party history, ideological approach and/or revisionists. Greater account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will provide a thorough discussion of all of the above, highlighting Stalin’s skill in appropriating Lenin’s mantle and appealing to ordinary Party workers, as well as indicating a solid understanding of Stalin’s manipulative abilities (eg during the ‘war scare’ of 1927). It will also demonstrate a more detailed understanding of the range and importance of the different factors involved (ie policy differences and shifts over collectivisation). The best answers will consistently refer to the varying schools of thought as above and may include the Liberal school highlighting personalities and may show an awareness of the changes in interpretation from the 1930s to present day. An answer might here include Trotsky’s opinion as the quote suggests.

## Question 5

**“Death solves all problems. No man, no problem.” (Stalin)  
Does this adequately explain the Purges and the Terror?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will give a basic account and analysis of the Purges, show trials and terror in the 1930s, covering the Kirov murder, the purge of the ‘Trotskyites’ and ‘Zinovievites’, the trials of the Old Bolsheviks in 1936 and 1937, the purge of the Red Army leadership, and the pervasive sense of terror sown by the NKVD throughout the country. Answers in this range will address the ‘problems’ suggested; looking at social problems in industry and agriculture and the resulting instability in the 1930s, Party instability from the 1933 onwards, and considering Stalin’s fear of challenges to his position. Some account will be taken of historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will do all of the above, but will develop a clear and analytical argument. In particular answers in this range will be expected to engage more directly with the substance of the question ie that in stating ‘no man’ Stalin is suggesting that ‘totalitarian’ nature of the soviet system. The erosion of the individual as part of his cultural revolution which stresses ‘nation’, thus getting rid of Kulaks, the bourgeois class and neo-NEPs. It suggests that he was in control and a discussion of the intentionalist and decisionist schools might be included. That the purges and the terror are intrinsic to the system will be considered. Better answers will explore more fully the arguments that terror was a result of the need to rapidly modernise a backward country, that the ‘sharpening of the class struggle’ as a justification is an excuse, that Stalin’s paranoia meant that it was in the end random, and that there were threats to the USSR and its leadership are incorrect. Greater account will be taken of differing historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will do all of the above but will consistently address the debate here. It will evaluate the validity of the ‘problems’, discuss the ‘top down’ totalitarian view and the ‘bottom up’ revisionist view. It will consider fully the issue of the individual in the system and indeed might consider the issue of the ‘system’ as well. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 6

### How important was Stalin's leadership to Soviet victory in the Great Patriotic War?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will offer an account and analysis of the overall picture of Stalin's contribution right from the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact 1939. It is likely the candidate will focus on Stalin's activities rather than making any deep comparison with other factors. Stalin's contribution might be identified through reference to the effects of the Five Year Plans and other economic policies in building up Soviet strength, (Urals/Kuznetsk steel combine, 1000 miles beyond where Germans reached), the building up of the Red Army, military appointments that were significant (Zhukov), Stalin's relations with the Western allies, turning the war into a patriotic defence war (his speech, 2 weeks into the war), his role in ordering or organising epic defences (Leningrad, Smolensk and Stalingrad) and how these contributed to ultimate victory, his refusal to leave Moscow and the general use of propaganda. Westwood believed *'he began to provide the resolute and inspiring leadership that was to carry USSR through four years of bitter attrition.'* There are many areas that the candidate can comfortably analyse in order to give an evaluation, with some account of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will be as above but will consider at least some of a wider range of alternative deeper explanations, and is likely to also be critical of Stalin. Some reference to the purges of the Army, the inadequacy of collectivisation as a food provider under wartime conditions, Stalin's lost nerve in 1941, ignoring of intelligence advice, the misleading of the Russian population, the military ineptitude at the start of the war, (defence of Kiev and loss of 0.6 million troops), obsolete weaponry, terrible losses due to defending Ukraine rather than the centre, and 'doctrine of the immediate offensive' etc all suggest a counter view to the traditional Soviet interpretation of Stalin's brilliance as a supreme commander. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations such as Mawdsley's *'Stalin was not a great commander'*, or the role of allied assistance ('equal to the output of 7 million Russian workers').

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will expand on this and will show confident handling of the arguments and have a wider picture of the factors that led to Soviet victory. These may include observations about the changing nature of Stalin's input as a war leader over the war years, (personal handling of the war and his generals at the start, moving towards diplomatic manoeuvres that brought Western allies into action later on) and the changing factors that were essential in aiding Russian victory. There may possibly be analysis of other diplomatic factors (neutrality with Japan, occupation of Baltic provinces, detail on gaining allied supplies [one sixth of Soviet airforce was imported plus spam!] etc) and domestic factors (mobilisation of labour, changed relationship with Russian Church, [*'Stalin's masterstroke'*], rationing etc) in protecting or strengthening Russia's position. Beevor's point that Spanish civil war had provided battle experience for 5 of his top Army commanders. There will be clear evidence of understanding of different historical interpretations.

## Soviet Russia (1917-1953)

### Part 2

#### Question 1

**How helpful are the differing views in Sources A and B as perspectives on the causes of the February Revolution of 1917?**

The candidate evaluates usefulness of **Source A** and **B** as perspectives on the causes of the February Revolution in terms of:

#### Source A

##### Origin

- extract from Trotsky's *History*, written while in exile
- reflects views of key figure who had been absent in USA at the specific time of the events, but had become a main player thereafter.

##### Purpose

His intention is very much to down play the role of the Bolsheviks in stimulating this stage of the revolution.

#### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

Trotsky's analysis of the revolutionary situation in February 1917 is that it was 'a revolution from below'. He supports this argument by referring to:

- key leaders were oppressed women textile workers with links to soldiers
- strikes got out of hand and the masses clashed with police, and increased in numbers
- workers organised themselves with meetings and processions towards the centres of power in Petrograd
- the original cries from these discontented workers [for bread] became replaced with cries wanting an end to autocracy and the war.

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

- detail on the impact of war on driving the urban population to strikes, [Putilov workers] demonstrations, [against shortages and constant queuing, plus inflation]
- International Women's day [evidence that the women workers were certainly getting in front of the Bolshevik agitators. Memoirs of VN Kayuriv]
- Westwood: *'these women, wily nilly, became the catalyst for a social upheaval.'*
- wider evidence of general state of war weariness
- detail on workers groups that were getting organised; Schliapnikov and the Petrograd Bureau; Mezraionka; Shop stewards; influence of Viborg workers.
- Rex Wade: *'the long awaited revolution had come swiftly, arising out of strikes and popular demonstrations.'*
- secondary works like Corin and Fiehn: *'The main push came from the workers in the cities.'*

Candidates who are able to provide content detail and analysis on any of these aspects noted above, are showing they can offer support for the wider picture of the claim that Trotsky is making.

## Source B

### Origin

Extract from views of modern historian of Polish ancestry who is generally regarded as being fairly hostile towards the Bolsheviks.

### Purpose

He wants to correct what he sees as fallacies in peoples' approach to studying the causes of the February Revolution.

### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

Pipes' analysis of the situation is that the role of the workers in the February Revolution has been over estimated. He supports this argument by referring to:

- industrial labour merely reacted to the events that were happening, it didn't cause them
- the real stimulus to the revolutionary events in February were the army and the Petrograd Garrison. This mutiny had a knock on effect on the decisions of the Tsar [he lost his will] and on the generals and politicians [who were now in an urgent mood to persuade him to go]
- worker revolt as a cause of the February Revolution is therefore a myth, it was the generals and politicians who really brought about the down fall of Tsarism.

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

- detail on Industrial labour; evidence of state of anarchy [Rodzianko telegram]; Tsarina Alix's views on nature of unrest in streets of Petrograd
- evidence of women workers pushing the reluctant men
- accurate detail on role of army, eg regiments and rank of soldier. Role of Kirpichnikov [in Figes]
- that Army units [Volinsky regiment] joined rioters from 25 February in Petrograd, the role of the Petrograd Garrison [*'diluted by the casualties of war'* – Kowalski]
- *'The mutiny of the Petrograd garrison turned the disasters of the last four days into a full scale revolution'* – Figes
- Figes' story of the girl and red roses for cossacks as evidence
- role of General Khabalov in losing control of Petrograd
- details on decision-taking role of Tsar in bringing about this state of disorder:
- Nicholas' return from Stavka at Mogilev to Petrograd: diversion of train to Pskov
- detail on the wider picture of a military coup; discussion of how wide was general plotting within the military [Guchkov, plus Generals Krymov, Brusilov, Alexeyev]. Alexeyev had a draft of the abdication document in his pocket!
- comments from historians who support the line of argument that Nicholas was betrayed by the upper elites
- Beryl Williams: *'Ten days of popular demonstrations, political manoeuvring and army mutiny developed imperceptibly into a revolution.'*

Candidates who are able to provide content detail and analysis on any of these aspects noted above, are showing they can offer support for the wider picture of the claim that Trotsky is making.

### **Points which offer wider and more critical contextualisation of the views in the sources.**

Comparing these sources shows one view giving all the credit to the workers; the other view gives the credit to the soldiers/politicians. Candidates should develop their thoughts on what other perspectives can be considered when looking at the events of February.

- role of revolutionary parties: Mensheviks, SRs and Bolsheviks; influence of personalities eg Kerensky, Tseretelli
- role of the peasantry. Were they only a factor at the fronts, in the army? Bolshevik propaganda in the front lines as a factor in causing army breakdown
- Sukhanov's views on the absence of Bolsheviks in Petrograd in February
- role of Lenin in Zurich: purely a distant spectator or an influence on events at low level through his letters and/or bolshevisation of the low level worker groups in engineering?
- reference to other theories on why Russia tipped into revolution

Kennan: long term failure of autocracy to set up parliamentary institutions

Westwood: refers to the optimist view of the émigré's; Katkov supported this view. 'Two years of war and sacrifice were too much to bear... were the tsarist government in German pay?'

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the helpfulness [ie the accuracy and completeness] of the two sources in covering the main perspectives on the causes of the February Revolution.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding the differing views of the sources, and a reasonable developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

**How adequately does Source C reflect the reality of Soviet foreign policy under Lenin after 1917?**

### Origin

Cartoon by Deni in 1920 at time of rise of activity of Comintern (established in 1919) talking about world revolution, and the global perspective, including the hostility of East and West.

### Possible purpose

To highlight the possibility of the wider revolution, to present propaganda/the message without need for language.

### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

- Lenin sweeps the world of the parasites of the old order
- figures include key figures of the old order; monarchs, religious leaders, capitalists
- statement that this is Lenin the global figure and the centrality of world revolution is necessary to keep the Russian revolution alive, the Russians taking a back seat when revolution in more developed countries. To do this or die.

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

- Marx had spoken about revolution in most developed economies, and this represents his thinking on world revolution ie that ideology will lead the way
- this Marxist analysis appeared in Bolshevik aims elsewhere eg in Britain and Germany (the revolution in developed countries)
- Lenin's writings at the time are examples of the international revolution doctrine eg about imperialism as the highest form of capitalism
- whereas that idea of revolution had traditionally been amongst the sophisticated working classes of developed capitalist nations Britain, Germany *et al*, it now extended to the toiling masses of the non-developed world on the back of self-determination (Woodrow Wilson) to the colonial peasantry
- extent to which Bolshevik policies (or support for Communism) did in fact sweep away, (or attempt to) the capitalists, monarchs and church in other states
- the Peace Decree 1917, and a comparison with the view in the cartoon
- reference to Brest-Litovsk, 1918, details on conduct, methods and behaviour, Lenin's hopes dashed (or determination to save the revolutionary regime at any cost) especially on world revolution (very annexationist)
- reference to hopes put 'on hold' because of Civil War and Allied Intervention on Whites' side, war with Poland. Impact of Polish war in changing Lenin's views on national patriotism
- Lenin's attitude towards national minorities at home and on Russia's borders. Shown both in civil war by his idealist views of letting them go (compared to White views) then how his views changed under Stalin's pressure to be more restrictive
- the importance of the creation and development of the Comintern and the tradition of the Working Mens International (1919) - revival of working men's international association. The Third International in direct opposition to the Second International, here the true Communist International. Noting the failures of attempts to spread communism – Berlin, Munich or Hungary for example. Perhaps also raising something of its idealism and crusading spirit
- reference to Rapallo 1922, Locarno 1925, Berlin 1926; trade agreements with Britain; the way the official Soviet Foreign ministry under Litvinov tried to become 'respectable'. (ie it was hampered by Comintern's behaviour)

- by 1920 world revolution was a way of attacking the big Empires, not only at home but was also an attack in their colonies
- historians' viewpoints eg Figes on Brest-Litovsk sealing the end of permanent revolution and the Comintern '*flirt with the idea of exporting Communism*' but not more than that. Or James White citing the '21 conditions' on which foreign Communist parties would be admitted to the Comintern.

### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

**How helpful is Source D in assessing the nature of Soviet relations with Eastern Europe after 1945?**

#### Origin

Newspaper article in TASS on the conference that set up the Comecon (contemporary): an official Soviet/Communist viewpoint

#### Possible purpose

To a degree this was propaganda and self-justification:

- to give a summary of the meeting held in Moscow regarding the new organisation created by the socialist countries (rather than giving any indications as to the outcome)
- to inform of the potential economic union and separation of powers
- to inform of the trans-national nature of economic trading.

#### Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall

Centres on economic relations but the subtext is political and military developments. Candidates should note the divide being set for the Cold War, including:

- the six countries which would be included as new communist states, and in the future a buffer for Russia proper in the Cold War
- a description of COMECON: this is about economic relations, although that is a way of establishing control of the new countries in the union
- negative attitude of USA and others boycotting, showing the Cold War divide
- Marshall Plan: the West tied into this and so the comment is tongue in cheek. Seen as vehicle for espionage.

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

- CMEA aimed to co-ordinate economic growth of all countries which were part of the Soviet bloc. (ie even those not in E Europe: GDR, Mongolia, Cuba, Vietnam)
- Marshall Plan after Truman Doctrine, giving financial aid to Europe from USA, but tied. Cominform a reaction to this and links to the Cold War split, under the banner of the ideological split
- the West had already taken steps, with 1948 First Congress of Europe suggesting the West uniting and in May 1949 with Statute of the Council of Europe
- also Schuman Plan (May 1950) proposed Franco-German unification of production of coal and steel to prevent war through the security of interdependence
- security through tying economies together comes to fruition by 1951.
- the forced nature of the governing of the 'Eastern Bloc'. If the new communist countries are to keep allegiance after the ravages of war, success in economic efficiency is vital to the acceptance of the new political order
- both (East/West) sides talking about super power consolidation on either side of the European rift. The Soviet Union establishing its hegemony over the countries it has taken over. Although has been agreed to by people like Churchill that Soviet Union had spheres of influences. The political hegemony had already been established at Yalta and Potsdam
- by 1949 Europe was divided: "Iron Curtain" speech, 1946
- might include political commentary eg Churchill's speech March 5 1946 or Historians eg Kennedy-Pipe on 'special rights in the east' or Ward's assertion that European domination was not the Soviet aim.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## The Spanish Civil War (1931-1939)

### Part 1

Each question is worth 25 marks

#### Question 1

**Do you agree that the monarchy could not have survived the departure of Primo de Rivera?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will give a largely narrative account of events in 1930-31 that saw the collapse of Primo de Rivera's regime and the collapse of the monarchy. The reasons for Primo's failure will be touched on, especially why Alfonso turned against him. Consideration should be given to the idea that Alfonso's support of the Dictatorship had caused unpopularity. Had these groups who had come to dislike the Dictator also come to dislike the king? Could his staying have kept Alfonso in power? Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations. This may include Brennan's observation that *'The whole country had turned against the Dictadura and the king.'*

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will give a more considered account of events. Was Primo de Rivera protecting the crown? Was he a reformer or simply a reactionary? Why did Alfonso fall from power? Greater attention will be paid to historian's views. These may include views such as Patricia Knight's, that political and social change had not kept pace with economic change – and Alfonso failed to remedy this.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) This should provide a full discussion of the question. Was Alfonso's fall inevitable once Primo de Rivera left? Did Primo keep the monarchy going? Had the dictatorship made too many enemies? How had Alfonso so upset the Army that they would not support him? Attention should be paid to the rise of opposition forces. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians. This may include observations such as Ben Ami, that the king had *'lost the support of the army'*, or Preston's; *'sacrifice of the king to ease reform'*.

## Question 2

### How far was Azana's government (1931–1933) brought down by its own attempts at reform?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will be a simple account of Azana's government and its various reforms-land, army, church. Some attention will be given to the outcomes of these with discussion on why elections were needed in 1933. Perhaps discussing the failure of reform by considering Preston's view that the Right saw reform as a challenge to their power, or Brennan's view that the republic was supported by small landowners, so agrarian reform was mild. Also, that *'all the converts in Madrid were not worth a single republican'*. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will enlarge on above. Why did the various reforms fail? Did Azana upset so many different interests that he could not survive? Did he upset his own supporters by not doing enough? Views of Brennan on the old fashioned tax system or Casa Viejas on the deaths. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) This will be a full discussion of the reasons for the fall of Azana's government. How well thought out were his reforms? Did they fail due to lack of money or poor execution or resistance? How much blame must Azana bear? Was he just unlucky? What of the view of Malefakis that *'Agrarian reform was a revolution'*? Caballero argued that *'the agrarian reform act was the aspirin to cure appendicitis'*. Were Church reforms an unnecessary provocation? There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

### Question 3

**To what extent did the revolution of 1934 and the methods by which it was suppressed contribute to the outbreak of the Civil War?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) may give a straightforward account and analysis of events in 1934, especially in Asturias, and then examine the results of the way in which order was restored, with large numbers from the Left being imprisoned, in order to make a judgement about how likely a civil war was to occur. Some mention may be made of who was responsible and how both sides were affected by the events. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations. This may include discussion of such views as Hugh Thomas's *'The Civil War was almost inevitable.'* Preston's view was that attacks on democracy were led by Robles/Suner and that nothing was done after 1934 to heal matters.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) should contain a more detailed account of events after the election of 1933. The attitude of the Right must be discussed: visits to Mussolini, speeches against democracy. Motives of the 1934 strike – was it a refusal to accept reaction? Attention will be paid to details of the terror in Asturias. Both sides now planned revenge – suggested military coup? Narrow win for Popular Front in 1936 – Right now determined on violence. H Browne's view was that both the left and the right were prepared to abandon democracy. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will show a good grasp of situation from 1933 on: result of election, determination of Right to destroy reforms of Azana. Equally the determination of Left to fight back. Rising terrified and angered Left and Right. Right appalled by rising, Left by terror of Franco. Election result saw narrow win for Left, and Right abandoned the democratic process. Brennan discusses the stupidity of the Right. Balanced conclusion; did the events of 1934 lead to the civil war and if so by how much? Perhaps using information on the differing accounts of Oviedo – no harm to priests/40 priests killed. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

#### Question 4

##### **How damaging to the Republican cause was the dispute between the Communists and others on the Left after 1936?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) may contain a basic account and analysis of the factors leading to the rising influence of the Communists and its attempts to gain control of the Republican side. An attempt should be made to explain why. Mention should be made of the row in Barcelona and also of the International Brigade, and the Trotskyist POUM. Preston observed that *'The republic lost more land in 10 months than the Peoples' Army did in 23'*. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will give a much fuller discussion of events. Consideration should be given to the validity of Communist aims and the truth about the inefficiency of the militias and collectivisation. How much damage did they do? Heywood emphasises that division in the Republican side was a crucial factor. PCE gained by prestige of International Brigades. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) A full account should be given of the events. The candidate should discuss the position of the Communists given Russia's role in helping the Popular front. How much harm did Anarchism and the militias do to the Republican effort? Was repression of the Left good or bad? Was there really a choice between revolution and winning? There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians. This might include Berneri's view that 'war or revolution' had no meaning. Orwell's view was that it was *'a reign of terror'*, while Cyril Connolly saw it as *'If you postpone the revolution, how do we know you are in good faith?'*

## Question 5

### How effective was the Falange as a political and ideological force after 1937?

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will give a basic account and analysis of the role of the Falange after 1937. It will cover its support for the Rising, and its part in the fighting along with the Carlists and others. Attention must be paid to the rapid expansion of the party and how these new members seemed bent on self-aggrandisement. However, Falange never gained the position of the Nazis in Germany – membership needed. Some account must be given of the take-over by Franco in 1937. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations. This might include Knight's view that they were the nationalist equivalent of the FAI.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will give a fuller account than above. Some mention will be made of Franco's intentions towards the Falange and the behaviour of the Party after 1937. Perhaps the answer may consider Knight's view that the fascist ideology of the Falange replaced the Church. Labour Charter of 1928 – a copy of Fascism? Only of tactical value – to be shelved later? More consideration of historical views will be shown.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will give a detailed consideration of the story of the Falange from 1936, through 1937 and later. What did they become? What happened to Falangist ideology? Did it simply vanish? What of "unity, totality, hierarchy", the Falangist motto? Yaque's call in 1938 for a Falangist state – he was sacked. Preston's view that there was no need for a new state and unified party. De Llano's distrust of the Falange. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 6

### **How great an influence did the Catholic Church have on the Nationalist side during the Civil War?**

The candidate is asked to make a judgement on the amount of influence the Catholic Church had on the Nationalist side during the Civil War from 1936 to 1939.

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will discuss the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in a general way. It will point out the pro-Catholic views of many of the rebels, especially the Monarchists and the Carlists. Mention will be made of the support given by various of the clergy to the rising from the beginning. Calls for a crusade will be noted. The bishops' letter of July 1937 and the support and recognition of the Vatican will be touched on. Some idea of how this support affected the Nationalists should be given. Various historical views may be discussed eg Carr – how the Carlists got strength from religion; motives of the Church – merely an end of reform. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will cover the some ground as above but will discuss the Church's motives for giving support in more detail. How much influence did the Church show by emphasising the idea of crusade and reconquest? Did this help to increase atrocities? Did the Church really exert any control over decision making? Why did the Church want a return to the counter-reformation? Preston: "the war only looks like a civil war; it is a crusade". Some mention should be made of the special circumstances of the Basques. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will give a full discussion of the issue. It may begin by citing Spain's experience of driving out the Moors and using the Inquisition to control dissent. Did the Church see the Civil war as a re-run? Constant support from the earliest days of the Rising-September 1936 onwards. Preston: "Communists and Anarchists are sons of Cain." Church was anti-Semitic (see Cardinal Gorna).

Special attention must be paid to Basques - here the Church supported the Republic. See attitude of Bishop Mugica (Oct 1939). Execution of 14 priests by Nationalists- no complaint from Vatican. Recognition of Franco by Vatican in 1931 and De Jure recognition in 1938. Support from German and American Catholics important. De Meneses: Church's help made Nationalist message available and acceptable to mass audience. 'Atrocities were a purging of Spain from anti-Spanish elements.' Was the Church behind this attitude? It certainly forgave it! There will be clear evidence of understanding the views of different historians.

## **The Spanish Civil War (1931-1939)**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

**What light does Source A shed on the developing relationship between the Basques and the Republic during the 1930s?**

The candidate evaluates the source as an explanation for the Basques changing relationship with the Republic in terms of:

#### **Origin**

This is a secondary source; from a prominent historian of Spain who lived in Spain at the time. It was written not long after the war.

#### **Possible purpose**

To explain events at the time of the war

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- Basques at first disliked Republic – too anti-Catholic
- but Basques wanted autonomy. In 1933 they supported CEDA but the 1933 government would not grant autonomy. Government then tried to levy a tax against Basques' financial privileges.

#### **Possible points from recall providing wider contextualisation**

- Basque demands for autonomy went back to 1900. In 1931, agreement to give Basques autonomy was put off
- Basques were politically and religiously conservative
- 1933-36 government would not give them devolution. Stood in election on their own (130,000 votes)
- Sotelo denounced all separatist groups – a *'Red Spain before a broken Spain'*
- Carlists also attacked Basques. Fighting in Navarre. Claimed that *'Basques were allies of Jews, masons and communists.'*
- Basque Party (PNV) had been too right wing to get support from 1931-33
- but too left wing for government of 1933-36
- in 1936 election Popular Front won 7 seats in Basque territory as opposed to PNV (due to Popular Front proposals for autonomy)
- Basques decide to take sides with Republic after military rising
- army worried by talk of autonomy
- alliance between UGT and Basques after 1934.

## **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## Question 2

### **How helpful are the differing viewpoints in Sources B and C as perspectives on the impact of foreign intervention on the Nationalist cause in the Spanish Civil War?**

Candidates must judge how useful Sources B and C are in looking at the impact of foreign intervention on the Nationalist side in the Spanish Civil War.

#### **Source B**

##### **Origin and purpose**

Secondary source written by a respected historian of Spain.  
Not usually seen as biased.

##### **Points from the source which can be developed by the use of additional recall**

- shortly after the Rising, Axis powers became worried that Franco might lose.
- Italy sent 3000 volunteers – later 40,000. But they suffered a defeat at Guadalajara. Blamed Franco [4,500 casualties]
- did not get on with the rebels – constantly criticised and demanded control
- the result was anti foreign feelings
- Italians did not perform well; by 1938 Franco wanted rid of the ground troops but could not do without the air force.

#### **Source C**

##### **Origin**

Primary Source: Communication between Mussolini and Count Ciano [his foreign secretary] in November 1937.

##### **Purpose**

Formulation/reassessment of Italian aims and policy on intervention in Spain.

##### **Points from the source which may be developed by the use of additional recall**

- we have spent vast sums in Spain. These must be paid back
- but there is a political aspect to this. We must have a Spain saved by ourselves and tied closely to us
- Rome and Berlin must work in concert to ensure Franco follows us
- we have a naval base at Palma and want to stay there as long as possible
- Majorca must remain an Italian base.

### Possible points from recall to contextualise those in the sources

- help given by Hitler and Mussolini was vital in getting Franco across from Morocco
  - even before the rising Mussolini had given money to the Spanish right
  - both Italy and Germany sent troops to Spain but Italy sent far more
  - motives for this varied:
    - a Fascist Spain
    - Mediterranean a Fascist lake
    - bases, minerals, etc
  - aircraft and tanks were especially valuable
  - Italy also helped to keep Russian aid away from the Republic
  - assistance not always welcome – see Yague's attack
  - Italian performance not always good. “Timing not quantity”; when aid was given not how much
  - despite help, Franco avoided commitments (role of Camaris in shaping Franco’s attitude: Germany would lose the next war).
- 
- role of Italian submarines, provoking other foreign reaction
  - specific cases/events where German or Italian intervention was effective or infamous [Guernica] havoc incident. Role of Portugal
  - role of Condor Legion: nature of German contribution
  - details of financial/commercial relationship between Franco and Germany role of iron ore deposits
  - aid to the Republic; role of International brigades and Soviet Union
- 
- Historians views:
    - Preston - Italian policy lacked consistency and rationality. Franco could not be allowed to lose. Hitler wanted a pro-German government in Madrid.
    - De Meneses - Mussolini had difficulties at home and needed action abroad. Italians could not win the war on their own. German motive was not to try out new weapons. Hitler limited aid to keep war going, not so Franco could win.
    - Brenan - Continuity of German and Italian aid which decided war. Western democracies failed Spain.

### Marks

- 1-4** Vaguely written; not answering the question or showing understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describing the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well-written and some relevant points of explanation made. Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little grasp of significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources, and a reasonable developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources, a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and well developed levels of relevant analysis.

### Question 3

**How valid are the arguments in Source D about the use of terror during the Spanish Civil War?**

#### Origin

A secondary source from a new history of the period. Uses documents recently available to historians.

#### Purpose

Offer new insights.

#### Points from the source which may be developed by the use of additional recall

- civil wars are usually brutal affairs. In Spain, Nationalists would not compromise
- republicans were divided over use of terror
- they did however see that the two sides would eventually have to live together
- large numbers killed by Nationalists. Were the two sides the same?
- republicans did make an effort to stop the killing – Franco encouraged it.

#### Possible points from recall to contextualise those in the sources

- both sides committed atrocities during the war. These were often in revenge or as retaliation
- Popular Front did carry out atrocities – most parties had a policy of killing but later the Revolutionary Tribunal in Madrid stopped this
- by October 1936 deaths had ceased except by tribunal
- later the police terror against the Left saw many arrests but few executions
- Nationalist terror was always policy. Massacres began early on and continued throughout the war  
The Church urged them on. International brigade prisoners shot/ Italians also killed  
at least twice if not three times the number of Republicans as Nationalists were executed
- many were killed for their sympathies rather than for anything they had done (Lorca)
- the terrorists were in charge (Brenan)
- the intention of the rebels was to wipe out their enemies
- De Llano: *'we amputated a diseased limb to preserve society.'*
- Vance Palmer: revenge on institutions, not people.

#### Marks

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well-written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of topic and reasonably developed analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument, solid grasp of context and significance of material; well-developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **Britain At War and Peace (1939-1951)**

### **Part 1**

**Each question is worth 25 marks**

#### **Question 1**

**How deep were the social and economic divisions in Britain on the eve of war?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) would give a basic account and analysis of Britain's economic position on the eve of war, in terms of the North/South divide and the difficulties posed by long term unemployment. Such an answer may concentrate on the extent of unemployment in the depressed regions of Britain and offer details on a contrast with the more prosperous south. Reference may be made to new industries and their location and importance. Social divisions may be tackled in terms of access to education and medical care, as well as the issue of housing. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations. These may include MacKay, and possibly older sources such as Mowat and Cole.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will demonstrate a wider understanding of the social and economic inequalities of British society in the thirties and make specific reference to the structural decline of industries such as coal, shipbuilding, iron and steel making and textiles. A clear understanding of regional unemployment patterns will be obvious, along with the appreciation that the South, Southeast and Midlands of England were significantly more prosperous due to new industries locating there. The candidate may refer to the means-tested dole and social deprivation of much of northern Britain and contrast that with the consumer led boom of the prosperous south. Some attempts may be made to discuss how far economic recovery had been achieved by 1939, compared to the earlier period. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will provide all of the above but with details on the significantly enhanced evidence of levels of unemployment, infant mortality rates and other evidence of social deprivation in the North, contrasted with evidence of the enhanced standard of living enjoyed by those in the more prosperous South as exemplified by increased leisure time, house and car purchase and greater spending by the middle classes on private education.

Attempts may be made to quantify the degree to which economic recovery had been achieved by 1939, compared to the earlier period; along with an appraisal of the depth of social division or inequality that existed within pre-war British society. There will be evidence of clear understanding of the views of different historians; these may include Brockway, Orwell and other social commentators of the time, as well as historians such as Cole, Constantine and Mowat, along with more modern writers such as MacKay.

## Question 2

**“The failure of the Norway campaign was the most significant cause of Neville Chamberlain’s resignation in May 1940.” How far do you agree?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will offer a straightforward account of Chamberlain's fall, examining the main reasons given by historians for his resignation. The importance of the failure of the Norway campaign will be emphasised as an example of the lack of preparedness of the military machine in Britain during the Phoney War. The candidate could however, attempt to broaden the scope of the argument by examining Chamberlain's personal failings as a war leader and his antipathy to the concept of total war. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations, which may include a note on Addison's work in this area.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will offer a more considered explanation by taking into account Chamberlain’s reluctance to pursue the war effectively and the belief that he still envisaged a negotiated peace with Germany as late as May 1940. The Norway campaign will be seen in the light of a symptom of the general political and military malaise and hence the occasion rather than the cause of Chamberlain's downfall. There will also be an examination of the residual disenchantment at the failed policy of appeasement. The extent to which Chamberlain was personally held responsible for the muddle of the Phoney War and general lack of preparedness for total war by elements within the Conservative party will be addressed as well as the root causes of the antipathy felt towards him by the Labour movement. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will offer a range of historical perspectives on the causes of Chamberlain's resignation. Some reference may be made to Tony Corfield’s interpretation of the significance of the Labour Party's implacable opposition to working with Chamberlain as well as a detailed examination of the Commons’ debate and the reasons behind the defection of a significant section of the Tory party. The part played by the Norway campaign will be examined but only in the wider context of disenchantment with the lack of effective progress during the Phoney War and the antipathy felt towards Chamberlain by the Labour movement as a whole. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians; these may include Addison's work, along with Jefferys and possibly Fielding, whilst Calder is another possible source of historiographical reference.

### Question 3

#### **How effectively did Britain's system of civil defence cope with the German military threat 1939 – 1945?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will rely largely on a description of the component parts of the civil defence system and their respective tasks in combating the German military threat. Mention will be made of ARP, LDV and the competence of the emergency services in the face of the bombing campaign. Some discussion of the adequacies (or otherwise) of the shelter provision will be evident, whilst reference should also be made to the evacuation scheme. The fear of gas attack and methods taken to counteract this threat should be referred to, as well as the anti-aircraft defences and medical facilities. The essay may offer a more narrative than analytical structure. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will offer a wider perspective on the role and objectives of civil defence in not only counteracting the German military threat but also in maintaining civilian morale. The extensive preparations for aerial bombardment will be examined in detail along with an analysis of the extent to which the provision of bomb shelters was adjudged to be sufficient. Some reference to the Home Guard and preparations to counteract Operation Sea Lion may be made as well as an evaluation of the evacuation scheme and the performance of the emergency services. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations. Harold L. Smith and Nick Tiratsoo may well be referred to as critics of the provision in the east end of London whilst Mackay and Roberts are more supportive of the ARP's success in minimizing casualties.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will provide an in-depth critique of the ARP system and the extent to which the government's unwillingness to encourage deep-shelter mentality may have compromised the safety of civilians. The lack of effectiveness of anti-aircraft batteries may be reflected upon and the candidate should examine in some depth the extent to which ARP succeeded in bolstering civilian morale. Evacuation should be seen as an integral part of the attempt to thwart the use of civilian deaths as a legitimate tactic to undermine morale and the success and shortcomings of the scheme addressed. A more analytical approach will be evident embracing the range of measures taken to oppose military threats as well as subversive threats. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians. These may include reference to the works of Calder, Tiratsoo, MacKay, Hylton and MacIntyre.

#### **Question 4**

##### **To what extent was there a “swing to the left” in British politics between 1940 and 1945?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will focus on the developing strength of the Labour Party in the war period and offer suggestions as to its increased credibility as an alternative to Conservatism. The role of the Labour war cabinet ministers may be noted as a cause of the enhanced status of and hence electoral success of the Labour Party. The impact of the Beveridge Report will also feature significantly as an indicator of the popularity of the concept of social reform and change in general, as will the impact of evacuation on people's perceptions of the extent of poverty and the need for change. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will offer a wider perspective on the meaning of a swing to the left which would include not only evidence of changes in voting habits and intentions but also in the provision of social reform. The success of the Commonwealth Party in by-elections may be referred to as a clear indicator of disenchantment with the Tories as well as the sense of a people's war which developed after Dunkirk. Beveridge will be examined along with the parties' contrasting attitudes to it, and the general political landscape prior to the 1945 election will be analysed. The impact of central planning and government control on people's perceptions of the potential role of government should be referred to. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will range widely over the issue of a swing to the left and all that entails; from the popularity of Priestley's Postscripts radio programme to the influence of ABCA. The increasing circulation of left-wing daily newspapers should be examined along with the influence of the Left Book Club. Evacuation as a cause of a re-examination of political standpoints should be examined as well as the influence of the Beveridge report on post-war reconstruction. Equality of sacrifice and the 'fair shares for all' mentality along with the perceived success of government control of the economy and supply of basic necessities should also be addressed as possible causes of a leftward swing. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 5

### **How effectively did the Labour Governments of 1945 – 1951 manage the economy?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) will offer a basic overview of Labour's economic policies in the period and the extent to which they coped with the 'financial Dunkirk'. A review of policies designed to promote exports and restrain domestic consumer spending will be offered. The essay will then range onto the constraints imposed by massive external debt and the lifeline offered by US loans and the Marshall Plan. Success in implementing an expensive social reform programme against a background of such financial stringency may be examined. The policy of demand management and nationalisation will be referred to and an evaluation of their success as policies offered. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations. These may include historians such as Morgan and Jefferys and possibly to critics such as Barnett.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) will offer a more in-depth analysis of economic strategy with reference to all of the above as well as the economic difficulties posed by sterling crises and overseas trade difficulties. A review of successive Chancellors may be offered along with the strategic importance of Marshall Plan aid in underwriting British economic performance in the late 1940's. Reference may be made to the success of nationalising the 'commanding heights' and to the continued programme of austerity measures necessitated by demand management. Full employment will be discussed and the extent to which any redistribution of wealth was achieved in this period. Constraints imposed by overseas defence commitments and the onset of the Korean War should be discussed in the light of Labour's expensive welfare reform programme. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will contain all of the above but in considerably greater detail and depth of analysis. The ability of the Labour governments to achieve full employment yet restrain inflation will be discussed, as will the success of increasing exports to pay for the dollar deficit. The gap left by the sudden ending of Lend Lease and the necessity of seeking massive overseas loans will be judged alongside the spending commitments made by Labour. The candidate may wish to outline the historical debate between Barnett and left wing historians over the hoped for 'economic miracle' v New Jerusalem issue and the extent to which Labour may have missed the opportunity to regenerate British industry in this period. The extent to which Labour indulged in fiscal conservatism as opposed to redistributive policies may also be touched upon. The degree to which the domestic market was overly constrained by bureaucratic interference and austerity measures may be analysed along with the significant drain imposed by defence spending. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## Question 6

**How significant was the Second World War as a factor in hastening Britain's imperial decline by 1951?**

A PASS answer (13-14 marks) The candidate will offer a review of the extent to which Britain had reduced her colonial possessions by 1951 and the primary reasons for this. Significant mention may be made of Indian independence and the reasons for it. Britain's financial difficulties after 1945 and the concept of global overstretch should also be made mention of, as well as the ideological position of the Labour party on this issue. The extent to which the war was a significant factor must be balanced against pre-war anti-colonialism. Reference should also be made to the attitudes of the USA and the Soviet Union to post-war British imperialism. Some account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A GOOD answer (15-17 marks) may also look at the reasons given by the likes of Darwin and MacIntyre for decolonisation and the extent to which financial constraints imposed by the war were significant in this process. The situation in the Middle and Far East should be referred to as well as the Indian situation. Candidates should review Labour policy in this period and offer an analysis as to the extent of its influence on the decolonisation process as well an analysis of the extent to which the empire was affordable after 1945. The reasons for the departure of Burma and Ceylon will be gone into and the way in which military weakness led to reducing overseas commitments. Greater account will be taken of different historical interpretations.

A VERY GOOD answer (18+ marks) will offer a more sophisticated analysis of the post-war international situation and the position Britain found itself in *vis a vis* the superpowers. Some appreciation of the financial pressure exerted by the USA to decolonise and to end imperial preference should be made as well as the innate hostility of the Soviets to British imperialism. The candidate may wish to explore the extent to which the war hastened an already ongoing process or build an argument around the global overstretch theory. Britain's notion of a Commonwealth of democratic countries should be referred to along with Bevin's reluctance to consider abandoning our commitments east of Suez. There will be clear evidence of understanding of the views of different historians.

## **Britain At War and Peace (1939–1951)**

### **Part 2**

#### **Question 1**

**How well do Sources A and B illustrate the differing arguments over the effectiveness of the bombing campaign against Germany in the Second World War?**

The candidate offers a constructive insight into the differing views on the issue of the effectiveness of the bombing campaign against Germany expressed in Sources A and B in terms of:

#### **Source A**

##### **Origin**

Secondary, modern historian who writes extensively on air warfare.

##### **Purpose**

Offers a very modern assessment of Bomber Command's achievements in a critical light.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- Lake's assessment of Harris is highly critical
- he asserts that Harris had an unrealistic sense of the achievements of the bombing campaign and it's overall effectiveness
- he claims that Harris was complacent in fully evaluating the campaign and was indeed dismissive of the armed forces' campaign on the ground and saw Coastal Command as a hindrance rather than a help
- Harris saw Bomber Command as the ultimate strategic weapon in winning the war.

#### **Points from recall providing a wider contextualisation**

The candidate should be able to engage in a historical debate on the alleged shortcomings of the policy of strategic bombing using recall such as:

- strategic bombing was ineffective and random
- German war production was never seriously disrupted by the campaign
- German morale may even have been strengthened rather than destroyed by the campaign
- the resources used to conduct this campaign could have been used more effectively in other theatres of war eg the Battle of the Atlantic and in troop support in North Africa
- it was costly in human life and expensive financially
- it was morally repugnant and involved the deliberate slaughter of innocent civilians
- mention may be made of historians such as Kitchen, Verrier and Keegan.

## **Points from Source B**

### **Origin**

Modern historian from secondary source.

### **Possible purpose**

To offer a historical interpretation of this issue in support of strategic bombing.

### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- that the strategic bombing campaign diverted resources and manpower away from the fighting fronts
- German bomber production was harmed as more fighter aircraft had to be produced
- other scarce resources had to be diverted to defending against the allied attacks
- the bombing campaign effectively limited Germany's capacity to expand her war production
- scarce resources such as synthetic oil had to be limited in their production.

### **Points from recall providing a wider contextualisation**

- the moral dimension should be examined thoroughly
- the impact on civilian morale in Britain
- the concept of strategic bombing as an effective second front by 1943 and this impact on Stalin's perception of Allied war effort
- the necessity of Germany deploying over 2 million people to man air defences or effect repairs
- that it undermined the reliability and morale of the German workforce and drained the battle fronts of scarce resources.

Candidates may engage in the historiographical controversy over this issue and refrain from merely citing statistics and subjective judgement. Clearly, in these two sources we have a summary of the core issues at stake in this debate.

Candidates should be able to engage in a wide ranging comparison of the two sides of this debate, making historiographical references where appropriate and demonstrating that they understand the controversy over the effectiveness and morality of strategic bombing.

### **Marks**

- 1-4** Vaguely written: doesn't answer the question or show understanding of the differing views in the sources; minimal explanation, little sense of context; merely redescribes the sources.
- 5-7** Fairly well written and some relevant points of explanation made: Shows a limited understanding of the differing views in the sources and contains a basic sense of context; lacks clear structure; points are made randomly, indicating little real grasp of their significance.
- 8-11** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points and sets the material in context fairly accurately. Shows a good factual grasp of the topic, an understanding of the differing views of the sources and a reasonably developed analysis.
- 12-16** Accurate, wide-ranging, and convincing argument; shows a clear understanding of the differing views in the sources; a solid grasp of context and significance of material, and well developed levels of relevant analysis.

## **Question 2**

**What light does Source C shed on the attitude that war work was an emancipating experience for women?**

The candidate offers a structured analysis of the source's use in illustrating the argument in terms of:

### **Origin**

Primary source from a woman welder written in 1942.

### **Possible purpose**

Personal reminiscences of wartime experience.

### **Points from source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- insinuation that women were not allowed to do skilled jobs in the workplace
- concept of being seen as second class citizens by male supervisors
- implication of supercilious attitude in allocation of menial tasks
- women unable to determine for themselves appropriate work-related tasks
- Agnes decides for herself what is appropriate for her to do thus emphasising her independence of thought and action
- note that a more senior woman was involved.. and that women discriminated against other women. The senior woman was in a welfare role (a perceived 'woman's job').

### **Points from recall providing a wider contextualisation**

- Marwick's argument that war work was a liberating experience
- the assertion that many new women joined the workforce and became used to being a breadwinner
- that this new found independence in the work-place translated into a greater degree of personal freedom and independence for women that was to be a permanent and lasting feature of the post-war period
- that the ending of the marriage bar was a prime example of this liberating effect
- that working women were to become a permanent feature of the industrial landscape
- that women were now less likely to remain within traditional sex-roles.

This source offers the candidate the opportunity to debate the issue over whether Agnes's demeaning treatment but her subsequent independence of action offer a representative picture of women's work place experience during the war. The candidate would be expected to introduce recalled information which may include;

- the extent and nature of Women's work in industry, agriculture and the armed forces during the war
- the extent to which historians like Marwick have argued that this work was the single most emancipating experience of the war for women
- the hostility met by women from trade unions and employers and the general repetitive nature of the work given to women
- the fear of dilution by male workers
- the notion that women should not get equal pay for equal work
- the extent to which women deserted the work place after the war ended
- arguments in this field from other historians rejecting the view war work was emancipating eg H L Smith and Penny Summerfield.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence as to the validity of the original proposition.

### **Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of the topic and reasonably developed relevant analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

### **Question 3**

#### **How well does Source D illustrate the development of consensus in British politics by 1951?**

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source D's analysis of the development of consensus, in terms of:

#### **Origin**

Secondary source from a prominent Conservative of the war and post-war period.

#### **Possible purpose**

To explain the nature and reasons behind Tory party policy in opposition after 1945.

#### **Points from the source which can be developed with additional explanation from recall**

- Butler explains the philosophy behind Tory party policy as an attempt to counter accusations of being a laissez-faire party and of possibly wanting to turn the clock back politically
- assertion that Tory party values post-war included a commitment to the welfare state and full employment
- Butler tries to assert that his party put these issues before any other domestic political objectives the party might have had
- he suggests that in doing so the Tory party was offering a credible political alternative to democratic socialism without being seen to be abandoning the collectivist ideal.

#### **Points from recall providing a wider contextualisation**

- details of Conservative party policy as developed through the Industrial Charter
- Conservative realisation that they could not move forward from the 1945 electoral defeat unless they embraced the core policies of full employment, a welfare state and a mixed economy
- the increased rapprochement between Conservatism and the Trade Union movement.
- historiographical review of this issue including the views of Addison that the war developed consensus between the two main parties, and refuted to a large degree by Jefferys
- the argument that substantial differences still existed between the rank and file of both parties in the post-war period despite seemingly similar aims and policies
- the notion of Butskellism as it appeared in the immediate post 1951 election
- the extent to which the social and economic policies of the Conservative party had actually moved to the left or whether political opportunism dictated this as a necessity
- Churchill's instructions that the Trade Union movement was not to be confronted
- whether the Conservative Party had achieved a credible political alternative to socialism by 1951.

**Marks**

- 1-3** Vaguely written; not answering the question; minimal explanation; little sense of context; merely re-describes the source.
- 4-5** Fairly well written; some relevant points of explanation made; a basic sense of context but lacking clear structure; points made randomly, indicating little real grasp of significance.
- 6-8** Clearly written and sensibly structured; explanation ranges over several relevant points; sets material in context fairly accurately; good factual grasp of the topic and reasonably developed relevant analysis.
- 9-12** Accurate, wide-ranging, clear and convincing argument; solid grasp of context and significance of material; well developed levels of relevant analysis.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]