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Part One: General Marking Principles for: History Advanced Higher

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this Paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the specific Marking Instructions for each question.

(a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these general marking principles and the specific Marking Instructions for the relevant question. If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader/Principal Assessor.

(b) Marking should always be positive ie, marks should be awarded for what is correct and not deducted for errors or omissions.

GENERAL MARKING ADVICE: History Advanced Higher

The marking schemes are written to assist in determining the “minimal acceptable answer” rather than listing every possible correct and incorrect answer. The following notes are offered to support Markers in making judgements on candidates’ evidence, and apply to marking both end of unit assessments and course assessments.
General Instructions

Markers are particularly asked to note the following points:

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

All markers will have their marking reviewed on an ongoing basis during the Central Marking diet. Scripts will be selected at random from each marker’s allocation. These will be reviewed by the Examining team. By doing this “marker check” procedure, the Examining team guarantees the equality of the marking standard across the 12 fields, and ensures that, for example an A in Renaissance is the same value as an A in Britain at War. Until scripts/markers have been standardised, marks awarded should be regarded as provisional, and written in pencil on Ex Supplements and/or scripts.

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

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

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

Open each envelope and:

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

Check that the candidates whose scripts are enclosed are those whose names are listed on the Mark Sheet.
**Marking Part 1: The essays**

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

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

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

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

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

Factors which do lead to an essay failing:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. **Relevance.** While relevance is important, it is not the sole criterion on which a response is judged. It is a question of degree; responses should be marked positively. A pass at the C level can be gained by an essay with enough relevance to convince the marker of its overall virtue; and a pass can be granted even despite the odd lapse or digression.
4. **Thoroughness.** This aspect of width of detail is clearly a major discriminating factor in determining a grade. It is NOT a pass-fail factor. If a candidate misses out what a marker thinks is a key factor, but comprehensively discusses a lot of other key factors, the A pass can still be awarded. While the candidate may seem to be presenting a very ill-balanced and distorted view of the width of relevant issues in the chosen title, that selectivity is the candidate’s privilege. Therefore the marker should mark the essay for what argument it does contain and not for the degree to which it conforms to the view of the marker.

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

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

6. **Conclusion.** This is an important aspect of the essay; it pulls it all together and shows the marker how the candidate has marshalled their facts and arguments. A good conclusion is often decisive in pulling the essay into the next higher marks band, and a weak conclusion will certainly hinder the chances of getting an A. However, the lack of a conclusion in itself is not a factor leading to an automatic fail.
Marking Part 2: The source questions

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

The “how fully” question (12 marks)

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

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

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

The “how useful” question (12 marks)

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

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

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

The “two-source” question (16 marks)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**EXAMPLE**

```
Essay 3            16
Essay 5            14

---
Source Q1          8
Source Q2          6
Source Q3          13

Total            27
```

```

---

Total            57
```

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

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

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

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

Special Assessment Arrangements

Transcriptions

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

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

Suspected Malpractice

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

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

Marker Report

This is an important mechanism in our procedures for quality assurance. Comments on candidate performance and the workings of the marking scheme contribute towards the Principal Assessor’s report. This report should be completed before leaving the Central Marking venue.
Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is for the candidate to examine arguments relating to the extent to which Northern Britain was changed by Rome’s presence. Candidates can examine evidence for social change and for social continuity. Candidates might wish to consider the evidence for short and long term change or for social, political, economic change. Candidates will be expected to reach a conclusion on the extent to which Roman influences impacted on society.

The candidate might use evidence such as:

Points discussing the view that Northern British society was changed:

- Fraser argues that the idea of native Celts as “preserving their natives ways...untouched” is “utter fairy tale”
- “The peoples had been snug in bed with the Roman elephant during the Roman Iron Age” (Fraser)
- The idea that the North was unchanged by Rome is a reflection of popular culture, embracing “the uplifting idea of a free Caledonia, where native Celts manfully and womanfully preserved their independence.” (Fraser)

Socially/Politically

- Native religion was changed – brought Christianity to the Frontier Zone
- Native society gained fledgling signs of literacy – Traprain Law
- John Mann (1974) suggests the threat of Rome led disparate Iron Age tribes to amalgamate – he suggests the creation of the Pictish Confederacy
- Rome inadvertently created the Picts, forced to become a larger, more centrally controlled group to pose a serious military threat to Rome
- Fewer tribal names are recorded post Roman invasion compared to those documented in Ptolemy’s Geography – testify to amalgamation
- Rome’s presence and influence destabilised native power sources – access to Roman goods and the ability to emulate them became an important source of power and prestige
- Society may have been destabilised – societies became too reliant on Roman goods, elite relying on Roman exotica to display their power – when Roman goods were not available societies were destabilised or collapsed
Economically/Material Culture
- Trade, diplomacy and tribute flourished during the Roman occupation – plugs Northern Britain into Mediterranean network
- Hoards of silver coins, especially North of the Forth, such as at Birnie, Moray, suggests Rome “bought peace” – either to pay off troublesome tribes or sweeten friendly tribes – bolstered native system of control
- 40% of native sites from Southern Scotland revealed Roman finds – indicates Roman presence and influence
- Roman finds are relatively abundant and cannot be explained away as exclusively status items – Roman finds associated with jewellery and feasting are not uncommon and may indicate a change in Iron Age practices

Points discussing the view that Northern British society was unchanged:
- Rome had minimal impact – the presence of Rome was “but a hiccup in the development of Iron Age societies in Scotland which had no lasting impact” (Hanson 2003, 216, Keppie 1989, 72-73, Harding 2004, 179-199, 203)
- Roman interlude was little more than a series of brief military interludes
- Hanson highlights the short time-scale of Rome’s presence in the North – he points out that the total period of Roman occupation of any substantial part of Scotland was limited to some 40 years
- Roman occupation never extended to even half of Scotland’s land mass – all known forts are south of the Highland Boundary Fault
- Society was unchanged as Rome’s temporary presence was exclusively military – largely temporary camps, forts and fortlets – not occupied for any real length of time
- Romans did not have to change the North economically as evidence suggests much of the produce needed during the occupation was actually imported, eg, wheat
- Impact of the presence of Rome on the nature of settlements has been overestimated
- Have a picture of broad continuity, not disruption or change, “the core remained largely untouched” (W Hanson)

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historian’s commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- **J Fraser**: suggests that the north was changed
- **W Hanson**: maintains that Roman presence was of little consequence in terms of changing Iron Age society
- **J Mann**: argues that tribal amalgamation and long term tribal change occurred due to Rome’s influence
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to investigate the possible purposes of the Pictish symbol stones, examining the evidence, which suggests they were of spiritual significance in conjunction with alternative explanations such as the stones, were political statements, territorial markers or personal inscriptions. The candidate will reach a conclusion on the primary significance of the symbol stones.

Candidates might use evidence such as:

Evidence which may suggest that the Pictish symbol stones were of spiritual significance:

- Picts put symbols on small objects and on the walls of caves, but primarily they carved them on large stones that were set upright as a visible and important component of the Pictish landscape. Some 200 symbol stones have survived, from the Firth of Forth to the Northern and Western Isles.
- The interpretation of the meaning of the individual symbols, the function of the objects which carry them and their date excites furious debate.
- Hugely challenging to discern their meaning as W Cummin states, “like the Pictish language itself, the meaning of the symbols has been lost, almost without trace”.
- Professor Charles Thomas argues that the stones are headstones, and that the symbols are the ancient tattoo designs, which he further believes indicated the personal rank of the tattooed individual.
- “The most logical interpretation of the symbols is that they are identifications of the dead, or personal inscriptions where they occur on portable objects or cave walls. They were in effect names and/or titles, giving cultural identity/ancestry or history”. (Lloyd and Jenny Laing)
- Some symbol stones have been found in association with cairns such as Garbeg, Tillytarmount and Dunrobin Dairy Park – indicates they were a type of funerary marker.
- Many stones in Aberdeenshire have been found in kirkyards and other burial grounds, indicative of possible perpetuation of the location’s function (Picardy Stone, exposed a number of burials in the vicinity of the stones).
- It is suggested by Dr Ross Samson that the stones were memorial stones, and the symbols represent names - either the name of the dead person, or of the person who had the stone erected. Moreover not only are the stones burial markers but he suggests that they were often for women, indicative of women’s status in Pictish society.
- It is suggested that the symbols actually spell out Pictish names, deceased Picts with their names on memorials.
- Inga Gilbert and Edward Peterson maintain that stones don’t have a secular purpose but are of religious significance.
- In terms of religious significance the serpent on Aberlemno I represents the snake goddess, whilst the two discs represent An, the god of heaven and Ki, the god of earth. Adad is suggested to be a weather god symbolised by the rod of lightning and thunderbolt, names from Mesopotamian mythology have been applied to the Pictish symbols.
- Petersen argues the symbols were religious as “totemic symbols” such as the serpent on Aberlemno I was a totemic symbol of the Pictish serpent tribes whilst the concentric stone circles represented druidic sun worship.
- The crescent as seen on stones such as Aberlemno could represent moon worship (Peterson).
Evidence which may suggest that the Pictish symbol stones were of alternative significance:

Territorial/Lineage
- One suggested explanation for individual symbols is that they were representations of tribal names – for example ‘the people of the fish’, or ‘the wolf folk’
- Anthropologist Antony Jackson has suggested that the symbol stones are seen to identify lineages and the stones to be public statements of marriage alliances between lineages – and here the mirror and comb (symbol) is thought to indicate the endowment paid by one lineage to the other on the occasion of the marriage
- Jackson believed that animal symbols on stones represented lineages of the Southern Picts whilst geometric designs belonged to Northern Picts
- Examples of stones showing lineages could include Aberlemno I which according to A Jackson records a marriage between a man of the Double disc and Z rod lineage with a woman of the Serpent lineage, with mirror and comb signifying bride wealth or gifts

Memorials
- According to C Thomas, Aberlemno I could represent a memorial to a member of the Serpent Group who was a king and had died (represented by a broken spear). The memorial could have been erected by his widow (mirror and comb)
- The Class II stone at Aberlemno would have been a memorial to an underking (crescent) who later became a King (double disc)
- V rods, representing a broken arrow, like Z rods, can be taken as indicators of death
- Arguably the symbol stones are memorials to groups which resemble later Scottish clans – a type of early clan badge
- Thomas maintained that the symbols on the stones related to historical divisions within the Picts (serpent, eagle, goose, fish, boar, all represented groups) yet he could find no demonstrable territorial value
- Four kings and one king’s brother (Nechtan, Oengus, Talorgan, Kenneth son of Fert an Drust) are all identifiable in symbol stones – indicates that the stones may have been memorials to kings
- W Cummins suggests that the St Andrews Sarcophagus might be a memorial/tomb of Constantine son of Aed, “the son of the last recorded King of the Picts”

Writing
- Katherine Forsyth suggested the symbols might be a system of writing
- Alphabetical hieroglyphs is an idea touted and in need of comprehensive study

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Lloyd and Jenny Laing, maintain the stones were of markers, either of territory, the dead or individuals achievements
- Sally Foster, “They appear to make most sense when looked at in the light of Celtic religious beliefs and practices”
- W Cummins, argues Class I and II stones were memorials, as were some Class III stones
Question 3

The aim of this essay is to enable the candidate to analyse the nature of Northern Britons society. Candidates could examine the extent to which warfare dominated society relative to other features which could include Christianity, kingship

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Britons lived in the lands between Loch Lomond and the Solway Firth and reaching in to Strathclyde. Their principal fort and capital town was Dumbarton, otherwise known as Alcuid, or the Rock of the Clyde. Perceptions of British kingdoms in Early Historic Scotland focus on the Kingdom of Strathclyde due to its longevity.

Warfare played a central role in the lives of Northern Britons:

- Britons, occupying the Lowlands, were sandwiched between the Picts in the North and the Angles and Saxons to the south. As the Angles expanded north, the Britons were forced to move west and south-west
- Seemingly endless bouts of warfare amongst Britons and their neighbours – documented accounts of battles and siege between Britons and Angles and Picts and Vikings
- St Patrick writes about society at the time of King Ceredig’s reign, describing a warrior society, warbands, capable of piratical raids on the Irish coast (even Ceredig’s name meaning ‘guledig’ or ‘wealthy’ indicates successful plundering
- Indications of a measure of sea power – able to raid the Irish shores
- Sporadic warfare between neighbours – Irish Annals record various battles including British king overthrowing king of the Picts “slew him and many of his men”, c.752
- Warrior values reflected in carvings at Govan
- Viking incursions are well documented and encroachment of competing powers would have been a constant
- Norse king, Olaf of Dublin captured Dumbarton Rock in 870, as recorded in Welsh Annals – the summit of Dumbarton Rock was destroyed and prisoners taken back to Dublin
- By the mid or late 5th century a successful British dynasty with an active warband was established on Dumbarton Rock, carrying out plundering raids against north-east Ireland
- Y Gododdin in the Book of Aunerin records heroic values, feasting, fighting and death in battle amongst the men of the Gododdin, leaving Dun Eidyn (Edinburgh) to fight the Angles of Deira
Factors which may suggest/support the view that other forces shaped society:

Religion
- Britons were a Celtic people, on the fringes of the old imperial province and thus may have retained a thin veneer of Romanitas/Christianity
- The Britons of Strathclyde were Christian – there are 5th and 6th century Christian stones at Kirkmadrine and Whithorn in Galloway
- St Ninian had established his religious community in the Whithorn area
- St Kentigern allegedly arrived to some vestiges of Christianity in the second half of the 6th century (according to Jocelin of Furness’ Life of Kentigern)
- The Britons of Strathclyde were educated in the gospels by the missionary Mungo (dearest beloved) - real name Kentigern and Glasgow became his centre. The Britons were quicker to accept Christian teachings than either the Picts or the Angles
- Govan was the most important religious site in the Brittonic Kingdom of Strathclyde. Archaeological digs have revealed that a curved side of the graveyard follows the line of a Dark Age boundary ditch that would have marked out an ancient monastic enclosure
- Carved stones, crosses and sarcophagi from Govan highlight value attributed to Christianity, warfare and kingship
- See early Christian burials across British lands – early cemeteries with dug or trench like graves suggest unified Christian church (Hallow Hill)

Kingship/Kingdoms
- Annals document an array of British kingdoms including Kingdom of Strathclyde and Kingdom of Gododdin, based in Edinburgh
- British kingdoms have fluctuating fortunes reflecting instability of the period – Rheged, Gododdin and Elfet (Elmet) are swallowed up by Northumbrian advance during 7th century
- Royal centres have been recorded – Parterich/Partick, Dumbarton, Rutherglen
- Kingdom of Strathclyde flourished around 7th century whilst the Kingdom of Gododdin was destroyed in c.640
- From about the middle of the sixth century, Kings of Strathclyde emerge as historical figures
- King Rhydderch (580-614?) – documented accounts of raids, plundering and concern of enemies slaughtering him
- Kings closely tied to the Christian church – recorded as seeking advice from Saints
- Intermarriage between royal dynasties – King Beli (c.627AD) may have married a lady of Northumbrian royal descent, ‘son of the king of Dumbarton’ was a very powerful king of the Picts, Brude son of Beli, who defeated Angles at Battle of Dunnichen = complex web of family alliances and power bases
- North British kings bolstered power through alliances with an array of neighbouring kingdoms such as Angles in Bernicia c.590
Typical Celtic concerns
- Britons were in many regards much like their neighbours – Celtic kingdoms
- Little difference between the Britons and their neighbours in terms of social organisation – “fully fledged barbarian realms”
- They spoke an ancient form of Celtic language that has been classified as Brythonic or Brittonic. It is identified by linguists as a member of the P-Celtic form of languages spoken by other Britons, Welsh and Cornish

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

- **T Clarkson**: clearly highlights that “warfare played a central role in the life of a kingdom”, king and aristocracy relied on warfare and obligations to secure and maintain power
- **A Smyth**: refers to the Britons as “a full-blooded barbarian Celtic aristocracy”
- **A MacQuarrie**: emphasises the role of kingship and intermittent warfare
- **S Foster**: discusses that they are a typical post-Roman Celtic kingdom
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to examine and analyse the extent to which St Columba’s role in the conversion process of Northern Britain’s has been exaggerated. The candidate would examine St Columba’s role in relation to both other individuals and other forces such as Rome, St Ninian, St Patrick and kingship before reaching a conclusion on the extent to which St Columba’s role has been exaggerated.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors examining St Columba's role in the conversion:

Columba's role has been exaggerated

- Adomnan’s Vita Sancti Columbae was largely a work of hagiography, seeking to highlight St Columba’s holiness by crediting miracles to his God given powers
- Adomnan’s testimony cannot be accepted at face value since not everything he wrote was necessarily true or accurate even though he did have access to the monastery’s own written and oral traditions
- Between St Columba’s death in 597 and the publication of the Vita c.700AD, old traditions passed down by monks were undoubtedly amended and embellished to suit the monastery’s needs
- Views of St Columba have been further skewed by “The Praise of Columb Cille”, an Irish poem supposedly composed around the time of St Columba’s death which extols St Columba’s ascetism and holiness
- Columba’s mission into Pictland led to only a small number of converts. We cannot even be sure that King Brude was one of them
- The main evangelising achievements should be credited to Columba’s successors in the abbacy of Iona – his cousin, Bainthe and his successor Abbot Laisren oversaw continuing Pictish conversion
- Bede and Adomnan suggest the conversion should be credited to St Columba but other monasteries and other saints receive little or no acknowledgement in the Iona centric annals and hagiography
Columba had a key role
- Consensus suggests that many men and women were important in the conversion of the North but two figures stand out as key: St Columba and St Ninian
- St Columba has been remembered as a key figure in the destruction of paganism, as founder of important religious settlements and as focal point of devotional cults
- Bede states that St Columba gave Christianity to the Northern Picts, coming to the North as an Irish monk in 563AD
- St Columba’s royal lineage ensured he had influence to wield, arriving in Argyll being granted land and hospitality by Pictish monarch, Brude (according to Bede) or King Conall of Argyll – allowing him access to the ruling elite
- St Columba founded a monastery on Iona, off Mull which became not only the base for his missionary work but for the evolving Celtic church
- St Columba exerted influence over Scots in Dal Riata and Pictish communities in the Western Isles and adjacent mainland
- St Columba acted as spiritual mentor to Kings of Argyll, namely Aedan mac Gabrain
- St Columba led missionary work among the Picts, starting with their overking, Brude, son of Maelchon (Prior to 584) – upon meeting Brude’s closed fort gates he used his divine assistance to open the gates – in reality this was a formal embassy from Iona to the pagan north-east – indicates his real role in the conversion process
- St Columba’s negotiation paved the way for the establishment of churches in Pictish territory though there was no mass evangelisation of the Picts
- St Columba’s mission can be credited with sowing seeds of Christianisation

Real beginnings of Christianity in Northern Britain lie with Rome
- Romans practiced a polytheistic religion, embracing many cults one of which was the exotic eastern cult of Christianity which was embraced by emperor Constantine the great in the early 300s and promoted as the official religion of the Empire
- Christian communities were in existence in Southern Scotland by the 5th century – early Galloway Christian monuments show Christianity prior to St Columba
- Early 6th century monuments from Galloway record the presence of priests and talk in terms of “initium et finis” (the Beginning and the End)
- In former Roman territories Christianity remained even after the Romans had withdrawn however further north, farther from those once Roman territories, the Christian influence was barely felt at all

St Patrick and Coroticus
- The earliest literary reference for “Scottish Christianity” is from the writings of St Patrick in the 2nd half of the 5th century
- Patrick was a Briton from a Christian family of wealth and status – having been captured by Irish pirates he nurtured a desire to bring the Irish into the Christian fold, escaping to Britain, training as a priest before returning to Ireland
- When Patrick’s Irish community was raided by Britons he wrote to their Christian King, Coroticus who may have been the first king to turn from paganism
- Clyde Britons were Christian by the time of St Patrick’s writing
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St Ninian

- To Bede and his contemporaries in 8th century Northumbria, the Southern Picts were converted by Saint Ninian of Whithorn
- Excavations from Whithorn suggest a Christian settlement existed from around 500AD, developing into Candida Casa
- Ninian was bishop of Candida Casa from where he executed miracles and converted the southern Picts
- However, as with St Columba Ninian's legacy is obscured by medieval hagiography, the Vita Niniani (Life of Ninian) “essentially a marketing brochure produced by, or on behalf of, the primary cult-centre of a long dead saint”

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

- **T Clarkson:** Contends that local St Columba’s role in conversion has been exaggerated because of medieval hagiography
- **A Smyth:** Recognises that St Columba alone was not responsible for the conversion of Picts in Northern Scotland
- **D Meek:** Suggests that evaluations of St Columba are caught between “faith and folklore” with his profile being subjected to rearrangement since earliest days
Question 5

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to examine and analyse the extent to which the union of Picts and Scots was a result of having to face a common enemy. Candidates could examine other factors or forces which led to the union of Picts and Scots such as influence of the church, the role of Kenneth mac Alpin, common Celtic inheritances, intermarriage, trade and cultural exchange.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Picts and Scots united to form Alba following AD 800 and the acquisition of the Pictish kingship by the Dal Riatan kings. The creation of a new kingdom comprised much of Pictland but was ruled by Scottish kings.

Picts and Scots united because of a common enemy
- The threat posed by the Vikings necessitated a shift of power to the east
- The Vikings upset the existing balance of power – daring Viking raids into Pictland gave the Scots an opportunity to free Dal Riata and to exploit weakness amongst the Pictish nobility
- The threat presented by the Vikings prompted reorganisation amongst native elites
- In response to the Viking threat dynastic marriages may have been made to underpin alliances
- Attacks weakened the Britons of Strathclyde and Angles of Northumbria, allowing Scottish leadership to expand

Picts and Scots united because of common Christian faith
- The church and its associated elite put pressure on Scots and Picts to unite
- The church played a crucial role in the union of Picts and Scots
- The church was concerned to promote a strong united kingdom - unity under a consolidated kingship would lessen violent rivalries and instability
- The church was keen to promote economic development, which could be nurtured through the stability provided by a consolidated Christian king
- Churchmen were the King’s “right-hand men” – administrators and propagandists, maintaining the mechanisms of government, seeking the stability which unity would bring
- Church would have brought a unifying language to Scots and Picts
- Evidence of the church uniting Scots and Picts comes from the endurance of Columba as the Scottish saint until eventually subordinated by St Andrew
- Evidence that the church united Scots and Picts comes from the continued use of Iona as a burial site for Scottish kings until the end of the 11th century

Picts and Scots united because of Kenneth MacAlpin
- Traditionally, history has tended to pin the creation of Alba on to Kenneth MacAlpin
- In 839, the slaughter of Pictish nobility at the hands of the Vikings opened Kenneth MacAlpin’s claim to a vacant Pictish throne and a chance to re-establish Constantin Mac Fergus’ dynasty over both peoples
- MacAlpin destroyed the remnants of the Pictish army in 841, according to legend, inviting surviving claimants to the throne from all seven Pictish royal Houses to a feast to settle things peacefully, “the Scots immediately slaughtered them all”
- Kenneth moved his capital to Scone and brought the relics of St Columba, including the Stone of Destiny – imposing his authority despite Pictish resistance
Picts and Scots were united due to common inheritance/culture

- The Picts and Scots had been in close contact for centuries and they shared a typical 'dark-age culture'
- Both Scots and Picts were pastoral, warrior societies inhabiting the same environment and speaking variants of the same language, they would have had much in common
- Little other than language set them apart
- Scots living in small kin groups near Pictish settlement, occupied by people with whom they had much in common would invariably be socially fluid
- One example of common cultural ideas comes from artwork: the existence of a boar in art – evidenced in the rock carving at Dunadd and at the fort of Burghead
- B Sykes has highlighted the closeness of Scots and Picts in terms of their gene pool – “the maternal gene pool is more or less the same in Pictland, in Celtic Argyll and the Highlands”
- The Picts had long been in the habit of having men from elsewhere assume the role of king
- Picts and Scots shared the same daily experiences and understanding and so could readily merge
- King lists suggest interrelationships between Picts and Scots – long mutual involvement

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

- **F Watson**, suggests one of the reasons why Alba began to emerge as a coherent entity was because much of northern Scotland and the western seaboard was now being devastated by the Vikings
- **S McHardy**, maintains that external pressure, largely from the Scandinavian incomers led to the combination of Scots and Picts yet it was in fact a natural development
- **A Smyth** advocates the view that the Gaelic move East and domination of the Picts has to be understood in relation to the Viking presence, a common enemy
- **I Walker** suggests that Kenneth MacAlpin was key in completing the process of unification
Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000

Part 2

Question 1

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

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

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source A as an adequate explanation of problems in identifying the purposes of Iron Age hillforts in terms of:

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- no definitive interpretation of the function of hillforts
- hillforts conveyed a variety of ideological statements, varying in time and place
- hillforts do not uniformly seem to be built with defence in mind
- Evidence for warfare, conflict and violence at Scottish forts and enclosures is slight and thus unconvincing

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Some of the largest and most prominent hillforts are in areas of Scotland occupied by Rome (Traprain Law and Eildon Hill North) – once perceived as adding weight to the view that hillforts were defensive against Rome
- Hillforts cluster in the south of Scotland – exposed to greater external threat than Northern contemporaries
- In times of stability hillforts cease to function defensively
- Hillforts appear stoutly defended: ramparts, ditches, enclosed, high ground, monumental – arguably, testimony to violence, however, actual military strength and symbolic military strength look similar in the archaeological record!
Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source

- “Invasionist” theory maintained that hillforts were the result of force and population movement – defences grew as waves of invaders swept across the country
- Excavation and dating advances now suggest that some hillforts pre-date “invaders” and defy invasionist model
- Some of largest hillforts are amongst the earliest, once seen as tribal capitals
- Some hillforts manifestly not defensive – too large to defend
- Hillforts may have served as seasonal meeting places, for festivals or fairs, for dispersed communities.
- Hillforts may have had a role in Iron Age ritual - having served as earlier burial sites (Traprain Law)
- Symbolic defences on forts may suggest the presence of warrior elites, using forts as symbols of power since hillforts give a type of dominance over the landscape
- Chesters, in East Lothian, is wholly ineffectual as a defensive fort, as immediately overlooked by a higher ridge – suggests the fort was built to glorify inhabitants or elite rather than defend them, marked by “sheer defensive incompetence” (I Armit)
- White and Brown Caterthuns, Angus, have multiple entrances (9 on Brown Caterthuns) – given that entrances are the weakest point in any structure, they seem to be inviting more than deterring access
- Hillforts built to give occupants or elite physical dominance of the surrounding landscape
- Hillforts demanded collective manpower, upkeep and repair – a constant method of asserting and reinforcing authority
- Hillforts and their remodelling may represent the coming to power of new chiefs or kings, keen to legitimise their position
- Some hillforts show little evidence of settlement and indicate that they were a focus for ritual or ceremonial activities, chosen due to their topographical setting (Dundee Law, excavated by S Driscoll)
- Likely that hillforts may have housed a small permanent population of priests, craftsmen or local nobility

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

- I Armit supports the new idea that hillforts reflect fragmented social groups, seeking to reinforce authority, rather than permanent settlements, they should be seen as places where people would congregate at special times
- S Piggott developed the invasionist idea that forts served to defend natives from the instability brought about during the Roman advance
- I Armit and IBM Ralston emphasised that recent work plays down the idea of hillforts as defensive, stressing their social implications: the command and mobilisation of labour, the territoriality and the authority implicit in their scale and location, “there is no a priori reason to link warfare with hillfort construction”

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source A is helpful in offering a full explanation of the problems in identifying the purposes of hillforts.
Question 2

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)

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

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)

These 10 marks will be awarded for:

[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians’ views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources B and C about the differing views of relationships between Vikings and natives in Orkney and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source B

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views

Source B
- this transformation in building styles indicating the taking over of the island by the Vikings
- hapless Picts were either driven out or put to the sword
- a radical change in building style showed the dramatic alterations in the way in which life was lived with the houses at Birsay
- altered perceptions of social life and social relationships

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Birsay had been a place of some importance prior to the arrival of the Vikings, symbol stones shows local ruler and his warrior retinue – thus a desirable target for Vikings, keen to dominate the existing social structure
- The farming economy continued at Birsay, indicative of Norse settlement in their new home from home
- Vikings essentially took over existing strongholds and farms
- Norse style buildings appeared, radically changing the existing landscape
- Farmland was controlled by incoming Norsemen
- That Pictish buildings and Pictish people seem to have been subsumed by Vikings is in line with the view that Vikings crushed Picts at Birsay on Orkney
Source C

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- The view that Picts and Vikings exclusively clashed and that Picts were subjected to Viking oppression is questionable traditional view of violent extermination or at best slavery at the hands of the Vikings was challenged
- Viking sites with native artefacts suggests co-existence Norse farm which had itself been built on top of the ruins of an earlier Pictish farm...
- Vikings clearly did not exterminate natives since they continued to trade and interact with natives, using their material culture but normal native Pictish types of tiny bone pins and decorated bone combs were found. They implied that the Viking newcomers were able to obtain domestic equipment from a native
- Integration occurred in Orkney if not in many other places some degree of integration of the two communities

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Not only was there continuity in domestic material culture, it is suggested that there was continuity in land administration in Orkney
- The presence of Pictish artefacts on Scandinavian sites (Native pins, pottery and reindeer antlers) appear to reflect a continuing Pictish presence and may signal integration
- Ritchie envisages peaceful colonisation at Birsay, Buckquoy and other key sites across Orkney
Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources

- Although power centres and ownership may have transferred into the hands of Vikings it is dubious whether there was a real change in the make-up of the land.
- At some sites, the Vikings do not build over existing sites but establish new farms – at Jarlshof in Shetland, the long-lived Norse farm had no earlier Pictish predecessor.
- At Maes Howe, Vikings re-use an earlier Neolithic burial chamber – arguably indicative of their control of the upper levels of society since they were evidently entitled to or able to press the tomb back into service for a Viking lord.
- Place name evidence suggests Scandinavian colonisation.
- In Orkney names of natural features and habitations are dominated by Scandinavian elements.
- In Orkney it is suggested that colonisation was ‘wholesale’.
- In Orkney, at Skail, on the east coast of the mainland, archaeologists documented a ‘clean break’ in the cultural continuity of the site though some native graves were reopened by subsequent Norse burials.
- At Birsay and Buckquoy there is evidence for assimilation whilst at Pool, Sanday there is evidence for the regeneration of the site when new Norse influences brought stimulus to the area.
- There may be place-name evidence indicative of a period of bilingualism followed by the adoption of the more fashionable Norse language, eg Papi ‘priest’ or ‘Christian’ may reflect integration.
- That the Norse arrived to an empty land is no longer thought to be consistent with the archaeological evidence, so there had to be some relationship between Picts and Viking.
- Brian Smith vigorously argues that the native population was massacred by incoming Scandinavians.
- However, it is possible that Scandinavians would not have wanted to destroy a free source of labour and may have preferred to enslave the Pictish population.
- C Morris suggests that there was either amiable integration or the Pictish finds in Norse settlements reflect the disturbance of Pictish layers in the Norse period.

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

- C Hough: suggests pre-Norse names and ways have not been disguised in the archaeological record but replaced.
- A Ritchie: Excavation of a Pictish Farmstead, Buckquoy, Orkney is adamant “there can be no doubt that some form of social integration between Picts and Norsem man existed…”
- S Clouston: maintains a direct response that the Norsemen brought their swords and if the inhabitants were numerous and offered resistance, they fought them – a type of “chance your luck but always bring your gun” approach.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources B and C are helpful in offering a full perspective on the ways in which Vikings and natives interacted in Orkney.
Question 3

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source D as evidence for/of difficulties faced by Severus during his invasion of North Britain, in terms of:

Provenance:
- Dio Cassius, a Roman senator of Greek descent, wrote a History of Rome, in 80 books, covering last years of the republic
- Credited as writing a very full, better account than many other Roman historians, having had opportunity for historical investigation due to the offices he held
- Dio Cassius held high offices, was a friend of several emperors – represents Roman version of events
- Wrote sometime in the early 3rd century under Severus or Caracalla, both of whom he knew

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Untold topographic difficulties - forests, high ground, swamps, rivers
- Severus couldn’t persuade the enemy to meet in pitched battle
- The enemy wore down the Romans and ambushed them
- Severan troops killed their own to prevent native subjugation

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Under Severus a large army headed up Dere Street to the Forth, with a clear east coast focus
- Failing to draw natives into pitched battle means that Rome found herself in the nightmare of guerrilla activity
- Some academics suggest that Severus built a pontoon bridge of boats to cross the Tay
- The huge losses [50,000] have been developed by some academics who maintain that the scale of death was tantamount to genocide
Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source

- Dio Cassius also reports that Severus saw that his sons were making legions enervated by idleness and was prompted to invade – difficulty of bringing two debauched sons
- Severus was unwell, knowing his fate having been told by seers that a thunderbolt had struck a statue of his, erasing letters from his name
- Severus' sons were plotting against one another and even against Severus himself
- Antonius (Caracalla) attempted to kill his father outright with his own hand as they rode to discuss details of a treaty with the Caledonians
- Endless revolts against Severus - Caledonians and Maeatae repeatedly rebelled
- Severus challenged by a coalescence of barbarians as Caledonians and Maeatae united in face of Severan presence, tales of Roman savagery towards their neighbours (Maeatae) brought them (Caledonians) into the fray
- Severus did receive pledges of peace from the barbarians and returned to his base in York
- Severus died in 211 in York and his successor, Caracalla, shared little of his father’s enthusiasm for the northern campaign
- Logistical difficulties for Severus - The navy was required to supply the vast army as indicated by the rebuilding of coastal grain stores such as at South Shields and Cramond

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

- **T Clarkson** highlights the extent to which Severus faced a united opposition from the Caledonians and Maeatae
- **Whittington and Edwards**: have suggested that scale of opposition forced Severus to embark on a local genocide
- **Adversum Paganos**, Against the Pagans, records a number of difficult engagements for Severus in Northern Britain, prompting Severus to separate those whom he had conquered from the ‘unconquerable’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source D is useful as evidence of the difficulties Severus faced during his invasion of North Britain.
Scottish Independence (1286-1329)

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to consider the historian’s description in the light of Bruce’s conduct during the Great Cause, including the arguments and manoeuvrings he used in pursuit of winning the kingship. The candidate might seek to explain, and seek to justify, why Bruce behaved as he did in order to reach a conclusion as to the validity of the description.

Factors which may support the description:

- Bruce was one of the first to accept Edward I’s claim to overlordship before the proceedings began (Balliol was one of the last)
- Bruce’s case was far more complex than Balliol’s
- So Bruce had to work harder to substantiate his claim
- Bruce claimed Alexander II had designated him heir apparent in 1238 after the death of his first wife, Joan, when he had no children
- Bruce failed to produce evidence to support this claim
- Bruce made a deal with another claimant, Florence, count of Holland
- Florence claimed that earl David had resigned the rights of himself and his heirs to the kingship
- Florence’s claim was based on his descent from earl David’s younger sister, Ada
- The legal hearings were suspended to give Florence time to find proof
- Bruce and Florence agreed that if either gained the kingship he would grant the other one-third of the kingdom as a fief
- The agreement cleared the way for the Bruce v Balliol hearings to go ahead
- The ‘winner’ would then take on Florence
- Ultimately Florence’s claim floundered: he was unable to provide adequate documentation
- Even some of the Bruce-appointed auditors, eg the bishop of Glasgow, agreed with Edward’s judgement in favour of Balliol
- On losing the Bruce v Balliol stage, Bruce threw in his lot with John Hastings
- Hastings argued in favour of the application of English law of partition of baronies
- For Scotland was not a proper kingdom, argued Hastings
- He claimed one-third of the territory
- Bruce, having earlier argued the kingdom was impartible, now supported the argument for division
- There was precedent in England for division of an earldom
- But not in Scotland, argued Balliol
- The Hastings argument was rejected
- Following judgement in favour of Balliol: Bruce passed the family claim to his son; who passed the title of earl of Carrick to his son so the latter might avoid having to pay homage to Balliol
Factors which may contradict the statement

- Primogeniture was being gradually accepted as the custom, but as yet there was no law of primogeniture
- Bruce’s claim rested on proximity – nearness of degree
- He was one generation younger than John Balliol and John Hastings
- Among the descendants of earl David, he was the only survivor of his generation
- There were precedents
- King John succeeded his brother Richard in England though primogeniture favoured John’s nephew Arthur
- Alexander III’s tailzie would have given precedence to a daughter over the Maid, even though the Maid was the child of his first-born daughter, Margaret
- Primogeniture, claimed Bruce’s lawyers, did not apply to women
- He cited the exclusion of women from public office
- Balliol could only claim through his mother, Dervorguilla and could have no better right than she
- If she had been alive, Bruce would have been preferred: male blood was more worthy than female blood
- He advocated recourse to special laws which applied to kings: natural law, the law by which kings reign, and which made a kingdom impartible
- He rejected the use of custom or ‘common law’ which applied to ordinary people and tenants
- He spoke, too, of imperial or Roman law
- When Edward consulted Paris lawyers, most recommended using local law: failing that – nearness by degree: Bruce had a case
- Having failed to win the Bruce v Balliol round he was justified in trying to get what he could by supporting the case of John Hastings

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

- **Archie Duncan** writes of Bruce’s ‘characteristic deviousness’, and how “The historian privy to the dodging and weaving of Robert Bruce may find little sympathy for him when he received his come-uppance. He may have been badly advised and acted inconsistently … but his case was by no means weak”.
- **Amanda Beam** writes of Bruce producing “at least five documents as a means to cover all his bases, illustrating his weaker claim”.
- **Peter Traquair** suggests that Bruce’s deal with Florence before the proceedings got underway was a sign of the weakness of his case
- **Colm McNamee** describes how Bruce’s guile during the proceedings is to be marvelled at; he describes his later conversion to the idea of dividing the kingdom as a ‘fallback position’; Bruce was “determined to get something out of the Great Cause”
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to consider the importance of the political community as a factor explaining King John’s inability to exert royal authority. The candidate might also consider other factors such as his inexperience and his relationship with Edward I to help make a balanced judgement.

Evidence which supports the importance of ‘an increasingly assertive political community’:

- King John relied on many of the same magnates who had latterly worked with Alexander III
- These magnates steered the kingdom following Alexander III’s death
- They created the Guardianship
- They negotiated with Edward I
- Treaty of Birgham-Northampton shows their determination to secure the kingdom’s long-term independence
- And their roles in its administration
- The Comyns and their allies were key players in the political community
- They could be seen as a force for stability
- John Balliol was linked to the Comyns by marriage: his sister married John Comyn, lord of Badenoch, who was a guardian
- The political community had grown used to a central role in government
- Only natural that an inexperienced king should rely on an experienced political community
- Evidence of resumption of normal government activity in King John’s reign: summoning parliaments, creating new sheriffdoms
- Political community may have pressurised him to deprive Macduff of his disputed estates in Fife: badly advised
- Macduff’s subsequent appeal to Edward I would rebound on King John
- When John was initially summoned to answer the Macduff case at first he did not appear nor send attorneys: badly advised
- Magnates angry when John was summoned to support Edward’s war against France
- Unheard of since reign of Malcolm IV
- 1295 Council of Twelve formed: to beef up John’s government? Or to remove executive power from him?
- English chroniclers, eg Lanecrosts, write of political community preventing John from ruling
- Scottish “Gesta Annalia II” describes John still making decisions – with the advice of his community
- Political community may have asked Celestine V to issue bull releasing John from all promises to Edward I
- Council of Twelve may have pressurised John to make French alliance

King John’s inexperience:

- John not intended for kingship: he was a fourth son
- Probably intended for career in the Church
- No evidence of military or diplomatic service before 1292; brief spell as a royal clerk in Edward’s service
- John was not given time to gain experience as a king; less than four years
- Inexperience may have been a factor in why he was ‘sidelined’ in the war of 1296; he remained behind the scene
- It was the earls who led the two raids into England in 1296
- John was not present at the battle of Dunbar
Relationship with the king of England:
- John experienced nothing but interference from Edward I
- John held lands in England for which he performed homage
- Edward was godfather to John’s son: Edward
- Edward had become increasingly involved in Scottish affairs during the Guardianship
- Edward demanded recognition of his overlordship of Scotland
- John had recognised Edward’s overlordship at Norham; and again after being awarded the kingship
- January 1293 John sealed agreement to annul Birgham-Northampton: way open for Edward’s active application of his overlordship
- The ‘test cases’ of the appellants undermined John’s authority, especially that of Macduff
- John refused the first summons to appear before Edward
- Edward issued a series of rules should John refuse to answer
- When John appeared later in 1293 it was a humiliating experience
- John may have agreed to support Edward’s war with France on visit to England in June 1294
- Magnates angry when John returned and Edward summoned military support
- Final straw: Council of Twelve sought alliance with France: war
- John failed to answer a summons to appear before Edward in October 1295
- Edward summoned army to deal with ‘contumacious vassal’
- Not all of the community exerted influence
- The Bruces played no central role in Scottish affairs during John’s reign

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Ranald Nicholson describes how Balliol set out to be no less a king than his predecessors
- Amanda Beam writes of Balliol not being knightly or warrior figure, but rather coming to the throne as a middle aged cleric who might have been content with such a lifestyle and who constantly found himself torn between ‘his loyalty and obligation to Edward I as an English lord and his responsibility to the Scots as their king’
- Alan Young suggests that the Comyn party, because of their experience, held the reins of power
- Archie Duncan writes of the appeals: ‘Thus the king of Scots must trot to Westminster at the beck of any disgruntled subject, bearing the record of his court to be inspected for faults’
Question 3

The aim of the essay is to allow the candidate to consider the nature and importance of the contribution of William Wallace to the independence struggle between 1297 and 1305 in relation to the contributions of the other Scots who participated in the struggle, and thereby reach a conclusion on the validity of the viewpoint.

Candidates might use evidence such as:

Factors which may help assess the contribution of Wallace:

- Wallace’s involvement in the murder of the sheriff of Lanark, the failed raid on Scone, the battle of Stirling Bridge
- His role in the revival of the guardianship
- His apparent charisma and ability to attract a band of followers
- And all this despite his humble origins
- His dispatch of letters to Lübeck and Hamburg declaring Scotland was ‘recovered from the power of the English’
- Despite his defeat at Falkirk the guardianship survived
- Taking the war into England by raiding the north
- Securing the appointment of William Lamberton as bishop of St Andrews; he would play a key role in the continuing struggle
- Raising and preparing an army in anticipation of Edward I invading Scotland in 1298
- Securing the support of some aristocratic leaders, despite the risks involved for them
- Evidence of a diplomatic role to the king of France and the pope post-Falkirk
- The constancy of his support for King John
- His refusal to give up when others did
Factors which may help assess the contribution of others:

- Role of the church in encouraging resistance
- Risings in the western Highlands by the Macdougalls first exposed the fragility of the occupation
- The significance of Andrew Murray’s activities in the north-east of Scotland
- Wallace did not act alone: with Richard Lundie at Lanark; with William Douglas on the raid on Scone; with Andrew Murray at Stirling Bridge
- The headings on the Lübeck and Hamburg letters suggest Murray was the senior guardian
- Evidence of presence of leading magnates at Falkirk: the Comyns, Macduff of Fife, Sir John Stewart
- It was Murray’s death which left the way open for Wallace to be sole guardian
- Re-establishment of the aristocratic guardianship in 1298 under Comyn and Bruce
- John Comyn a Guardian almost continuously until 1304
- The new Guardianship able to hold parliaments
- Victory at Roslin boosted Scottish morale
- The role of Lamberton; as a peacekeeper in the Guardianship
- Ingram Umfraville as a replacement for Robert Bruce
- Appointment of John de Soules by King John
- Baldred Bisset lobbying at the curia
- Diplomatic activity in Paris
- Improvement in King John’s situation: from the Tower to his French estates
- Earl of Carrick was the only significant defection to Edward I
- Scots’ ability to continue resistance very dependent on French alliance
- Peace of Asnières between England and France left Scots isolated
- John Comyn’s negotiation of reasonably lenient peace terms in 1304
- Edward’s recognition that he had to work with important Scots to secure his settlement: the Ordinances
- Stirling Castle garrison’s determination to hold out in 1304 - ‘For the lion’

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

- **Fiona Watson** writes that in terms of achievement the most significant rebellion in 1297 was that of the young Andrew Murray in the north-east.
- **A D M Barrell** writes that even after his defeat Wallace was not an insignificant figure as Edward I’s obsession with his capture amply testifies.
- **G W S Barrow** comments on the efforts of Baldred Bisset at the curia: ‘If Scotland possessed in William Wallace a military champion she could also boast a forensic champion in Master Baldred Bisset’
- **Alan Young** describes how the Comyns’ vast influence, especially in the north, contributed to the ability of the Guardianship from 1298 to restore a semblance of government and administration in those areas beyond Edward I’s control
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to consider the importance of luck in explaining the change in King Robert’s military fortunes between the defeat at Methven and the victory at Bannockburn. The candidate might also consider the importance of other factors, such as Robert’s qualities as a military leader or the nature and extent of the support he received, in order to reach a balanced conclusion.

Factors which may support the importance of luck:
• Bruce was lucky to escape both Methven and Dalry
• Death of Edward I in 1307: Edward II did not have his father’s obsession with Scotland or leadership skills; faced baronial opposition
• Short term: brief campaign by Edward II in south-west after Edward I’s death; Edward had other pressing priorities back home; the Gaveston factor
• Long term: lack of English intervention allowed Bruce to deal with Scottish enemies
• Those Scots opposed to Bruce were effectively abandoned by Edward II
• Both John Macdougall of Lorne and the earl of Ross wrote to Edward pleading for help
• Bruce’s Scottish enemies failed to act together in the civil war 1307-1309
• Most important enemies: Macdougall, Ross, Buchan geographically separated
• Fortunate in having men like Douglas who saw Bruce as his best opportunity of winning back family lands
• English campaigns of 1310-1311 and 1314: both poorly supported
• Edward II roused himself in 1314 following letter from Lothian lords plus reaction to Bruce’s ultimatum to disinherit pro-English Scottish lords
• Disposition of English forces at Bannockburn

Other factors which contributed to the turnaround:

Bruce’s leadership skills:
• John Comyn’s murder had removed his main rival as the natural leader of the Scottish opposition
• Bruce learned lesson of Methven; turned his back on conventional military tactics
• Mastered the art of guerrilla tactics: preparing and choosing the ground; ambush
• Guerrilla tactics enabled success in campaigns of 1307-1309: Glen Trool; Loudoun Hill; Inverurie; Pass of Brander
• Used geography to his advantage: Moray used as base to threaten Ross and Buchan
• Bruce used mix of terror (hership of Buchan; Galloway) and offer of truces to neutralise enemies (earl of Ross)
• Captured castles were dismantled
• Bruce had the ability to recognise and use to his best advantage the skills of his lieutenants
• Prepared ground for Bannockburn; position offered opportunity to retreat without giving battle
• Read situation at Bannockburn well; English camped overnight in confined area; low morale in English camp; high morale in Scottish following the de Bohun incident and other early skirmishing
• Unlike Wallace’s schiltroms at Falkirk, Bruce’s at Bannockburn were mobile
Bruce’s supporters:
- Edward Bruce played key role in suppressing opposition in Galloway
- Randolph became key adherent after initial reluctance
- Douglas, Randolph, Edward Bruce involved in capture of key castles
- And in raids into the north of England; though Bruce too
- MacDonaldis, rivals of the Macdougalls, supported Bruce
- In initial stages of Bruce’s campaigns in particular Bruce had support of key clerics: bishops of Glasgow, Moray, St Andrews, though short-lived (captured or fled)
- They encouraged men to join Bruce; likened the struggle against Edward I to a crusade
- By 1314 Bruce had a core of hardened veterans

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

- **Fiona Watson** writes that “Bruce was lucky – one of the key attributes of a successful leader”
- **Alexander Grant** is of the opinion that the transformation of Robert I’s fortunes was largely due to the skill he showed from 1307, learning from his early defeats to forsake conventional warfare for guerrilla warfare, at which he proved a genius. He writes, too, of the strategic importance of Moray: “it gave Robert internal lines of communication from which to strike at each of his enemies in turn, making them defend their own lands and preventing them from uniting against him”
- **Michael Brown** “The death of Edward I bequeathed his son a legacy of war and its costs. Though the new king enjoyed far greater Scottish support in the war against Bruce than his father had received in the conflict before 1304, Edward II’s handling of Scotland in the opening years of his reign was disastrous”
- **Colm McNamee** describes how Edward II, like his father, was anxious to maintain and increase the power of the English monarchy, and that included holding on to Scotland by every conceivable means, but he lacked his father’s single-mindedness, his powerful influence over the English feudal nobility and his over-bearing personality
Question 5

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to consider the importance of the overthrow of Edward II in enabling King Robert to secure eventual recognition of his kingship free from English subjection in 1328. The candidate may consider reasons for Robert’s failure to achieve his objective before 1327 and the importance of Edward II in that failure, and then may consider why, after Edward II’s deposition by Isabella and Mortimer, Bruce was able to use the change of regime to his advantage.

Evidence which may support the view that Edward II was an obstacle to Bruce securing recognition pre-1327:

- Despite defeat at Bannockburn Edward refused to give up claim to be Scotland’s overlord; too proud, too stubborn
- Edward still had resources to raise more armies; did so in 1319 and 1322
- Despite failure and humiliation of the 1319 and 1322 campaigns, no change in Edward’s attitude
- Edward had little sympathy with or understanding of the plight of the northerners
- Andrew Harclay Earl of Carlisle, so exasperated with Edward II’s refusal to make peace, he made separate peace with Bruce (1323)
- Edward II executed Harclay for treason on hearing of his treaty with Bruce
- In responding to Bruce’s offer of second truce, Edward addressed his terms to ‘the people of Scotland who are at war with him’; so no recognition
- Edward II angry with the pope’s eventual recognition of Bruce as King of Scots
- Edward II angry with the pope sanctioning the election of Scotsmen to Scottish bishoprics

Evidence which may support the view that there were other reasons why Bruce failed to secure recognition pre-1327:

- Different strategies from Bruce made little difference
- Raids into the north continued; became more organised and destructive; collection of blackmail, wreaked havoc with northern economy; but wealthy south was too remote from the north
- Bruce’s attempts to open a front in Ireland to damage Edward’s position there failed
- Edward Bruce was killed there; precipitated a succession crisis; emergency parliament at Scone
- Bruce failed to establish any link with the Welsh
- Best Bruce’s pressure could extract from Edward was truces: two year (1319), then thirteen year (1323)
- Bruce needed peace: Scottish economy in sorry state; war not universally popular; Bruce knew his kingship was vulnerable; could not continue to exert continuous military pressure
- No renewal of the French alliance until 1326 (Corbeil); no immediate help
Evidence which may support the view that the deposition of Edward II in 1327 was the key factor in Bruce securing recognition:

- Invasion of England by Isabella and Mortimer 1326 and deposition of Edward II 1327
- Initial reaction of Isabella and Mortimer: force sent north to deal with Douglas and Randolph; humiliated, given the run-around by the Scots
- Young Edward III almost captured
- Politically and financially Isabella and Mortimer needed peace
- Approached Bruce regarding opening negotiations
- Bruce insisted that young Edward III first concede that English kings, by claiming overlordship, had brought ‘affliction’ on both kingdoms; a medieval War Guilt clause
- Formal recognition of Bruce’s kingship free of English subjection conceded in the subsequent Treaty of Edinburgh-Northampton

Evidence which may show that there were other reasons why Bruce secured recognition after 1327:

- Bruce renewed hostilities on day of Edward III’s coronation; claimed his truce had been with Edward II
- Bruce campaigned in Ireland, Douglas and Randolph invaded northern England in 1327
- Bruce joined Douglas and Randolph in the north
- New strategy: brought siege engines; laid siege to major castles; talked openly of annexing Northumberland

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

- **Steve Boardman** writes that Bannockburn failed to deliver independence. “The English realm could absorb one defeat; England could always generate another army which could reverse the effects of Bannockburn"

- **David Cornell** writes that it was not Bannockburn that ultimately brought the English to the negotiating table but the long years of attritional warfare that followed. “Indeed 13 years after Bannockburn it had been necessary for Bruce to undertake one final campaign to pressurise the English into reaching a definitive peace settlement”

- **G W S Barrow** – ‘Robert Bruce and the community of the realm of Scotland’ - believes that peace would have come much sooner if King Robert had enjoyed the support of the papacy and the king of France, an advantage which King John and the Guardians had benefited greatly from down to 1302

- **Michael Brown** describes how the regency of Isabella and Mortimer was much more vulnerable to military pressure than Edward II had been and how for the first time, an English government was ready to seek peace ‘in language acceptable to Bruce’
Scottish Independence (1286-1329)

Part 2

Question 1

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source A as evidence of the nature of the relationship between the Guardians and King Edward I in terms of:

Provenance:
- Identification of the Guardians: originally six, by March 1290 four: bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow; John Comyn, lord of Badenoch, James the Steward; appointed by the political community on the death of Alexander III
- Identification of the role of the Guardians: wardens of the kingdom on behalf of the ‘nearest by blood’ to the late Alexander III: ie the Maid of Norway, ‘our lady’
- Acting in an official and executive capacity as spokesmen on behalf of the political community of the kingdom: bishops, abbots, prior, earls, barons
- Written shortly after the Treaty of Salisbury of 1289, negotiated between Scottish, Norwegian and English envoys, to arrange for the Maid’s arrival in Britain

Points from the source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views:
- The Guardians appreciate that Edward I and his ancestors have been good neighbours and Scotland has benefited as a result
- The news that the pope has granted dispensation so that a marriage can take place between the Maid and Edward’s son is welcomed by the Guardians
- The Guardians give their consent, urge Edward to do the same and initiate arrangements for the marriage
- The Guardians wish to discuss matters regarding the status of the kingdom in the event of such a marriage taking place and how this might be safeguarded
Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source:
- Recent relations between the two kingdoms had been good; Henry III had been called on to ensure political stability during the early years of the minority of Alexander III
- Alexander III and Edward I were brothers-in-law; correspondence between them reveals a relationship based on mutual respect
- Since the death of Alexander III in 1286 the Guardians sought to keep Edward informed of developments in the kingdom
- Although the Treaty of Salisbury (1289) did not arrange for a marriage between the Maid and Edward of Caernarfon, the possibility of such a marriage was surely discussed
- Papal dispensation was necessary because the Maid and Edward were second cousins; the Maid's great grandfather was Edward of Caernarfon's grandfather
- There need be no surprise at the Guardians' welcome for such a marriage: both Alexander II and Alexander III had married into the English royal family
- The marriage could have implications for the kingdom's short-term and long-term status
- The Guardians sought to secure guarantees for the kingdom's continued independence: they would have remembered Edward I's efforts to secure recognition of his overlordship from Alexander III

Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source:
- Alexander III had successfully resisted Edward I's attempts to seek recognition of his overlordship – 'I hold my kingdom of God alone'
- Neither Alexander nor Edward allowed the issue to harm their relationship
- In general the two kingdoms were drawing closer by 1286: cross-border land-holding, cross-border marriages were commonplace
- There is no evidence of Edward I seeking to exploit the new situation in Scotland in 1286 - Edward had other priorities on the continent
- The Guardians may have sought to do more than inform Edward: they may have seen him as a means to secure internal stability
- Only on his return in 1289 did Edward, as the Maid's uncle, become involved in her future - at the behest of the king of Norway, the Maid's father
- There is no evidence that the Guardians resisted this involvement
- The Treaty of Salisbury was designed to arrange for the Maid's arrival in Scotland or England
- Its terms suggest Edward's first real interference in the political situation in Scotland
- The Maid was to arrive in Britain free of any marriage contract
- The Scots agreed not to marry off the Maid without 'the ordinance, will and advice' of Edward – virtually giving Edward a say in the choice of her husband
- The Guardians were to ensure Scotland was in a peaceful and safe condition before the Maid might be sent there
- Probably a reference to the murder of the earl of Fife, a Guardian, in 1289 – though the murder was not politically motivated
- It may have suited Edward to imply that the kingdom was unstable
- The idea of a marriage between the Maid and Edward of Caernarfon was probably aired at Salisbury
- Alexander III had hinted at such a marriage in 1284
- Marriage between the Maid and Edward of Caernarfon suited Norway, England and Scotland: good match for Eric of Norway; possible extension of English control into Scotland for Edward; guarantee of stability in Scotland for the Guardians
- Edward sought papal dispensation without informing the Scots - if this caused disquiet within the political community, it was not stated in public, as shown by the letter
- There need be no surprise that the Guardians sought discussions on how the marriage would affect the status of the kingdom
- In the short-term, who would govern on behalf of the Maid and her husband-to-be; would there still be a role for the Guardians?
- In the long-term, the offspring of the marriage would reign over a united kingdom
• The Guardians sought to ensure the continued independence of the kingdom, entirely separate from the kingdom of England
• The Scottish political community benefited from Scotland’s independent status: enjoying posts and influence
• Church leaders in particular feared that loss of political independence might lead to loss of ecclesiastical independence - bishops of Glasgow and St Andrews were both Guardians
• The Guardians were aware of the recent suppression by Edward of Welsh independence, laws and liberties
• Following receipt of this letter Edward sent envoys, led by Antony Bek, the bishop of Durham, to meet with the Guardians and the political community
• Scottish political community met at Birgham with Bek’s delegation to hammer out what was in effect a prenuptial agreement
• The discussions were wide-ranging: the rights and liberties of the kingdom, church elections, raising of taxes, parliaments held outwith Scotland
• The Scots were determined that all decisions and matters relating to the governance of the kingdom should be made within, not outwith, the kingdom
• Scots resisted Edward’s demand for control of the royal castles
• Suggestions that Edward hurriedly confirmed the Scottish terms at Northampton because the Maid had already set sail
• His subsequent behaviour in 1290 suggests he did not take the treaty too seriously
• On the day he signed it at Northampton he instructed the Scots to accept Anthony Bek as lieutenant acting on behalf of the royal couple
• He instructed the Scots to be obedient to Bek and defer to him ‘in all matters which are required for the governance and peaceful state of the realm’
• For Edward the Treaty of Edinburgh-Northampton may have been a price worth paying to bring Scotland within his influence
• Following the death of the Maid in Orkney, the relationship between the Guardians and Edward entered a new phase

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

• Fiona Watson suggests that the Guardians’ approaches to Edward need be no surprise: ‘That they should do so was entirely conventional given that the Scottish royal family was so closely related to Edward, and that the Scots were quite accustomed to leaning on England’s broad shoulders in times of difficulty (such as Alexander III’s own minority)’
• Colm Mcnamee writes that the Guardians in their dealings with Edward succeeded in ‘landing a future for Scotland that involved neither civil war nor subjection to the English crown. Without doubt Scots saw Edward I as a benevolent and potentially stabilising influence, whom they were anxious to involve in Scotland to stave off unrest’
• Archie Duncan has written that the Guardians had little choice but to negotiate with Edward as they did: ‘No Scottish magnate can be identified as opposed to the negotiations or to the marriage, which is perhaps not surprising, for there was no reasonable alternative to the Maid as heir to the throne, and little hope of extracting her from Norway save with English help’
• Michael Brown: believes that ‘In the aftermath of the earl of Fife’s murder, it is probable that the Guardians actively sought Edward’s support … Edward was approached as a means of guaranteeing political stability in a Scottish realm which lacked a royal head’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source A is useful as evidence for investigating the issues which concerned the Guardians in their dealings with Edward I.
Question 2

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)
Candidates may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of each source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)
These 10 marks will be awarded for:
[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians’ views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources B and C of the murder of John Comyn, lord of Badenoch and offers a structured evaluation of the differing views in terms of:

Source B

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit

Points from the source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views:
- Bruce was ambitious to be king and recognised that John Comyn stood in his way
- Bruce took the initiative, inviting Comyn to meet with him at Dumfries to discuss unspecified business
- It was Bruce who instigated the quarrel; the murder was planned – ‘as conspired’
- Bruce is described in negative terms as a ‘tyrant’

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source:
- Comyn was indeed ‘powerful’: he had led the Scots to a reasonably lenient submission in 1304
- He was the recognised leader of the political community
- Assuming the Balliol kingship was finished, Comyn, as Balliol’s nephew, had the best claim to the kingship
- Comyn may have harboured his own ambitions
- Despite Bruce’s defection to Edward in 1302 it had brought him few rewards; he might well have resented the fact that the 1305 settlement favoured Comyn and his allies rather than him
- He had even lost his two sheriffdoms
- Edward I may well have begun to look on him with suspicion; how much of that was due to Edward’s relationship with Comyn?
Source C

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit

Points from the source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views:
- Barrow rejects any notion that Bruce would have planned such a thing: not in keeping with his character
- Barrow accepts the John Barbour explanation: that Bruce wanted to put a plan to Comyn to revive the kingship, a plan which involved Comyn: ‘Support my bid for the crown, and you receive my estates in compensation’
- Old antagonisms made discussion difficult
- Barrow has Comyn as the instigator of the argument, possibly calling Bruce a traitor

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source:
- Barrow’s rejection of premeditation might be supported because of the choice of meeting place: a church
- And was that considered a wise move because of the history of bad blood between the two men
- Barrow’s reference to the non-‘kiss of peace’ recalls the violent fall out at Selkirk in 1299
- The later John Barbour elaboration of Comyn and Bruce reaching an agreement then Comyn revealing all to Edward became the accepted version in the early Scottish narratives
- In this way Bruce was seen as the victim of Comyn’s treachery
- So: blacken Comyn’s character thereby vindicating Bruce’s reaction

Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources:
- John Comyn had been a constant in the Guardianship since 1298; Bruce only briefly
- Despite Bruce’s defection to him in 1302 Edward recognised that his best chance of achieving a peaceful settlement in Scotland was through the Comyns
- Bruce’s father died in 1304; Bruce inherited the family claim; may have given his ambition a new urgency
- The failing health of Edward I may have added to the urgency
- There is some evidence that Bruce had been sounding out prominent Scots
- June 1304 at Stirling, Bruce and Lamberton drew up a secret indenture
- The murder was followed some weeks later by Bruce’s inauguration at Scone
- Historians are divided as to whether all this was planned
- The bishop of Glasgow seems to have been a key factor encouraging Bruce to go for broke after Dumfries
- Absolved him, gave him robes and a banner
- But the ceremony at Scone was makeshift and ill-attended
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Michael Penman** believes it was very likely that Bruce’s canvassing support for his claim to the kingship had reached the point where he had to be sure either of Comyn’s neutrality or his vested interest.

- **Fiona Watson** writes that in 1306, prior to the murder of Comyn, ‘once again, Bruce was heading down a dead end in his plans to become king’

- **Alan Young** believes that in the circumstances of Anglo-Scottish politics at the time, it was probably the case that the argument was less about “nationalism” and “treachery” and more about having the ear of the English king and his influence and backing.

- **Edward Cowan**: ‘Looking at the evidence overall, and considering the deportment of the two main protagonists, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that John, the Red Comyn, has suffered, at the hands of posterity, one of the greatest betrayals in all Scottish history’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources B and C is helpful in offering a perspective on the differing views on the circumstances surrounding the murder of John Comyn, lord of Badenoch.
Question 3

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

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

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source D as an adequate explanation of the continuing vulnerability of Robert Bruce’s authority in Scotland after 1314.

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views:
- The deaths of Bruce’s brother, Edward Bruce and his daughter, Marjory precipitated a succession crisis
- Marjory’s infant son, Robert, Bruce’s grandson, was named successor, but in the event of a minority kingship, Randolph, failing him Douglas, would act as Guardian; important with the war continuing
- Bruce was an excommunicated usurper
- The statute against rumour-mongering and feuds indicated fears of a conspiracy within the nobility

Points from recall which develop and contextualise the evidence in the source:
- Bruce’s wife, Elizabeth, had been returned following Bannockburn but as yet the couple had no children
- A tailzie of 1315 had named Edward Bruce as Robert’s successor instead of Marjory Bruce, his daughter from his first marriage, setting aside primogeniture …because Edward Bruce was ‘a man of great prowess in warlike actions for the defence of the rights and liberties of the Scottish realm’ ……important consideration in light of the continuing war
- Edward Bruce was killed at Faughart in 1318 while campaigning in Ireland
- A hastily summoned parliament at Scone drew up the new succession tailzie
- Series of papal bulls: further pronouncements of excommunication on Bruce, placing an interdict on religious activity in Scotland, summoning four bishops to the curia; absolving Scots from allegiance to their ‘king’
- Bruce’s fears of conspiracy justified in 1320: the Soules conspiracy
- Many of the conspirators had been associated with the Comyns
- Now accepted that the conspirators sought to replace Bruce with Edward Balliol, back at English court since 1318
- One of Bruce’s responses to papal pressure – the barons’ letter to the pope (the Declaration of Arbroath); five of the barons who sealed the letter were involved in the Soules conspiracy
Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source:

- The Statute of Cambuskenneth (1314) was intended to force Scottish magnates who rejected his kingship to submit – otherwise they would lose their estates
- Many did, but their loyalties may have been dubious
- Bruce tried patronage, offers of land, to try to reconcile former enemies to his kingship; those who did submit lost their English estates
- As long as Bruce’s war with England continued, little prospect of recovering their ‘disinheritance’ in England
- Presence of significant group of disinherited landlords at English court who sought the overthrow of Bruce
- Bruce’s kingship was also threatened by the pope’s continued failure to recognise his title
- Although sent in the name of the barons, the letter to the pope was a product of Bruce’s chancery; it represented the Bruce viewpoint
- The idea that it represented the thinking of the barons is a fiction
- Some historians believe Bruce used the letter as a test of the barons’ loyalty; securing their commitment to his kingship

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

- **Archie Duncan** describes the succession tailzies as being loyalty pledges, not against the English, but against the Balliol right to the throne. ‘King John was dead, but his son lived and, as the conspiracy in 1320 showed, had no small following among Bruce’s fair-weather subjects’
- **Fiona Watson** emphasises that Bruce could not forget he was a usurper and suffered through the entirety of his reign ‘from an acute awareness of his lack of legitimacy as king’
- **Colm McNamee** writes that because history has been so thoroughly rewritten by King Robert’s admirers, scant record survives of opposition to the Bruce monarchy. ‘Yet we know from English sources that such opposition – for example the continued MacDougall and MacSween activity in Argyll and Knapdale – was significant and often sponsored by the English government’
- **Michael Brown** describes how many of those involved in the Soules conspiracy had fought against Bruce before 1314. Their allegiance to Bruce was a result of capture or defeat and was a matter of necessity. ‘The uncertain course of the war, the question of the succession and the pope’s censure may have tempted such men to revert to previous loyalties’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source D is helpful in explaining the continuing vulnerability of Robert Bruce’s authority in Scotland after 1314.
The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries

Part 1

Each question is worth 25 marks

Question 1

The aim of the question is to enable the candidate to make a judgement on the prosperity of the great Italian cities during the Renaissance and critically to assess the factors that had an effect on that prosperity, in particular commercial activity.

Commerce lay at the heart of economic prosperity:
- The forms of commercial activity that existed across the Italian states, including the wool trade and silk trade in Florence
- The links between successful commerce and economic prosperity
- The link between economic prosperity and the political dominance of certain cities
- The link between Venice's naval power and her growth as a sea and land based power
- The importance of a range of factors which influenced prosperity in the Italian cities, such as: internal and external trade; the creation of the “terra firma”
- the outmanoeuvring of rival cities (eg Siena by Florence or Genoa by Venice)

The importance of manufacturing
- Huge numbers of people in Florence were employed in the wool-finishing industries. The various processes were labour-intensive and some of the wealth of the commercial families trickled down to their employees
- The Arsenale in Venice employed huge numbers of people and created ships which carried and protected the trade of the city. Venetian wealth was dependent upon its maritime domination

The importance of banking
- Commerce required finance. Florentine families such as the Medici created banks which became extremely wealthy and fuelled the economy of Florence and of other Italian cities. They also acted as bankers to the papacy and so their banking underpinned papal power

The importance of mercenary activity
- Mercenaries lent their military services to the highest bidder and built up great wealth from this. Many of these mercenaries subsequently became princes and spent their wealth on building magnificent palaces which became centres of economic activity in their own right (eg the dukes of Urbino)

The influence of the papal court on the prosperity of Rome
- The wealth of Rome was built upon its position as the seat of the head of the Roman Catholic Church. Priests and clerics found profitable employment in papal service. Cardinals promoted their status by constructing magnificent palaces in Rome and filling them with art
Candidates may bring in a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Goldthwaite** on the role and significance of commerce on republican economies
- **Lauro Martines** in relation to the links between commercial life and political power
- **Robert Hole** on the wealth of Florence and Venice
- **Alison Brown** on the strength of the Florentine economy
- **Mary Hollingsworth** describes the wealth and power of Ippolito d'Este who became Archbishop of Milan at the age of nine and subsequently became a very wealthy cardinal based in Rome, employing gardeners, book-keepers, valets and doctors, squires and pages, cooks and stable boys
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to consider why it was that there was so much innovation in Florentine art from 1400 till 1450. The candidate should focus on the importance of the guilds as patrons seeking to promote their own prestige as a factor. However, they should balance consideration of the guilds with other relevant factors which might include the wealth of Cosimo de’ Medici and the genius of artists such as Donatello, Ghiberti, Brunelleschi and Masaccio.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the idea that the prestige of the guilds was vital:

- The competition to design new doors for the Baptistry in 1401 was conducted by the Calimala, the wool cloth finishing guild. The guild enjoyed special responsibility for the embellishment of the baptistry of Florence cathedral.
- The rivalry between the guilds and their prestige lay behind the commission from the Arte della Calimala to Lorenzo Ghiberti for a statue of John the Baptist in the guilds niche on the outside wall of Orsanmichele. In 1425, the Arte della Lana commissioned Lorenzo Ghiberti to sculpt a figure of St Stephen for their niche. Similarly, Donatello was commissioned to produce figures of St Mark for the linen draper’s guild and a statue of St George for the armourers’ guild. Vasari describes the rivalry behind these commissions.
- The dome of the Duomo in Florence by Filippo Brunelleschi resulted from a commission in 1418 from the Arte della Lana, which had a special responsibility for the city’s cathedral.
- The Arte della Setta was responsible for the Ospedale degli Innocenti, for which Brunelleschi was the architect.
- Some of the early Medici patronage may in fact have been sponsored by the Arte del Cambio, the Bankers’ Guild.

Other factors which may be relevant:

- The wealth of the Medici family as bankers. Cosimo’s donation to the monastery of San Marco seems to have been prompted by guilt over the sin of usury and the hope of buying remission of sins.
- Cosimo clearly enjoyed fine art. Donatello’s “David” initially stood in the courtyard of the new Medici Palace where he could enjoy it.
- Undoubtedly, artistic genius played a key role in artistic innovation. The new generation of artists in Florence in the early fifteenth century seem to have been particularly talented. Masaccio expressed raw human emotion in a way that had not been seen since Giotto in the Brancacci Chapel. Brunelleschi’s dome is a work of huge ambition and technical brilliance. Spanning the transept of the Duomo had defied earlier architects. Donatello produced the first life-size nude since antiquity and revived the Roman tradition of the equestrian statue.
- Ghiberti was commissioned by the guilds to produce a second pair of doors for another entrance to the Baptistry. Not only was he freed from having to compete for this task, but - in his own words - he was “permitted to execute it in whatever way I believed would result in the greatest perfection”.
- The discovery of the rules of perspective brought a new realism to Renaissance art. Brunelleschi’s experiment showed his understanding. Alberti’s “On Painting” defined the rules and Masaccio employed the devise to stunning effect in “The Trinity” in Santa Maria Novella.
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Giorgi Vasari** believed that the artistic brilliance and innovation stemmed from competition between the artists themselves as well as between the guilds. They constantly sought to outdo one another and learned from each other’s’ work.

- **Richard Stemp** takes the view that change came to the cities because they were governed by communes who lived in the city and took a pride in it, unlike absentee feudal lords. However, he also sees the changes in the first half of the fifteenth century as coming about because the wealthiest families - notably the Medici - had reasserted control of the politics of Florence and betrayed the spirit of rule by the popolo.

- **Michael Levey** believes that the early years of the fifteenth century were difficult, embattled years of warfare, and of severe political and financial stress for the Florentine republic. Some degree of civic patriotic magnificence and outward display had its value for morale and was a factor in the commissioning of public acts of artistic patronage.
Question 3

This question invites candidates to consider the extent to which it is true to say that by the sixteenth century artists in Italy had finally gained the freedom to produce the work they wished, in the style they wished. Such a view implies that the influence of patrons was now much less marked than earlier.

Candidates may use evidence such as:

“The artist was free”:

- Ernst Gombrich, writing in 1950, held this view. The words in the question are his. Gombrich claimed that the role of the artist and patron was now reversed and that the artist granted a favour to a rich prince or potentate by accepting a commission from him. They no longer needed to accommodate their works to the whims and fancies of their employers. This had the effect of a liberation which released a tremendous amount of pent-up energy. More recent work has suggested that Gombrich’s is an oversimplification.

- Artists were free to innovate. Bramante’s design for the new Saint Peter’s in 1506 was for a square church with chapels symmetrically arranged around a gigantic cross-shaped hall. Bramante was determined to disregard the Western Tradition of a thousand years.

- Vasari’s Lives of the Artists as an important source of information about the status of particular artists. His ideas on the emergence of individual geniuses. He describes Leonardo dying in the arms of King Francis I.

- Painters in general had a low social status in the early fifteenth century. It was compulsory for them to be members of the trade guilds. Many produced work anonymously and merely to meet the needs of the marketplace.

- The relationship between patron and artist as revealed by contracts and correspondence. The changing artist-patron relationship by the sixteenth century.

- Artists by the sixteenth century had been freed of the requirement only to paint religious scenes. Pagan mythology and contemporary portraits were now in vogue. So too was nudity.

- The remuneration of artists brought financial freedom: comparisons with manual workers. Many became very wealthy, Raphael and Titian for example. In contrast, Vasari describes how even by the mid-sixteenth century, “The artist today struggles to ward off famine rather than win fame, and this crushes and buries his talent and obscures his name”. Botticelli was frequently in debt.

- The humanist rediscovery of Pliny’s account of the status of artists in antiquity aided in the heightened status of the artist in the sixteenth century.

- Alberti’s “On Painting” elevated the status of the artist, though its circulation was limited.

- Michelangelo’s inscription on his Pieta for St Peters shows that the artist himself was important, not just the finished work.

- Leonardo, Michelangelo, Raphael and Titian as examples of artists whose work was much sought after by connoisseurs such as Isabella d’Este. She famously asked Leonardo to paint something for her. She left the details entirely to the artist.
“Artists were not free”:
- Michelangelo was primarily a sculptor and secondarily a reluctant painter, forced to the task by the popes who would not take no for an answer. He painted the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel for Julius II and then painted “The Last Judgement” on the wall behind the altar for Pope Paul III.
- Artists in the pay of the princely courts were expected to produce work that appealed to the prince, for example portraits of his lovers (Leonardo for Ludovico il Moro of Milan).
- Most artistic commissions in the sixteenth century were still religious in nature. Artists were expected to conform to the traditional representations of religious figures, though they enjoyed greater freedom in the poses they chose. Michelangelo famously brought movement to his figures, allowing the physical pose to reflect the emotional intensity.

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

- **Peter Burke** examines the changing relationship between artists and patrons, based on a detailed study of 136 artists, many of whom came from “artistic dynasties”. Burke argues that given their social background, renaissance artists generally did more or less what they were told. He refers to various social prejudices against artists such as the fact that art involved manual work and artists were often uneducated.
- **Lauro Martines** believes it is wrong to believe that an artist could impose his manner on a princely court. Instead, communities seized upon an idea, a style, a manner or a point of view. They seized and accepted it only when it endorsed or flattered vital interests and group identity.
- **Evelyn Welch** highlights the wealth of different experiences which make generalisation dangerous.
- **Geraldine A. Johnson** writes that it was under the influence of Michelangelo that the concept of art-making as primarily an aesthetic rather than a functional activity (“art for art’s sake”) emerged.
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to demonstrate an awareness of the importance of religion in the princely courts of the fifteenth century. However, the importance of religion must be balanced by other factors, perhaps including economic concerns, military matters, humanism and dynastic security. Candidates will be expected to suggest whether or not religion was the principal concern - or discuss the limits of our ability to answer this question.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support

- Religious themes dominate the art of the princely courts. Leonardo’s “Last Supper” in Milan, or the Pala di Brera originally from Urbino, or the Lamentation of the Dead Christ from Andrea Mantegna in Mantua
- Courts had private chapels (often magnificent ones) where the princely family worshipped or celebrated mass
- Princes spent lavishly on religious foundations. Gian Galeazzo Visconti founded the Certosa di Pavia for example, and Ludovico il Moro continued to fund it as well as Santa Maria delle Grazie in Milan, intended as the Sforza family mausoleum
- Princes were very concerned with their tombs. Funerary monuments were lavish and expensive, and of course located in churches. This implies a religious concern
- The birth of an heir or similar dynastic good fortune was seen as an act of God. Again the Pala di Brera illustrates this as the Sacra Conversazione celebrates the birth of Federigo’s heir, whilst memorialising his mother Battista Sforza who had died following complications relating to the birth. In this sense, religion and dynasticism went hand in hand

Factors which may contradict

- It is impossible to be sure of the individual religious conviction of the princes. Princes needed to conform to expectations. Christianity was the bedrock of fifteenth century society in Italy and few people dared or wished to challenge this
- However, princes clearly had concerns beyond religion. Dynastic continuity was very important to them. Some had come to power through deviousness rather than strict rules of succession and so were keen to create an artistic narrative which bolstered their legitimacy. The Sforza were keen to portray themselves as heirs to the Visconti in Milan. Federigo da Montefeltro ensured his ducal coronet could not be missed in his portraits
- Many of the princes were condottieri and their principal concern was fighting or supplying a military force to the highest bidder. The splendour of the courts of Urbino, Milan and Mantua was paid for by mercenary wages
- Some princes were very interested in the new humanist ideas of the Renaissance. They took education very seriously and became avid collectors of ancient manuscripts. Federigo da Montefeltro had Livy’s history of Rome read to him during meals. Ludovico il Moro supported Leonardo in Milan, during which time he drew his “Vitruvian Man”, seen by many people as the quintessential humanist work
- Sigismondo Malatesta’s Tempio Malatestiano in Rimini is branded with the initials of himself and his wife and much of the art is secular, pagan and esoteric. He was not a religious man, and the Tempio, also known as San Francesco, built in Rimini, by Leon Battista Alberti and decorated by artists including Piero della Francesca and Agostino di Duccio, was essentially a lay monument to Isotta degli Atti, his lover and third wife. Malatesta’s reputation was largely based on Pope Pius II’s perception of him, although numerous contemporary chronicles described him as a tyrant and a womaniser: he delved in “rape, adultery, and incest"
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Richard Stemp** argues that in Renaissance society denial of death was impossible. Life expectancy was shorter and infant mortality rates were high. However, people took comfort from the religious belief that death was not the end, but a transition to the afterlife. The question was where one would spend eternity - in heaven or hell. It was important to be mindful of the hereafter because the way you lived your life determined your fate after death; it meant living for others as much as for yourself; and spending your money more for the glory of God and in charitable deeds than for your own pleasure.

- **Stephen Campbell and Michael Cole** believe that most wealthy lay people who paid for works of art would have accepted that there was a difference between the sacred and the profane. Certain times and spaces were set aside for God. Yet in practice the sacred and the profane overlapped to such an extent as to be indistinguishable.

- **Mary Hollingsworth** asserts that Federigo da Montefeltro’s programme of church building and decoration testified to his Christian devotion, but its principal aim was to embellish Urbino with the grand convents, monasteries and cathedrals that were the distinctive mark of a great city. She stresses also Federigo’s highly valued library - one of the most impressive in fifteenth-century Italy. Clearly learning was a priority for Federigo.
Question 5

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the papacy during the High Renaissance of the sixteenth century and to comment on the poor reputation of individual popes or the institution of the papacy. Candidates should explain where that poor reputation came from, before reaching a conclusion as to whether or not it was deserved.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the idea that criticism has been unfair:
- Much of the initial criticism was made by early reformers of the church, such as Erasmus of Rotterdam, and then taken up by Protestant historians who see in the worldliness of the popes the seeds of the Protestant reformation. Such people were attracted to the faults of the papacy but did not always balance this with praise for the virtues. Erasmus’s "Julius Exclusus" is an unbalanced attack on the papacy, ridiculing the faults for comic, political and religious effect
- It is unrealistic to expect the papacy to act as a credible political force in Italy and beyond if it did not have wealth and magnificence
- Some popes showed a genuine interest in humanism
- Pope Clement VII is said to have lived simply and even his worst enemies were unable to suggest that his was anything other than a blameless or moral life
- Julius II fought in defence of jurisdictions and territorial rights in Italy. These rights were seen to be the papacy’s by divine sanction as well as by legal right and long-established custom

Factors which may contradict the idea that criticism has been unfair:
- The popes of the High Renaissance seem to have been overly concerned with the things of this world, often to the detriment of their souls
- Dynastic advancement was common, especially by Alexander VI
- Acquiring a personal fortune was a priority for several popes
- Some popes practised the sins of simony
- The sale of indulgences by Pope Leo X was a clear abuse, albeit intended to raise money for the new St Peter's basilica
- Under the Borgia Pope Alexander VI sensual pleasure and dynastic ambition were not uncommon in the papal curia. He had several children after he became pope. He promoted the careers of his own children

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

- Margaret Hollingsworth sees Julius II as unfairly criticised. She says that in his ten years as pope he had achieved much. He had inherited a rebellious and divided Italy and had asserted control in the papal states and expanded his temporal authority in Italy. He had filled the papal coffers. “For once the Renaissance tradition of praising a patron for the transformation of a shabby city into a magnificent centre held more than a grain of truth”
- D.S. Chambers takes the view that it was not a new fashion for popes to participate actively in warfare. Justification was found in the Old Testament and the idea of “just war” formulated by St. Augustine. The portrayal by Erasmus is a “gross if not wholly undeserved caricature”
- J.R.Hale refers to Julius II as a financial genius and brilliant administrator
The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries

Part 2

Question 1

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)

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

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)

These 10 marks will be awarded for:

[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians' views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources A and B about the status of women and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source A

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views

- “A woman was the sinful daughter of Eve.” Women were as seen sinful as they were the “daughters of Eve”
- “One legal power women did have was making their wills and disposing of their dowries” Men controlled women except for their dowries
- Families and circumstances forced women into convents
- “For the holy life permitted the vile daughter of Eve to transform herself into the immaculate daughter of Mary.” Many women entered convents which offered them possibilities in the areas of education etc
Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source

- Males felt they had a duty, as well as a right, to control women
- The Catholic Church maintained its rigid theories of gender and expectations of women’s place and nature. The Church showed little flexibility in its attitudes to women, unless they were saints
- The taint of original sin affected the attitude of Renaissance society towards women. There were fears that left unrestrained their nature was lascivious
- Dowries allowed women a degree of control over their lives. Dowries should be returned to the women on the death of her husband, allowing her some economic autonomy. A woman from a high-status family would bring with her an impressive and tempting dowry to the marriage. A woman without a dowry had little chance of marriage. For her the convent was seen as a better option
- Most women received little by way of an education. The convents offered the prospect of women receiving an education, learning to read and write. Convents also became places of refuge for abandoned or abused women
- Attitudes towards women in courtly circles were changing. Some early humanists such as Leonardo Bruni encouraged women to pursue a classical education. Other humanists such as Leon Battista Alberti retained rigid views of the place of women in the family and in society

Source B

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

- Baldassare Castiglione, author of “The Book of the Courtier”, was a courtier in the court of the Duke of Urbino from 1504
- Castiglione served as an ambassador for several Renaissance courts, including the Gonzaga of Mantua, Urbino and the papacy
- This “Book of the Courtier” was seen as the definitive guide to the qualities of a loyal courtier and of a court lady

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views

- “an air of womanly sweetness”. Women should be sweet and tender
- “admirable accomplishments. For I believe that many faculties of the mind are as necessary to woman as to man”. Women should have talents
- “Beauty is more necessary to her than to the Courtier, for in truth that woman lacks much who lacks beauty.” Women should be beautiful
- “knowledge of many things, in order to entertain him graciously.” Women should entertain men

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source

- Castiglione saw the role of women as entertaining men, rather than having value in their own right
- The virtues and accomplishments of women helped them to serve men. Courtesans in particular were seen to have wit and humour with which to entertain men. Needlework, painting and music were important accomplishments for a Renaissance women to acquire
- The portrayal of women in Renaissance art is usually as things of beauty. Botticelli’s women or those of Ghirlandaio would be a good examples of this. Many portraits were made at the time of betrothal and celebrate female beauty. Others were made posthumously and again present a flattering perspective. Piero della Francesca’s altarpiece for Federigo da Montefeltro in fact shows his newly-deceased wife as the Virgin Mary
- Only exceptional women challenged men or dared to risk offending them
Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources

- Women play an important role in “The Courtier”. However, they rarely dominate a discussion but instead initiate a discussion by making a general observation and standing back once the men enter the discussion. They are primarily decorative and aesthetically pleasing but certainly not the equal of their husband.
- A small elite group of women acquired an excellent education and managed to escape the confines of the lives of most women. Isabella d’Este from Ferrara, who married into the family of the Gonzagas of Mantua, would be an excellent example of this. She played a key role as a patron in Mantua.
- Francesco Barbaro argued that a woman should love her husband, lead a modest life and have a diligent and complete care in domestic matters.
- Women often had a vital role to play in raising the children. However, in court circles women often lost this role to tutors who passed on a humanist education to the children.

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

- Joan Kelly argues that women were disempowered during the Renaissance and reduced to domesticity.
- Burckhardt argued that gender relations during the Renaissance were based upon a perfect equality. He seems to have had in mind only women in elite circles.
- Stanley Chojnacki refers to the exclusion of women from public life where fathers and sons consorted. Renaissance society could be characterised as one in which mothers contributed but fathers commanded.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources A and B is helpful in offering a full perspective on the status of women during the Italian Renaissance.
Question 2

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source C as evidence of the values of Renaissance humanists.

Provenance:
- Bessarion travelled to Italy in the 1430s as part of the delegation from the Eastern Empire to discuss the possibility of uniting eastern and western Christianity. Thereafter he settled permanently in Italy, being made a cardinal and doing much by his patronage of learned men, by his collection of books and manuscripts, and by his writings, to spread abroad the new Greek humanist learning
- The fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453 causing the scholars and their manuscripts to flee to the west
- The advent of Bessarion increased awareness of and access to ancient Greek manuscripts, especially Plato

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- “I strove with all my might to assemble.” Renaissance humanists valued books as a source of learning and collected them any way they could
- “Books ring with the voices of the wise. They are full of the lessons of history, full of life, law and piety.” Humanists pursued learning in many areas
- “We should all be uneducated brutes if there were no books. We should have hardly any record of the past, no example to guide us, no knowledge whatever of the affairs of this world or the next.” Renaissance humanists made the books of the ancients the basis of a humanist education. They were an indispensable guide. This shows their obsession with history as examples for the present
- “All my strength and time has been devoted to seeking out Greek books.” Great learning was to be found in ancient Greek texts
Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source

- From Petrarch onwards, humanists collected texts of ancient Roman origin. Scholars such as Poggio Bracciolini travelled widely, even to monasteries in Switzerland, France and Germany, to track them down. Bracciolini located the only surviving copy of Lucretius’ “On the Nature of Things.”
- Humanists believed that an education grounded in the classics was an excellent preparation for the contemporary politics and statesmanship. The ancient texts became a treasure trove of examples from history of fine men and fine deeds.
- In 1453 Constantinople fell to the Turks led by Sultan Mehmet II. This threatened the supply of manuscripts to western humanists. Aeneas Piccolomini wrote that “Homer and Plato have died a second death”. In fact, however, there was also an increase in the number of Byzantine scholars travelling to Italy as refugees from Constantinople after 1453. These émigrés were grammarians, humanists, poets, writers, printers, lecturers, musicians, astronomers, architects, academics, artists, scribes, philosophers, scientists, politicians and theologians. They brought to Western Europe the far greater preserved and accumulated knowledge of their own (Greek) civilization.
- The west had been much more familiar with Roman writers before the fifteenth century. Latin was taught in schools and universities and Roman authors were held in high regard.

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

- The Greek scholars brought to the west an understanding of the philosophy of not only Aristotle but also Plato which affected the Renaissance by causing debates over man’s place in the universe, the immortality of the soul, and the ability of man to improve himself through virtue. This was at the root of Renaissance Neo-Platonism as explained by Ficino and Pico della Mirandola.
- In 1396 Manuel Chrysoloras accepted an invitation to Florence to an appointment in the university to the first chair of Greek letters in the West.
- Leon Battista Alberti wrote that “A man may do all things if he will.” This confidence in man, his nature and his potential was a vital part of humanist belief, traceable to ancient Greek or Roman texts.
- Renaissance humanists on the whole remained firm Christians. Their new faith in man ran alongside their faith in the Christian God.
- Humanists such as Leonardo Bruni saw in ancient history a host of fine examples of men leading noble lives of action, participating in civic life or defending the state by their words or their swords. He encouraged young Florentines to pursue the active life and serve the republic, much as Cicero had served Rome. This application of humanism is often referred to as civic humanism.

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

- J.R. Hale wrote that Renaissance humanists was primarily a scholarly movement
- Hans Baron argued that Florentine humanism served to strengthen Florentine republicanism against Milanese despotism from Giangaleazzo Visconti, coining the term civic humanism.
- Jerry Brotton sees Renaissance humanism as a fusion of the classical world and western Christianity.
- Carol Everhart Quillen argues that humanists took aspects of the ancient past as a cultural model.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source C is useful as evidence for investigating the values of Renaissance humanists.
Question 3

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source D as an adequate explanation of the nature of Florentine politics under Lorenzo the Magnificent in terms of:

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views

- “Under Lorenzo the ancient institution of the Signoria was reduced to little more than a pantomime meant to distract the citizens; Lorenzo reduced the importance of the Florentine Signoria
- The real business of government went on behind closed doors wherever Lorenzo met his cronies.” Real power lay with himself and his friends
- Lorenzo created another type of leadership based on his wealth and status “one based on his magnificence”. Lorenzo impressed people with his wealth and refinement
- He used his money to buy favours such as purchasing goodwill that he could tap into in time of crisis.” Lorenzo won the loyalty of the Florentine poor by subsidising bread prices

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source

- Lorenzo placed himself at the centre of all decision-making as well as the cultural life of the city. Unlike his grandfather, he adopted an overt style of leadership, monopolising the political life of the state
- He carefully rigged elections to the Signoria to ensure a compliant council. This was a major undertaking, given there were elections six times a year
- He established the Council of Seventy in 1480 and used this as a way of disguising his own influence
- The wealth of the Medici bank was in decline under Lorenzo, following a series of defaulted loans from the branches in England and Bruges
- Lorenzo laid on extravagant public celebrations on feast days or to welcome prestigious visitors
- Lorenzo pursued a policy both of maintaining peace and a balance of power between the northern Italian states and of keeping the other major European states such as France and the Holy Roman Empire’s Habsburg rulers out of Italy. Lorenzo maintained good relations with Sultan Mehmed II of the Ottoman Empire, as the Florentine maritime trade with the Ottomans was a major source of wealth for the Medici
- Lorenzo won the confidence and support of the Florentine people through his friendship with powerful rulers
Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source
- Lorenzo himself married outside the Florentine elite. He married Clarice Orsini from a wealthy and powerful Roman family, elevating his branch of the Medici into the Italian aristocracy. His skill with nuptial strategies continued with his own offspring, whom he married to the children of dukes, the ancient Florentine nobility and, in the case of one daughter, to a pope’s illegitimate son. Only one son was left unmarried - and he became a cardinal
- He increased the family’s influence in the church. His son Giovanni became Pope Leo X. His nephew Giulio became Pope Clement VII
- Lorenzo is often seen as having great influence not so much because of his wealth (which was much diminished) but as an arbiter of taste. He advised the princes of Italy on matters of style and regularly introduced great artists to them. Leonardo seems to have been introduced to Ludovico Sforza of Milan by Lorenzo for example

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Robert Hole suggests that Lorenzo conducted foreign policy as if he were the prince of Florence, negotiating directly with other powers then getting the Florentine Signoria to rubber stamp his decisions
- Ralph Roeder suggests that the Pazzi Conspiracy of 1478 enabled Lorenzo to strengthen his control over the city
- Robert Davis and Beth Lindsmith see Lorenzo as skilled in politics and diplomacy, but unsuccessful in running the family bank. He was both crass and sloppy in his management of investments and debts

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source D is helpful in understanding the nature of Florentine politics under Lorenzo the Magnificent.
Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland (1715 – 1800)

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the importance of the lack of support from outside Scotland as a contributory factor to the total defeat of the Jacobite cause in 1746. It should be noted that much of the debate is concerned with the leadership of Charles Edward Stuart and his conviction that external assistance from England and France would be forthcoming as his campaign progressed. Other factors which the candidate may analyse as part of an assessment of the causation of the Jacobites’ defeat include the weakness of Charles Edward Stuart’s leadership, factionalism amongst the Jacobite officers and a detailed consideration of the events at Culloden. Candidates should reach a balanced conclusion.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

The extent of support for the Jacobite cause within Britain

- The march south avoided Northumberland, where the gentry were publicly committed to the Jacobite cause. In contrast, the route chosen went through Cumberland, a Whiggish region. Resultantly, no soldiers were recruited in northern England
- Partly due to the speed with which the Highland army marched, partly through indifference to the cause and partly as a result of an increased Hanoverian control than was possible in the Scottish Highlands, the lack of support in England as a whole was almost total. English Jacobites totalled barely more than a few hundred men raised in Manchester
- Even support in Scotland was highly regionalised. There was only marginal support in the lowlands and outright opposition in Glasgow. Even in the Jacobite heartland of the northeast support was uneven. Highland clans were split, many remaining undeclared, including influential clan chiefs Macleod of Dunvegan and Macdonald of Sleat. Others were overtly pro-Hanoverian

The role of European support

- The principal of French support for the Jacobite cause was long established, though it was dependent on the prevailing politics of the day and in particular the French relationship with Britain
- From 1743 Britain and France were at war. Louis XV authorised a naval assault, however the French fleet were forced back by a storm and the plan was abandoned
- Although arguably Irish rather than French assistance, Lord Clare, Commander of the Irish Brigade in the French service arranged for Charles’s passage to the Hebrides and the accompanying 700 Irish Brigade soldiers who were forced to return to France after engaging the Royal Navy in the English channel
- Charles was acutely aware of the importance of continental assistance though his seven hundred professional French soldiers and munitions never landed during the ’45, being forced to return to France after bombardment by HMS Lion
- Charles’ assurances of promised French support proved dubious, further eroding goodwill amongst his officers
- Further French assistance was extremely limited following their decision to cancel their invasion in the winter of 1745/6
- Widespread desertion followed the interception of French coin in 1746 as the Jacobite soldiers were denied pay and food
Charles’s leadership
- Charles’ leadership was defective - key decisions were consistently ill judged. Throughout the campaign his mood swings from depression to over-optimism became increasingly pronounced, undermining his authority. Symptomatic was his petulant refusal to participate in the command of his army following retreat from Derby
- His erroneous belief in the invincibility of his Highland army led to an over-confidence in their prowess
- Charles did not establish a secure hold on Scotland prior to his premature advance into England. Counter-revolution occurred across the country – Edinburgh reverted to Hanoverian control
- Charles’ disingenuous assurances of pledges from English Tories undermined his leadership further when they failed to materialise

Factionalism amongst the Jacobite officers
- The Jacobite army lacked effective command for much of the campaign. The difficult relationship between Charles and Lord George Murray was especially tense; however, there were frequent disagreements amongst others
- Two camps emerged, ‘the Irish’ regarded as the Prince’s favourites, and the Scots who became increasingly disillusioned with Charles’s leadership
- As Charles’ relationship with his officers deteriorated discipline slackened. Desertion, a problem from the outset worsened as the rebellion progressed
- Military success at Prestonpans and Falkirk and the well-ordered retreat from Derby were largely thanks to Lord George Murray and, in the instance of the latter, achieved in spite of the sulking Prince. Further, Prestonpans is widely regarded as a victory won through considerable good fortune

Specific reasons for defeat at Culloden.
- Culloden Moor suited the updated techniques, tactics and modern weaponry of the Hanoverian army, including Cumberland’s reformed bayonet drill and the use of grape shot. The bog made difficult ground for the Highland charge.
- O’Sullivan, Charles’ Quartermaster, failed to secure adequate supplies throughout the campaign. The Jacobite army was particularly poorly supplied prior to Culloden, leaving many Highlanders on the verge of starvation
- Advised by O’Sullivan, Charles insisted on fighting an orthodox defensive action at Culloden despite opposition from a number of his senior officers led by Lord George Murray
- Abortive night raid on Cumberland’s troops exhausted the Jacobite host

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Duffy: Suggests that the nature of the Highland army ensured many Englishmen would not support the Jacobite cause.” In 1745, to men who were willing to be affronted by the Jacobite cause, it seemed that the very personification of Disorder were on the march into England from the north”
- Pittock: Downplays the likelihood of France committing to an invasion “Charles himself was an embarrassment to France, who wished to downplay his importance to some of its allies”
- Lenman: Recognises both Charles’ role in driving the rebellion but also his stubborn and ultimately flawed leadership - ‘the obstinate, insensitive egotism of Prince Charles which drove the rebellion to its relentless bloody climax’
- Mackie: Emphasises the importance of Charles Edward Stuart’s drive in the risings apparent near success which he partly ascribes to the ‘personality of one young man’. However, he also suggests Charles’ optimism may have led him to over-estimate the strength of his army which was bolstered by ‘uncertain adventurers, including even a few deserters from the British army’.
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the relative importance of causal factors that caused the Scottish economy to industrialise in the later eighteenth century. In addition to the importance of the expansion of both domestic and foreign markets, candidates may analyse the role of industrialists’ business practices, the role of the banking sector and the geography of Scotland. Using the relevant evidence, a balanced conclusion should be made.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the view that industrialisation of Scotland in the later eighteenth century was primarily caused by the expansion of markets:

Domestic markets
- Expanded as purchasing power increased as urban and rural wages increased
- Family incomes rose as children and women became employees as a result of industrialisation and agricultural innovation
- Urbanisation increased demand for agricultural produce and raw materials
- Emergence of the urban middle class created new demand for luxury products
- Improved transport: roads and canals

Export Markets
- Treaty of Union provided tax free access to English domestic and colonial markets
- Increasing importance of markets within the European continent
- Dynamic Scottish merchants established new trading relationships with Australasia, Asia and South America. Other notable examples included Scots successes in the British West Indies, India and Asia suggest an ability of Scottish industrialists and merchants to exploit the advantages provided by the British Empire
- Expansion of export trade linked to efficient business practice and commercial methods – most obvious example the trading practices of the tobacco Merchants
- Involvement in the Atlantic Slave Trade and ownership and management of plantations

Factors which may contradict the view that industrialisation of Scotland in the later eighteenth century was primarily caused by the expansion of markets

Enterprise and Finance
- Active role played by Scotland’s aristocracy in financing industrial enterprises including mining, canal building and manufacturing eg Earl of Mar and the Gartmorn Dam
- Banking sector – innovation including small note issue and cash credit and willingness to back pioneering industrial ventures.
- Bold business practices of Scotland’s early industrialists. For example, Glasgow’s Tobacco Merchants who financed nearly 40 manufactories in Glasgow between 1730-95, in addition to founding the Ship Bank (1752), Arms Bank (1752) and the Thistle Bank (1761)
Geography
- An island nation with sea channels to both Europe and America and a land border with England provided access to markets, labour and raw materials
- Large, accessible deposits of key raw materials including coal and iron within the central belt
- Forth and Clyde estuaries supplemented by the Forth and Clyde and Monkland canals enabled transport of raw materials and finished products. Numerous smaller river systems provided power.

Labour Market and Technology
- Densely populated central belt provided a flexible, comparatively cheap labour force which allowed Scottish industry a significant competitive advantage – prompted Arkwright’s boast that lowered costs of production applied a ‘razor to the throat of Lancashire’
- Numerous examples of the introduction of new technologies which were successfully applied to Scottish industry such as the water frame, scotching machine and powered Crompton’s mule

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

- Devine – citing the example of Ireland, he maintains that industrialisation was dependent upon the quality of Scottish business acumen. “Success in the global market was not inevitable but dependent ultimately on the Scottish commercial response”
- Whatley – has noted the importance of low cost labour, and in particular, the role played by women and children, which was proportionately greater than in comparable areas in England
- Rostow – emphasises the entrepreneurial acumen of Scottish merchants and industrialists who were instrumental in taking advantage of the commercial opportunities presented to them. “Men devoted to commerce: men concerned with fine calculations of profit and loss, men of wide horizons whose attitudes communicated themselves in various ways throughout their societies”
- Smout – notes the role of imported foreign technology. “English technology, enthusiastically borrowed in the first instance, and then still more enthusiastically adapted and advanced by native ingenuity…”
Question 3

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to consider the relationship between lowland Scotland’s social problems and the process of urbanisation in the eighteenth century. Candidates should focus upon a detailed analysis of the problems caused by urbanisation, and in particular the impact of the rapidity of urban growth in lowland Scotland and the inadequate provision of infrastructure and amenity, with reference to issues such as housing, overcrowding and public health. Candidates may also include an acknowledgement of the advantages which the growth of towns conferred upon many urban dwellers and a comparison with problems prevalent in rural areas. Candidates should reach a balanced conclusion.

Factors which may support the view that Scotland's social problems were largely caused by urbanisation:

- Overcrowding in subdivided tenements particularly in Edinburgh’s old town and Glasgow’s rapidly expanding wynds. Unparalleled expansion of the urban population both in terms of total numbers and as a proportion of the total Scottish population largely as a result of industrialisation accelerated as the eighteenth century progressed.
- The rate of this trend is key, as it was not matched by a sufficient growth in urban housing nor waste disposal. Sanitary problems were endemic in all urbanised areas as the existing systems of sewage disposal were overwhelmed.
- Scale of the redistribution of the population to towns was vast. Between 1755 and 1801 the population of every major town in lowland Scotland increased significantly – the population of Glasgow, Greenock and Paisley nearly trebled. The fastest growing parts of the towns and cities were often the poorest and the most vulnerable to the rapid spread of disease.
- The statistical account indicates Glasgow and the industrial towns of the west suffered particularly high child death rates. Appalling conditions led to endemic diarrhoea, particularly prevalent in the summer. In contrast, rural areas had significant advantages including easier access to clean water, fresh vegetables and in particular the potato.
- Traditional Scottish patterns of urban development and unreformed municipal authorities created a pernicious, constrained environment of narrow wynds, high built tenements, small courts and non-existent street cleaning.
- Inoculation against smallpox, by a considerable margin the worst epidemic killer of the eighteenth century, was comparatively poorly organised in the cities in contrast to rural lowland areas where the practice had become widespread. Predominantly a child killer, urban infant mortality rates were consequently comparatively higher than in rural regions, notably Dumfriesshire and Galloway.
- Smout identifies a hostile attitude peculiar to urbanised areas where prejudice against inoculation remained very strong. Between 1744-63 1 in 10 deaths in Edinburgh were due to small pox, in Kilmarnock between 1728-64 it was 1 in 6 whilst in Glasgow between 1783-1800 the figure was 1 in 5.
- Cyclical unemployment – a few industries, particularly those related to textiles, came to dominate many newly urbanised areas. The workforce of towns such as Paisley and Kilmarnock were therefore particularly susceptible to downturns in external demand and consequent periods of significant economic hardship.
- Urban employment was not necessarily more secure than in the countryside. A large proportion of the urban workforce was casual labour paying low wages. Terms of employment fluctuated through the year.
- Traditional parish schools which provided a good standard of basic education were unable to cope with the rate of growth of the urban population.
Factors which may contradict the view that Scotland’s social problems were largely caused by urbanisation:

- Many social issues such as endemic poverty, inadequate diet and a lack of sanitation were prevalent in both urban and rural areas of lowland.
- Rural peasant society afforded no luxuries to the vast majority who were landless labourers. Often working in dangerous, highly physical conditions, if they were fortunate enough to have any land to cultivate as their own it was subject to insecure tenure and the whims of the land owner.
- Webster’s survey of 1755 did not identify differences in key indicators of public health such as infant mortality between urban and rural parishes.
- The comparative superiority of rural housing should not be exaggerated. Housing for the majority featured earth floors, unplastered walls and rafters for a ceiling. Rural overcrowding was also common.
- The establishment of infirmaries and dispensaries were an exclusively urban phenomenon. Within the context of contemporary medical standards, relatively good standards of care were achieved. By 1794 Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Dundee had established infirmaries whilst numerous smaller burghs had hospitals and dispensaries.
- Urbanisation has been linked to a number of positive developments in Scottish society, such as the emergence of the urban middle class, expanding urban economies and a vibrant intellectual environment which became the context for the Scottish Enlightenment.
- Recent research by T.M. Devine suggests that the expanding towns of the eighteenth century attracted migrants from the country by the “positive attractions of higher wages and a greater range of employment opportunities”.
- The impact of urbanisation was not uniform across all Scottish cities and towns. The experiences of the inhabitants of the industrialising cities of the Clyde basin and Dundee differed markedly from the populations of regional centres such as Perth, Aberdeen and notably Edinburgh. All had areas of deprivation, inadequate housing and poor sanitation. However, ordinary people in the less industrialised cities were less likely to experience cyclical unemployment associated with the domination by one or two industries of urbanised areas in the west.
- Burgh schools and academies provided a formalised standard of education which was unavailable in most rural areas.

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

- **Devine:** Disputes the assumption that urbanisation had a direct impact upon life expectancy. “The speed of Scottish urban expansion did not have a significant impact on mortality rates until the second and third decades of the nineteenth century. The larger towns were mainly free of epidemic fevers from 1790-1815. Further, he argues that poverty and destitution due to low wages and insecure terms of employment.
- **Smout:** Challenges the impact of urban medical care during the eighteenth century stating that the “disadvantages of these institutions were that they were restricted entirely to the burghs, their facilities were too small even to cover the town’s needs adequately, and knowledge of hygiene and of the nature of infection was so rudimentary that the operating table, in particular, often proved fatal to those upon it.”
- **Wohl:** Reminds us that urbanisation provided economic and social opportunities previously unavailable to the majority and was not necessarily a negative influence upon those who had migrated from rural hinterlands. “Urbanisation meant more jobs, a wider diversity of social contacts and infinitely greater colour and excitement in the lives of the masses”
- **Buchan:** Describes the desperate living conditions in Edinburgh in the mid eighteenth century as being characterised by “poverty, religious bigotry, violence and squalor”. He further damns the capital as “inconvenient, dirty, old-fashioned, alcoholic, quarrelsome and poor.”
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the relative importance of causal factors that resulted in the erosion of Puritanism during the eighteenth century. In addition to the importance of the leadership and management of the Moderate Party, candidates may analyse the role of the fragmentation of the Evangelicals, The Patronage Act and the impact of the Enlightenment. Using the relevant evidence, a balanced conclusion should be made.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Success of the Moderate Party
- The Moderate party used effective management to control the General Assembly for significant periods during the eighteenth century. In particular, the inspired leadership of Principal William Robertson allowed the Moderates to completely dominate between 1762-1780
- The Moderate Party successfully asserted discipline in church government as the General Assembly overruled unwilling presbyteries using riding commissions to ensure the appointment of Moderate ministers. For example, in 1752 the Assembly censured the Presbytery of Dunfermline for refusing to appoint a Moderate appointee, deposing the minister in post
- The General Assembly dispensed harsh sentences to overly puritanical ministers, such the twelve devout ‘Marrow Men’ who were publicly rebuked and admonished
- The Moderate Party’s successful resistance to Erastianism gained it further support within the General Assembly
- The rise of the Moderate Party coincided with the emergence and increasingly influential philosophy associated with the Enlightenment with which it espoused clear links
- The relative decline of the Moderate Party under Principal George Hill in the late 1780s led to eventual defeat to the Evangelicals in 1805, suggesting a causal relationship between the fortunes of the respective parties fortunes

The Patronage Act 1712
- Encouraged the advancement of more moderate ministers, as it was unlikely to be in the interests of the landowner to appoint dedicated puritans. Rather, successful candidates tended to be moderates likely to share the landowner’s wider beliefs and aims
- The General Assembly supported landowner’s use of the Patronage Act which furthered the Moderate objective of an unfanatical ministry
- 1732 – In a measure to reinforce the principle of the Patronage Act, the General Assembly passed an Act against congregational elections

Enlightenment
- All ministers of the Kirk were trained at Scottish Universities and subject to changing methods of tuition and the curricular content as influenced by Hume, Hutcheson and Reid
- Scottish and continental Universities had long established links. As rational and liberal concepts spread through these channels ministers of the established church became increasingly moderate, gradually easing theological restrictions
- Concepts that underpinned the Enlightenment coincided with the emergence of the polite church, as ministers moved their preaching style away from puritanical admonishment
- Weakening of the church’s control over society including education and justice within the context of the flowering of Enlightenment ideas may have disinclined congregations to adhere to puritanical theology, continuing long term trends such as the declining use of church discipline, scriptural examination and the church stool
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Factionalism of Dissenting Presbyterianism

- The 1740 secession created four dissenting churches, initially guided by Erskine’s devotion to the doctrinal values of the Covenanters.
- The Old Licht Burghers, New Licht Burghers, Old Licht Anti-Burghers and New Licht Anti-Burghers remained disunited throughout the eighteenth century, though their congregations remained a significant minority.
- Thus the 1740 secession left those Evangelicals unwilling to secede from the Kirk without leadership within the established church. They remained too disunited to challenge the Moderate party until the late 1780s.
- Non-Presbyterian churches, such as the Glasites and the followers of Robert Haldane failed to organise themselves into meaningful alternatives and ultimately lost what support they had.

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

- **Smout**: Suggests that the declining power of the puritans was linked to the state’s refusal to bolster church discipline with civil penalties. “The chances of the puritans making a deep and lasting impression on society was lessened by the fact that excommunication was not now accompanied by civil penalties... an offender could laugh at the session and get away with it.”
- **Mackie**: Underlines the relationship between the Enlightenment and the decline of Puritanism. “churchmen and laymen, alike influenced by the dawn of ‘reason’, began to doubt whether restrictions upon life imposed in the name of piety were justified. The ‘enlightened’ views commended themselves to philosophical thinkers in the universities... the severe discipline of the Kirk was part of an old superstition which might well be discarded.”
- **Kidd**: Notes that the rise of Moderatism preceded the eighteenth century “before the formation of the Moderate party proper, there had been expressions of moderation within the church. From the Revolution of 1689 onwards several influential figures in the church perceived the necessity of watering down the high ecclesiology of 17th century Covenanting in the interests of winning support.”
- **Brown**: Argues that Evangelicals were numerically dominant to Moderates in the country as a whole, and that the success of the Moderates within the General Assembly was largely due to an exceptionally well-managed party line and a landed interest which accounted for 80% of members.
Question 5

The aim of this essay is for candidates to ascertain the extent to which Scotland’s intellectual life was made possible by the structure of Scottish education. Candidates should analyse the impact of the education in its own right and consider both the schools and universities. Other causal factors linked to Scotland’s intellectual life such as the influence of the Kirk and the Treaty of the Union may also be analysed. Using the relevant evidence, a balanced conclusion should be made.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest that Scotland’s intellectual life was due to the structure of Scottish education

Schools

- 1696 - legislation prescribed for a school in every parish. Parish schools produced comparatively high levels of literacy and numeracy amongst the Scottish populace, particularly in the lowlands by the latter eighteenth century
- Burgh schools achieved a more advanced level of education including Latin
- Burgh schools produced many of the finest minds associated with the Enlightenment. Adam Smith attended Kirkcaldy burgh school, William Robertson was taught at Dalkeith Grammar while David Hume studied at the High School of Edinburgh
- Bursaries were available from burgh schools which facilitated social mobility enabling pupils of modest means to attend university and ultimately enter professions including the church, teaching and law

Universities

- All the Scottish Universities except Aberdeen’s King College had progressed beyond ‘regenting’ to specialised teachers specific to individual subjects by the 1760’s
- The university curriculum evolved into a wide spread of modern subjects though St Andrews lagged behind Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen in this respect. In particular, moral philosophy and political economy emerged as core subjects which became central to Enlightenment culture in addition to the traditional disciplines of law, medicine and divinity
- In addition, there was a willingness to embrace the latest foreign ideas such as Newton’s scientific research and von Pufendorf’s theories of moral philosophy
- Emergence of a professional professoriate resulted in a high standard of university teaching which encouraged independent thinking. Particularly influential were law tutors who were able to influence the landed gentry who made up a significant proportion of the students
- Sympathetic patrons such as the 3rd Earl of Bute and the 3rd Duke of Argyll selected many of this new generation of university teachers
- Influential works of the Enlightenment such as Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations, Hutton’s Theory of the Earth and Reid’s Philosophy of Common Sense were directly inspired from university courses
- Notable intellectual achievements such as Black’s discovery of latent heat, Hutton’s pioneering chemistry which established the discipline of geology and Ferguson’s principles of moral philosophy all had their origins in the new academic disciplines emerging from Scottish universities
- Edinburgh and Glasgow Universities medical schools attracted investment and prestige. The most talented minds were employed by both in an academic environment which encouraged debate within a context that linked science and society
Factors that may suggest that the Scotland’s intellectual life was not due to the structure of Scottish education

- Parish schools were never wholly effective particularly in remote areas such as the highlands, thus there remained a minority who did not receive any formal education.
- Social mobility remained limited. Rural pupils educated in parish schools rarely progressed sufficiently or at a young enough age to gain entrance to university. The more prestigious professions such as law and medicine largely remained the preserve of the upper middle classes.
- Increasing religious toleration due to the rise of the Moderate party created a societal environment of widening diversification and participation in which the church actively promoted intellectual enquiry in contrast to its intolerance at the beginning of the century.
- Many litterateurs of the Enlightenment were men of the Kirk who took advantage of the new dominance of moderatism.
- Informal patronage of tutors by the aristocracy provided some of the greatest minds associated with the Enlightenment the financial means they required to further their intellectual enquiries, notably Hume who was denied a chair due to his atheism.
- Urbanisation created a cosmopolitan yet cohesive society in Scotland’s major cities which contributed to the strongly club orientated nature of the Enlightenment.

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

- Mitchison – argues that the nation’s schools and universities which created a ‘democracy of speech’ directly caused the Scottish Enlightenment. The Scotch peasant was trained to read, write and argue with his ‘betters’.
- Murdoch and Sher – emphasise the economic prosperity and political stability of the latter half of the eighteenth century which encouraged a progressive culture. “economic improvement was conducive to the spread of the Enlightenment. The atmosphere was relatively progressive and open”
- Allan – describes the emergence of a culture rather than specifically the structure of formal education which allowed for the dissemination and articulation of a broad sphere of disciplines associated with the intellectual development. “A peculiar social environment underpinned these ties…with academics, lawyers, landowners doctors, clergy, merchants and other educated people…meeting to discuss and debate issues of public, literary or intellectual interest.”
- Whatley – notes the impact of the Union and the subsequent deprivation of the political elite’s ability to express themselves in their traditional forum. “Union led to ‘inversion’ whereby political energy was redirected into intellectual pursuits.”
Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland (1715 – 1800)

Part 2

Question 1

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source A as an adequate explanation of the reasons why some Scots supported the 1715 rising in terms of:

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Opposition to the misery and unhappiness following the 1688 Revolution
- Traitors had exiled the true King
- The law and constitution were ignored as the line of succession was altered
- Episcopalian clergy were forcibly removed from their religious offices, losing their homes and incomes

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- After 1688 Scottish bishops remained loyal to the House of Stuart
- James Garden was an influential Episcopalian minister who had lost his position as Professor of Divinity at King’s College following the Settlement Act
- The disestablishment of the Episcopalian church ensured the Episcopalian clergy would remain steadfastly loyal to the Stuarts
- A substantial section of the Church in Scotland refused to accept the re-establishment of Presbyterianism in 1690
- In large parts of the Highlands and the lowlands north of the Tay, the Episcopalian church likely accounted for the majority of the population, and may have amounted to forty percent of the population of Scotland as a whole in 1715
Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source

- The Earl of Mar, the self-appointed leader of the rebellion, was a political opportunist who orchestrated the rebellion for personal gain and political necessity
- Scottish Catholics, accounting for an estimated 2 percent of the population, which tended to be concentrated in particular clans, were committed Jacobites
- A minority of Presbyterians who opposed the Treaty of Union tended to be inclined to Jacobitism
- In a wider context the Union was a powerful source of recruits for the Jacobites, as their ‘No Union’ banners confirmed
- 1707 – Pittock estimates 90% of Scots were opposed to the Union – led directly to the attempted Jacobite landing of 1708
- Controversial legislation including the Toleration Act, the introduction of the Malt Tax, the Patronage Act and the Act for Ensuring Loyalty motivated support for the Jacobites across religious and political boundaries
- Repeated imposition of taxes of new indirect taxes to pay for foreign wars reduced the popularity of the House of Hanover further
- 1713 – in defiance of the Treaty of Union, for the first time a Scottish staple crop – malt – was subjected to English levels of tax. Scots MPs responded by moving for a dissolution of the Union
- Tenants and kinsmen of Mar and other Jacobite inclined gentry such as Huntly and the Earl Marischal had little choice but to take up arms in support of the cause

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

- Devine argues that amongst dynastic and ideological reasons for support, it was religious conviction which remained the most powerful. “Many supporters had strong religious reasons for committing themselves…especially the case among Catholic and Episcopalian laird families”
- Donnachie et al stress the broad range of factors which motivated support for the rebellion. “In short, devotion to the Jacobite cause was by no means the only reason for coming out in the Fifteen rebellion.”
- Pittock acknowledges the role played by the Treaty of Union – “An address was printed at Edinburgh calling for an end to the ‘late unhappy Union’…by mid-autumn Mar had accumulated a vast host
- Lenman confirms the successful use of nationalist sentiments by the Jacobites in raising widespread support across Scotland. “The towns tended to be every bit as keenly Jacobite as the landward areas. Nationalist emotions…could only find expression in Jacobite actions.”

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source A is helpful in offering a full explanation of the why some Scots supported the Jacobite rebellion of 1715.
Question 2

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source B as evidence on the impact of sheep farming on of the Highlands in the late eighteenth century.

Provenance:
- The author was a prolific Scottish writer whose work on philosophy, history and economics represented a notable contribution to the Scottish Enlightenment
- An associate of Robert Burns, Heron’s best known titles include The Life of Robert Burns and A History of Scotland. He also co-authored the Statistical Account of Scotland under the employment of Sir John Sinclair
- A member of the general assembly of the Kirk, Heron also edited various influential newspapers including The Globe and The British Press

Points from the Source
- His view is that the claim that traditional Highland farming could support a larger population than the introduction of sheep farming is wrong
- Sheep farming resulted in increased productivity and is therefore beneficial to the country
- Sheep farming will create increased wealth which will benefit many. Income is obtained for a much greater number of mankind
- De-population of the Highlands will recover - it will soon be seen to restore to the Highlands the population which they may seem to have lost

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Contemporary opinion was divided. Observers including Boswell, Johnson and Pennant variously described both the positive and negative impact of new agricultural practices and their impact upon the traditional Highland way of life
- Although regionalised, de-population of the Highlands in the late eighteenth century was the beginning of a long-term statistically significant trend
- De-population did not correct itself as a result of prosperity generated by sheep farming
- Sheep farming led to increased cash rents for clan chiefs and landowners
Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source

- Highland landlords were themselves divided regarding the merits of large-scale sheep farming. Sir John Sinclair was notable in his strongly held opinions that sheep ranching was potentially disastrous to the highlands and highlanders.

- Numerous instances of the incompatibility of the continuation of established levels of population density and the introduction large-scale sheep farming. Bliadhna nan Caorach, The Year of the Sheep (1792) arguably the most infamous example.

- Traditional Highland agriculture produced little and was barely at more than subsistence levels. Famine was not unknown. Methods were virtually unchanging until the 1760s.

- Traditional rents had been paid in military service prior to the Jacobite defeat at Culloden. In addition, rent was paid in kind or quit-rents. Tokenistic, they rarely equated to a commercial payment.

- Highland agriculture was based upon a hierarchical structure which, ironically given its paternalistic repute, could hold sub-tenants in perpetual debt to their tacksmen.

- There was some geographical variation. The eastern Highlands, particularly the Spey valley and Moray Firth, achieved considerably higher levels of productivity than the west and the islands.

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

- Mackie - argues that taken as a whole, the population of the Highlands actually increased until the 1830s and that areas such as Argyll which became dominated by sheep farming produced fewer emigrants than the Hebrides which was little affected by sheep ranching.

- Macinnes – offers an alternative interpretation, as although total Highland population continued to grow in the 1790s he notes that in those areas newly devoted to sheep farming a third experienced a net loss.

- Richards - notes that the attempts to improve Highland agriculture in the late eighteenth century were often not connected to attempts to remove the indigenous population but rather were efforts to “retain the entire population and render them more productive”.

- Prebble - “The growing destruction of ridge farming was undoubtedly economic and profitable, the merging of small holdings into a large single units under one tenant increased the numbers of landless men. Compassion makes expensive calls on the conscience, and it is a comfort to find it undeserved.”

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence about the extent to which a consideration of Source B is useful in offering a full explanation of the impact of sheep farming on the Highlands in the late eighteenth century.
Question 3

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)
Candidates may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of each source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)
These 10 marks will be awarded for:

[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians’ views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources C and D about differing interpretations of the reasons for Henry Dundas’s ability to control Scottish politics in the late eighteenth century and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source C

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- The use of a local power base and alliances
- His effective debating skills
- The importance of Dundas’s relationship with Pitt
- The patronage system which empowered MPs to fill vacant posts with their preferred candidates.

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Dundas’s efforts were relentless in consolidating local alliances to extend both his and the government’s influence in Scotland. He promised government favour to engineer a pattern of alliances in the north and northeast which, following the general election of 1790 largely excluded government opponents from seats in those regions
- Dundas was a significant political figure prior to his relationship with Pitt whose oratory and debating skills had gained him a formidable reputation as a parliamentarian
- Dundas’s alliance with Pitt was closer than any Prime Minister and Scottish manager since Walpole and the Earl of Islay
- Dundas rarely interfered with appointment made by MPs unless to arbitrate between local interests friendly to the government

Source D

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Gained popularity for continuing to use Scots dialect
- He was free from rigidly supporting one party and held successful appointments under both Tory and Whig administrations which enhanced his reputation
- He was never considered a turncoat and considered a great servant of Scotland
- Meticulous examination of parliamentary lists enabled Dundas to gain influence in the Commons and the Lords
Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source

- The use of Scots rather than English divided the Scottish political classes at a time when major Enlightenment figures were discouraging the native language in favour of English
- Dundas was never universally popular amongst the Scottish elite whom continued to be divided on the merits of management
- Despite serving both Tory and Whig administrations Dundas's monopoly of power under Pitt gradually polarized Scottish politics as Scots Whigs increasingly opposed him
- The term ‘Dundas Despotism’ alluded to Dundas’s control over the Scottish political nation through his near complete control of the selection of candidates and access to patronage

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

- Dundas’s management of Scotland was in the context of Union. Scottish politics had moved south to Westminster in 1707. In the resultant vacuum Scotland was governed in the eighteenth century either through a manager, or remotely from London
- Dundas’s management provided access to central government and allowed him to grant patronage to MPs who were willing to be loyal
- Dundas’s access to patronage was almost total due to various senior posts including the Home Office in 1791. As a result, for the next three years he had the entire supervision of official correspondence on Scotland
- The outbreak of war in 1793 and the perceived threat of radicalism bolstered Dundas’s authority over MPs as the status quo appeared to be threatened by internal and external forces
- Dundas’s Scots opponents were gradually neutralized. For all their efforts, they were not well enough organised, and throughout the 1780s and 90s were increasingly marginalised

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

- Murdoch – notes the importance of the support of the Scottish aristocracy and their regional influence in ensuring Dundas’s authority remained unchallenged
- Smout – confirms Dundas’s mastery of patronage which he notes, for the first time, included influence over church appointments
- Fry – argues that the phrase ‘the Dundas Despotism’ is inaccurate as ‘the system over which he presided was perfectly satisfactory to Scots of the time

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources C and D is helpful in offering a full perspective on the reasons Henry Dundas’s ability to control Scottish politics in the late eighteenth century.
“The House Divided”: The USA (1850 – 1865)

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to discuss the similarities and differences in the economic and social systems of North and South in the period before 1861. The candidate may wish to extend and/or link the analysis to consider the differences that existed between North and South beyond the economic differences specifically. Indeed, the candidate may also provide evidence to show that they had as much in common as divided them.

The candidate may use evidence such as:

The Economic Arguments: Industrial North vs. agricultural South

The ‘Industrial’ North
- Greater industrial development than the south
- Greater railway mileage with journey times significantly reduced. The south tended to rely on their river network more than railways
- Industrialising rather than industrialised. For example; four northern manufacturing industries employed more than 50,000 people
- Inequalities in wealth distribution

The ‘agricultural’ South
- Cotton comprised 50% of US exports
- Tariff of annoyance to the South as this impacted on the profits in the south. The southerners feared a reactionary tariff would be imposed by the USA’s trading partners eg Britain
- Limited urbanisation in the south. By 1860, only 20 towns had more than 5,000 inhabitants. Charleston and Richmond only had a population of 40,000
- South had 35% of US population but produced only 10% of manufactured output
- Inequalities in wealth distribution with society dominated by the planter class which made up approx. 5% of the southern population

Common features of economic development
- Abundance of fertile land, timber, raw materials
- Navigable rivers with over 700 steamships operating on the Mississippi by 1850
- Between 1800 and 1850, gross national product increased 7 fold whilst, per capita income doubled
- Development of industry in South at, eg Tredegar Iron Works. The Upper South was traditionally along the same lines as the north – although perhaps not industrialising at the same rate as the north
- Population increase; doubling every 25 years!
- Some urban development but 80% lived in rural communities
- Predominance of agriculture regardless of the section. The North West was known as ‘the larder of the USA’ producing food crops whereas agriculture in the south was focused on cotton, tobacco etc but agriculture nevertheless in both sections
- Developments in transport, eg turnpike roads, canals, steamboats
- Growth of railways and eagerness to ensure the construction of the trans-continental railroad which would bring trade between the east coast and the Orient
- Development of the telegraph with 50,000 miles by 1850
Cultural differences between North and South
- the economic make-up of each ‘section’ had a significant impact on their respective cultural development.
- Majority of immigration to the North – very few immigrants in the South
- Northerners better educated
- Northerners responsive to new developments and initiatives
- Limited freedom of speech in the South in comparison to the North
- South arguably a more violent society

Ideological Differences
- Differing attitudes to abolitionism and abolitionist actions/propaganda
- Differing views on Fugitive Slave Laws introduced in 1850
- Differing attitudes to education. The south happy to maintain focus on cotton whereas the north required new ideas to compete on an industrial level
- Southerners increasingly believed in the idea that slavery could only be protected out with the Federal Union
- States’ Rights versus Federal Government

Broad similarities between North and South:
- The candidate may choose to challenge the statement with reference to features of a common identity:
  - common heritage and history
  - language
  - religion
  - faith in the Constitution
  - failure of the Nashville Convention
  - some support for the various bills that comprised the 1850 Compromise
  - strong belief in the values of the 1776 Revolution and the 1787 Constitution
  - most white Northerners and white Southerners had similar racial views.

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Beards: economic competition between a feudal South and an industrial North
- Potter: Rejects Beards’ views, no gulf between north and south
- McPherson: whole of USA witnessed a transport revolution. 5% of population owned about 70% of taxable property. Both North and South viewed the west as the nation’s future
- Miller: railroad expansion key to US prosperity
- Craven: South had the same level of economic enterprise as the North
- Freehling: noted that Lower South politicians cared more about perpetuating slavery than the Union, while Border South leaders would compromise on slavery in order to save the Union. Slaveholders overwhelmingly controlled the Lower South but less solidly controlled the Middle and Border South
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess how successful the Abolitionist movement was in the period to 1861 by defining the aims of the group and using that to compare these with what was actually accomplished and to come to an appropriate conclusion as to how far the group had been responsible for and involved in the decision making process until 1861.

The candidate might use evidence such as:

**Successes and Influence of the abolitionist movement**
- influence of William Lloyd Garrison and ‘The Liberator’
- Frederick Douglass’ rise to prominence after escaping from slavery and becoming one the leading abolitionists of the period. Douglass travelled to Britain to spread the word of abolitionism
- support for Liberty Laws of some Northern states
- impact of the novel Uncle Tom’s Cabin
- emergence of the Republican Party
- support for the case of Dred Scott
- Northern reactions to the case of Anthony Burns
- reaction to the attack led by John Brown

**Limitations and problems**

**Lack of interest**
- Limited appeal of the group in the free states
- Complete failure of the movement in the South
- Background of Northern hostility towards blacks
- Northern fears

**Lack of unity**
- One of several reform movements at the time eg temperance, women’s rights
- Several Abolitionist organisations in existence ranging widely in their approach
- Aims of the movement were divided – immediate versus gradual approach
- Influence of and attitudes towards William Lloyd Garrison and ‘The Liberator’
- ‘The Liberator’s’ circulation did not exceed 3,000, of which 75% were free blacks
- Role and influence of Frederick Douglass
- Attitude of anti-slavery societies towards blacks

**Political limitations**
- ‘Gag rule’ limited the political impact of abolitionism
- Lack of political forum to achieve their aims
- 1850 Fugitive Slave Law
- Lack of Liberty Laws in some Northern states
- The failure of the Dred Scott Case which ruled against the abolitionist case
- Failure to win the support of either Whigs or Democrat Parties
- Limited impact of the Liberty Party
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Barnes and Drummond**: suggest that most abolitionists had a simple and straightforward approach. The moral attack, not the violence of Garrison or Brown, convinced a majority of Northerners to join the side of the abolitionists and emancipation came in a violent struggle with the South.
- **Huggins**: has seen in the role of Frederick Douglass the pragmatist at work. He argued for the need to gain the franchise and the need for economic assistance for the freedman in order for him to secure his future.
- **Tulloch**: has concluded that though the abolitionists may have been heroes with feet of clay, nonetheless they were heroes.
- **Temperley**: has argued that the abolitionist movement found it more difficult to agree upon how to achieve its aims, rather than the aims themselves, and this handicapped its effectiveness.
- **Beard**: saw the role of the Abolitionists as insignificant since, in his view, slavery was not the cause of the conflict between the North and the South.
- **Craven**: attacked the abolitionists as he believed their militant strategies were inadmissible and unacceptable.
- **Freehling**: has highlighted the practical implications of abolitionist strategy. The Federal Government had limited powers, states’ rights were seen as sacrosanct, and autonomy was fiercely guarded. As long as slavery was maintained in 15 states, it could not be abolished by amendment.
- **Litwack**: has pointed out the indifference of Northerners on the question of race.
Question 3

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the crisis of 1860 and the extent to which a compromise solution was possible. The candidate would be expected to draw on the issues in the period 1860 – 1861, however the candidate may draw on the longer term issues that brought about the crisis of 1860 and use these to assess the extent to which compromise was possible.

Attempts were futile
- In 1860, the Republicans and Lincoln ran on a platform of non-extension of slavery; many in South interpreted this as abolition of slavery. Lincoln was a sectional candidate representing Northern views
- Republican platform was almost entirely focused on Northern issues
- Lincoln only achieved votes in Northern states. His name did not appear on the ballot paper of a single Southern state
- Southern press hostile to all northern actions eg portrayal of Republicans as the party of the black, which would encourage social and racial chaos
- Lincoln portrayed as a direct threat to the social/economic status of the South, and this justified immediate secession if he were to be elected
- The movement for secession had gathered pace before Lincoln had come to power. This made Lincoln’s task of appealing to the Southern states incredibly difficult when in office
- Lincoln was however, accused of alleged inactivity between his election and inauguration
- Regardless of his views, Lincoln as a Republican would also be linked to pledge to reverse Dred Scott decision
- Lincoln’s theme during his debates with Douglas in 1858 was not just slavery’s immorality or the danger of it spreading but the continuing danger of a malignant conspiracy against the North. The Southerners could not ignore this following Lincoln’s election
- “House divided” speech had widened the gap between the sections
- Abolitionists, John Brown and Harpers Ferry. Northern approval meant point of no return, many in South pushed for secession before a Republican administration acted aggressively
- The South Carolina Ordinance consisted of a list of the ways in which the non-slave-holding states had violated the rights of slave-holders
- Role of abolitionists and fire eaters in keeping the pot boiling

Compromise still possible following Lincoln’s election
- Lincoln did denounce John Brown’s raid and offer assurances to the South that he was not an abolitionist
- Lincoln reassured the south that he would not interfere with slavery where it already existed
- Northern Democrats and representatives from the Upper South in particular were hopeful of achieving a compromise
- House Committee of 33 and Senate Committee of 13 were established to explore a potential compromise
- Compromise plans were drawn up with Senator John J. Crittenden’s attracting most attention
- Proposal; permanence of slavery in the states was to be guaranteed; federal compensation to be paid to owners who did not recover their fugitive slaves; Missouri Compromise line was to be re-established (slavery prohibited north of 36 30’ and protected south of it) would be discussed as a potential compromise
- Support for secession by no means unanimous in the South
- Virginia Peace Convention met in February 1861 was attended by 133 delegates and explored options which would encourage the seceded states to return to the Union
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Potter:** Compromise was impossible from the start
- **Tulloch:** “It was the coming of the Republican Lincoln to power in 1860 that triggered off secession and a civil war.”
- **Gienapp:** Lincoln slow to grasp depth of crisis after election
- **Craven:** Lincoln deliberately engineered war during Fort Sumter crisis and that slavery became “a symbol and carrier of all sectional differences”
- **Ramsdell:** Lincoln responsible for war
- **Randall:** Dismissed Ramsdell; Lincoln moderate views
- **Geyl:** Lincoln showed greater wisdom by his appreciation of the inevitable tragic events
- **Donald:** Volatile electorate and party leaders without policy or principles
- **Beard:** Economic problems in the North, possible legislation that would be to detriment of the South
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess Lincoln’s motivation for issuing the Emancipation Proclamation. The candidate would be expected to assess the importance of military pressures on Lincoln in comparison to the range of other pressures and reasons for his decision.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Military Pressures

- Evolution of Lincoln’s policy: message to Congress of December 1861, first draft plan on emancipation of March 1862 and attempts to persuade the Border States to take the lead, use of presidential war powers since emancipation was a vital military necessity to win the war
- White volunteers less willing so would make wide scale use of blacks more acceptable. Lincoln argued that they were ‘a resource if vigorously applied……will soon close the contest’
- By 1864 100,000 white soldiers did not reenlist. Spring/Summer offensives would not have been possible without the 120,000 black soldiers. An eighth of Union troops around Petersburg were black
- Would black soldiers have been as willing to take risks in battle without emancipation?
- Suggestion from Seward to delay announcement until some military success is achieved
- Timing; psychological and ideological boost for North and a blow to the South
- Foreign involvement; the Proclamation meant war would stay domestic and now a war of attrition

Political Pressures

- Pressure from Cabinet to arm the blacks
- Actions of Generals Butler, Fremont and Hunter
- Pressure from abolitionists
- Pressure from free blacks
- Pressure from Christian groups
- Action of the slaves crossing into Union lines
- Actions of individuals like Sumner (‘state suicide’ theory) and Horace Greely (‘the prayer of twenty millions’)
- Pressure to transform Union war aims from ‘Union as it was’ to ‘Union as it should be’
- Congressional action against slavery eg Johnson/Crittenden Resolution, First and Second Confiscation Acts, Militia Act
- Radical Republicans put considerable pressure on Lincoln. There were a number of differing reasons for their view but all agreed that it would weaken the Southern war effort
- Lincoln didn’t have the constitutional power to abolish slavery therefore he had to do it as a war measure

Lincoln’s personal views on Slavery

- Lincoln personally against slavery but not an abolitionist
- Lincoln emphasised his opposition to slavery’s expansion in the 1858 debates with Stephen Douglas
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Stampp**: believed that Lincoln was reluctant to emancipate the slaves but the war demanded such drastic action
- **Reid**: saw Lincoln’s use of the war powers as one way to destroy a prop to the Southern war effort
- **Fields**: has argued that the actions of the blacks themselves in both North and South left Lincoln with no option but to issue a proclamation in effect recognising the legality of the existing circumstances
- **Tulloch**: has viewed Lincoln’s actions as those of a politician having to change tack due to the evolving nature of the conflict. In this case, Lincoln’s actions are viewed not only as necessary but also as just
- **McPherson**: stated that although the acts of Congress were impressive, they lacked the impact that a presidential order, covering the whole country and population, had
- **La Wanda Cox**: Lincoln’s actions looked towards long-term racial equality
Question 5

The aim of the essay is to allow the candidate to analyse the Southern economic problems during the Civil War and assess the extent to which the Confederacy failed in this aspect of their government. The candidate would be expected to offer some balance in their analysis with consideration of arguments against the statement.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Confederate failings and problems:

Confederate mismanagement
- Failed to develop an appropriate taxation policy as a means of raising revenue
- Loans resulted in massive debt eg Erlanger Loan, January 1863
- Paper money resulted in massive inflation
- Attempts to fix prices added to inflation
- Confederate bonds had limited success
- Informal embargo on cotton exports resulted in stockpiles of cotton which may have been an invaluable source of income at the start of the war
- Failure to supervise the railroads meant supplies often failed to reach troops
- Impressment Act, March 1863 and Taxation-In-Kind-Act, April 1863 were unpopular and caused resentment
- Many of the successful initiatives were arguably achieved by private enterprise rather than the Confederate Government eg Tredegar Iron Works, Richmond

Problems from the outset
- The South was overwhelmingly rural and dependant on cotton
- Limited industry and urbanisation in the South
- Problem of moving from cotton cultivation to food cultivation
- The Confederacy had few gold reserves – most of its wealth was in land and slaves
- Collecting taxation had been a state power. It was difficult to initiate national taxation given southern traditions. High and direct taxes would have been resented and counter-productive
- Unlikely that a fully comprehensive fiscal programme could have been established in 1861/62

Union advantages and initiatives
- Union naval blockade prevented the South selling cotton
- Union naval blockade led to shortages of basic commodities
- Manufacturing production was x12 greater in the North
- Crucial raw materials were steadily lost to Union forces
- Counterfeiting was encouraged by Union forces and contributed to inflation
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Douglas Ball**: The Confederacy’s greatest failure was in the area of finance. Memminger was solely responsible for this failure. Misguided fiscal policies were a major cause of Southern defeat.

- **Donald, Baker and Holt**: Memminger mismanaged the Treasury Department. He failed to distribute funds efficiently, leaving the army unpaid and without food, clothing and shelter. He failed to raise sufficient revenue for the war effort, forcing the Confederacy into debt. He failed to persuade the Southern people of the importance of making sacrifices for the war effort.

- **Parish**: The Southern people could not adapt quickly or efficiently enough to the new ways thrust upon them. Despite the upheavals of war, the Confederacy remained a predominantly rural and agricultural society.

- **McPherson**: Southern wartime taxation exacerbated class tensions and caused growing alienation of the white lower classes from the Confederate cause.

- **Thomas**: Ante-bellum agrarian inertia proved a formidable obstacle for the South during the Civil War. Transformation of the Southern political economy was a temporary response to the demands of the war.

- **Ashworth**: The war years were ones of increasingly severe economic dislocation and for most of the Southern white citizens, one of severe economic hardship. Southern Capitalism was damaged by the war.
“The House Divided”: The USA (1850 – 1865)

Part 2

Question 1

The candidate may be awarded a total of 5 marks for the quality of their evaluation of the provenance of the source AND for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. These marks may be split 3/2 or 2/3. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s value.

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source A as evidence for reactions to the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854.

Provenance:
- Produced in reaction to Stephen Douglas’ Kansas Nebraska Bill of January 1854
- Salmon P Chase was Senator for Ohio
- Salmon P Chase was a well-known ‘Free Soil’ activist who would become a leading and arguably founding figure within the Republican Party
- The authors were increasingly concerned about the southern dominance/orientation of the governing politicians and were the earliest advocates of the ‘slave power conspiracy’ theory
- Stephen Douglas took their response personally, launching an attack on the men in a debate in the Senate on 30th January during which he referred to the men as ‘the abolitionist confederates’
- Joshua Giddings…also attributed his name to the statement

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- A plot to ensure that the remaining territories become slave states
- The Union is failing to deliver its aims of justice and liberty and its existence is therefore under threat
- A rallying cry to politicians to resist the Act by speech and vote
- A rallying cry to the people of the USA to resist the Act and the attempts to limit slavery in the territories

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Kansas and Nebraska territory opened up to popular sovereignty following repeal of 1820 Missouri Compromise. Potential for slavery in the territory despite the 36 30 agreement
- Serious threat to the Union. Part of the slave power conspiracy to allow the South to dominate and spread its slavery. Northern outrage
- Resistance in the form of the Republican Party founded directly in rejection to the Act. Its original name being the Anti-Nebraska Party
- Emigrant Aid societies established to support the movement of free settlers to the region to impact on the vote in the territories. Bleeding Kansas followed as a result
Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source:

- Douglas believed the Kansas-Nebraska Act would provide the absolute solution to the issue of slavery in the territories
- The Act was viewed as offering something to both North and South as a means of providing a compromise on the organisation of the territories
- Douglas hoped that the Act would heal the divisions within the Democratic Party and unite them as a national party
- Most accepted that Kansas and Nebraska would emerge as free states given their climate and geography
- Initially kept Southerners happy through repeal of ban on slavery in Nebraska
- Allowing popular sovereignty was a miscalculation as it was open to sectional abuse for voting
- Douglas did admit however that repealing the Missouri Compromise and introducing popular sovereignty may ‘cause a hell of a storm’
- In the 1855 Kansas election problems lead to two rival Governments
- Anti-slavery Democrats, Whigs and Free Soilers had already met in Ripon, Wisconsin to propose the formation of a new political party based on opposition to the spread of slavery. The early movement had no leader, no real national organisation and little direction. The name anti-Nebraska was suggested but also Opposition and The People’s Party. The Republican Party emerged as a rainbow coalition of differing views across the North
- Nativist concerns in North progressively overshadowed by slavery issue and concerns over Kansas-Nebraska
- “Bleeding Kansas” re-emphasised slave power conspiracy in North & led to extremists being sanctioned on both sides, eg - Lawrence raid & Potawatomie Creek
- Other events emerged as a consequence of Kansas Nebraska eg, “Bleeding Sumner”, again linked to Slave Power Conspiracy
- 1856 Presidential Election Buchanan (Democrat) for Kansas-Nebraska & Fremont (Republican) against = more North/South split
- The Act became a focus for Lincoln-Douglas debates 1858

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

- McPherson: “Even more important than the Fugitive Slave issue in arousing Northern militancy was the Kansas-Nebraska Act which was passed by Congress in May 1854
- Coming at the same time as the Anthony Burns case, this law may have been the most important single event pushing the nation toward civil war”
- Tulloch: Kansas-Nebraska erased the stability of Missouri Compromise. The Republican Party, born as a result of the Kansas-Nebraska Act attracted those opposed to Southern determination to maintain slavery
- Farmer: Douglas did not predict Northern outrage and so weakened his party, damaged own presidential ambitions and revived North-South rivalry.
- Craven: territorial extension was perceived as vital to continuation of both sides
- Holden Reid: slavery was central to the sense of cultural divergence between the North and the South. Rise of sectional northern party dedicated to restriction of slavery signalled an end to a desire for compromise
- Parish: rivalry between North and South exacerbated by imbalance in political power brought about by territorial expansion
- Gienapp: Republicans united in opposition to ‘slave power’. Know-Nothings had eroded previous party loyalties

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source A is useful as evidence of reactions to the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854.
Question 2

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source B** as an adequate explanation of the motivations of soldiers for fighting during the Civil War in terms of:

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

**Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views:**
- Most soldiers signed up to serve for both sides for ideological reasons
- Northerners fought to save the Union and continue the ‘great experiment’ in democracy
- Northerners viewed Southerners as traitors and rebels and should not be allowed to break away from the Union
- Southerners fought to defend their homeland and southern independence

**Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source:**
- Most northerners fought for the union and protect the democracy which they had fought to have during the war of independence against Britain
- Union war aims at the outset were firmly focused on re-establishing the Union
- Northerners believed that the South had no legal right to secede from the Union and they should be brought back into line
- Southerners fought to defend their homeland against an invader

**Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source:**
- Comradeship
- Community
- Masculine identity ie a desire not to let your family down
- Ethnicity
- Conscription: After 1862 in the South and 1863 in the North, men were forced to fight
- Use of bounties to encourage recruitment
- Southerners united by the threat that a Republican government posed to them
- Southerners fought to defend the institution of slavery and resist the abolitionist threat from the North
- Southerners united in a defence of the Southern way of life. They fought to protect state autonomy
- Forcing the Yankees to recognise their rights and also their status
- The election of Lincoln as President in 1860 and the dominance of the Republicans in Federal Government terrified Southerners as they were perceived as abolitionist and a real threat to the South
- Resist perceived Northern oppression
- The South felt they had no political representation in Federal Government given that the Republicans represented Northern values and had received no support in the South
- John Brown’s raid at Harper’s Ferry, 1859, convinced many Southerners that there was a Northern attempt to incite a slave insurrection
- Southern nationalism or at least patriotism to the South
- Defend liberty and self-government of the Southern states
- Fought to defend property and property rights, which, they argued, included slaves
- Defend Southern womanhood from Northern depredation
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **James McPherson**: Confederate soldiers tacitly supported defence of Southern institutions
- **Susan-Mary Grant**: political and ideological factors played a large part in sustaining the “Civil War Soldiers” will to fight
- **Reid Mitchell**: Loyalties to fellow soldiers were important
- **A Haughton**: men filled with thoughts of excitement and drama of war. In the South, many fought for independence and defence of their own institutions and laws. Real affinity towards their community and section
- **Bell Wiley**: Southerners volunteered due to deep-seated hatred of the North, northern hostility to local institutions, a desire for adventure and a sense of it being the right thing to do
- **Parish**: combined forces of nationalism and democracy produced a massive increase in commitment to the cause of one side or the other, which made this a people’s war. Huge response of 1861 was the product of individual enthusiasm, state action and local initiative. Men joined due to encouragement of family and friends, motivated by a mixture of patriotism, fear of being thought a coward and anxiety that it would all be over before they could get involved

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source B is helpful in offering an explanation of the motivations that encouraged soldiers to fight during the Civil War.
Question 3

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)

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

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)

These 10 marks will be awarded for:
[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians’ views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources C and D about differing interpretations of Lincoln’s relations with his generals during the Civil War and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source C

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Lincoln’s first generals believed that the war should be carried out by professional soldiers and they should not be dictated to by politicians
- McClellan did not keep Lincoln informed about developments on the battlefield or his strategy believing that Lincoln should have no role in military conduct of the war
- Lincoln, knowing the importance of public opinion, wanted an attack on the South but McClellan refused to follow Lincoln’s orders for an attack on the South until he was ready
- Lincoln demanded an all-out attack on the South, whereas the generals believed in one battle at a time

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Frustration of Lincoln at McClellan’s disregard for his orders who declared that ‘I can do it all’. He was overly confident and optimistic about the war effort and his own abilities. McClellan was arrogant and took credit for victories that were not necessarily his. For example in West Virginia at the start of the civil war
- Political differences between the Lincoln and McClellan. McClellan was a Democrat who did not want to emancipate the slaves and described Lincoln as a ‘well-meaning baboon…..the original gorilla’
- Differences in their view regarding the purpose of the war
- McClellan wanted to outmanoeuvre the Confederacy and avoid ‘total war’ that Lincoln favoured. McClellan wanted to ensure that he did not create a lasting division between North and South. Hence his desire to avoid frontal assaults. Despite having a large army which outnumbered the Confederacy, he was reluctant to attack. He was over cautious and indecisive. He exaggerated the size of the enemy. For example; the Peninsula Campaign 1862
Source D

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views

- Congratulating Meade on success
- Lincoln is deeply distressed by the decision not to pursue General Lee
- Lincoln accuses Meade of failing to calculate the magnitude of General Lee’s escape
- As a consequence, Lincoln believes that the war will be prolonged indefinitely

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source

- General Meade offers to resign for his failure to capture Lee at Gettysburg and his overtly cautious approach. Meade had himself criticised his predecessor, Hooker for being too cautious. Lincoln could not sack Meade given the victory at Gettysburg
- Lincoln criticised Meade for failing to pursue Lee given the significant Confederate losses at Gettysburg following Pickett’s charge. Even during the retreat, Lee’s army found themselves extremely vulnerable as a consequence of heavy flooding which had made the Potomac River near impassable. However Lee was able to erect strong defensive positions before Meade could organise an effective attack
- Lee’s successful retreat allowed the Confederate army to regroup and continue their campaign against the North
- Lincoln and other leading politicians believed that the capture of Lee would have effectively ended the war. Nevertheless, Meade did receive the ‘Thanks of Congress’ and promotion to Brigadier General for his contribution to the victory at Gettysburg

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

- Tulloch: North paid dearly for the caution of McClellan. McClellan did not appreciate that in a modern democracy war was politics. In addition, Tulloch argues that Lincoln was willing to take risks – allowing Burnside to adopt a dictatorial style in order to achieve military success for example
- Dawson: McClellan was the personification of limited warfare. He mistakenly believed that when ever the war ended, the nation could only be restored on the basis of the Union as it stood in 1860
- Williams: in his dealings with the Lincoln administration, McClellan committed several bad errors that showed he lacked the qualities of a supreme commander. In addition Williams argues that Lincoln was a great military strategist and he grasped, long before many of the generals did, that a full on attack rather than taking territory and cities was far more important
- McPherson: Several of Lincoln’s generals were appointed for political reasons and as such they proved to be incompetent on the battlefield
- Archer Jones: Lincoln never pushed generals with particular political appeal for command of the major armies instead Lincoln displayed an informed and sophisticated grasp of the political and military impact of each
- Neely: Lincoln went to extremes to avoid partisanship in selecting battlefield commanders. This was an admirable trait crucial to Union victory
- Simon: Lincoln was reluctant to remove some of his political generals eg Nathaniel Banks

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources C and D is helpful in offering a full perspective on differing interpretations of Lincoln’s relations with his generals during the Civil War.
JAPAN

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to explore the extent to which the Tokugawa regime was successful in using Neo-Confucianism, Shintoism and Buddhism as a means of social control. Reference to their control of Christianity is also highly relevant. It would be relevant to examine ways in which the exploitation and manipulation of each belief system was either successful or unsuccessful – or sometimes a combination of both.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support

Neo-Confucianism

Successful
- Confucianism originated in China and during Tokugawa times this was promoted as main set of beliefs and moral code.
- Used as a form of social control to underpin their decentralised nature of control
- Advocated filial piety, respect and loyalty
- Underpinned Caste structure
- However, the notions of filial piety, respect and loyalty continued to be exploited by Japan’s leaders after 1868

Unsuccessful
- Notions of loyalty and piety kept the Emperor as a notional figurehead, who could be exploited and become a rallying point for any critics of the regime
- However, the Caste structure was blurring by the mid-19th century and Shintoism was challenging Neo-Confucianism for importance as the Revivalist movement gained momentum
- Its association with China meant it was increasingly criticised in late Tokugawa times, especially by members of the National Learning movement
Shintoism

Successful
- Indigenous religion which dates back to nature worship of pre-historic period
- It was a loose collection of beliefs and practices associated with worship of Kami or ‘spirit’. Shinto was used to support the claims of the imperial family to the throne, and so exploited to some degree by the Tokugawa regime as they used the theoretical position of the emperor to legitimise the caste structure
- The emperor was the high priest – represented as living Kami by virtue of his descent from the sun goddess
- Shintoism was also heavily controlled to ensure the Tokugawa could maintain control of the Emperor
- Formal institutions of organised Shinto (eg shrines) were deprived of funding or placed under the control of Buddhist priests although rituals continued, so heavily controlled

Unsuccessful
- However, as disillusionment with the Tokugawa regime continued, there was a Shinto Revivalist Movement, which used the Shinto religion as justification to get the Emperor restored as central to Japanese government. The Tokugawa regime was not able to fully control the Shinto religion in the manner they would like

Buddhism

Successful
- Buddhism was exploited to assist in the administrative control of Tokugawa Japan
- Buddhism formally entered Japan by the 6th century through the influx of Chinese scholarship. Japanese virtues multiplied
- It provided rituals and practices for specific aspects of life and death
- Every citizen had to register at his or her Buddhist temple – a form of social control
- Most common education took place in Temple schools, often centred upon reinforcing the ideas underpinning the caste structure

Christianity

Successfully controlled
- The Tokugawa regime attempted to heavily control Christianity
- Banned during Tokugawa times – association with colonisation. Tokugawa policy of isolation was a means of trying to prevent Christianity from entering Japan. In their minds there was a clear association between colonization and Christianity
- 1720 – ban on Western books lifted – except for the Bible

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

- Hunter: Contends that ‘the ruling class had long viewed both religion and education as vehicles for furthering the purposes of the state’
- Waswo: Suggests that Neo-Confucianism stressed the ethical nature of government, stressing obedience to one’s superiors
- Tipton: Argues ‘popular anxiety was reflected in the late Tokugawa period in pilgrimages to traditional religious centres. In 1830 an exceptionally large number of people converged upon the grand shrine of Isa, the sacred centre built for the Shinto Sun Goddess Amaterasu.’
- Jansen: highlights changing perspectives towards religion and the Shinto revivalist movement ‘a vigorous anti-Confucian and anti-Chinese polemic was mounted by a new school of Nativist scholars.’
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to evaluate the role played by the Iwakura Mission in helping Japan industrialise. It may be relevant to mention other factors but the influence of the Iwakura Mission must be adequately discussed thus reaching a balanced conclusion regarding the role of this isolated factor in Japan’s economic development.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the influence of the Iwakura Mission

- In 1871 a top delegation was despatched to Europe and America in the hope of substantive negotiation and revision of the Unequal treaties
- Led by Prince Iwakura Tomomi, a court noble, Okubo Toshimichi and Kido Koin (2 main architects of the Restoration) and Ito Hirobumi – individuals who dominated the ruling oligarchy
- Although they failed in their attempt to get the Treaties revised the mission did have beneficial results
- The mission made extensive observations of various aspects of Western society, including industry and commerce, which did influence the reform process undertaken
- Delegates on the Mission made many visits to factories and industrial plants in their visits throughout the West
- Infrastructure of modern state implemented was influenced by information gathered on the Iwakura Mission eg transport, postal, financial
- 1872 a government run western-style silk mill was started in Tomioka – aimed disseminating new techniques to private silk producers
- 1882 – Bank of Japan established as central bank along British lines. Other banks were commercial banks but were not allowed to issue notes
- There was selective and closely controlled use of western know-how
- Iwakura also was the start of closer relations with the west, which were exploited to help the process of industrialisation
- They hired large numbers of foreign experts during the 1870s to act as advisers, engineers and administrators
- These hired foreigners enjoyed a privileged life but remained subordinate to Japanese on all but technical matters
- Japanese were also sent abroad for training and observation
- The Iwakura Mission instigated the use of foreign experts during the 1870s to act as advisers, engineers and administrators
- These hired foreigners enjoyed a privileged life but remained subordinate to Japanese on all but technical matters
Factors which may contradict

Role of Zaibatsu
- Government favouritism resulted in the development of huge monopolistic concerns
- 1880s onwards Zaibatsu began to dominate manufacturing and commercial activities
- Most had their own bank
- Some concentrated on certain fields; others embraced a range of activities
- By the early 20th century control was becoming a problem
- These huge conglomerates were led by 4 giants – Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo and Yasuda
- Mitsubishi conglomerate controlled 25% of shipping and ship building, 15% of coal and metals, 16% of bank loans, 50% of flour milling, 59% of sheet glass, 35% of sugar and 15% of cotton textiles
- Developed networks of foreign contacts and gathered information in order to sell and purchase a wide variety of goods abroad
- They became influential in politics – so powerful that they could not be ignored

But development of Zaibatsu dependent upon support from government
- Japan’s development was a unique partnership between public and private institutions
- There was a high level of Government intervention, in contrast to the laissez-faire attitude that was still influential in Britain at the time
- Foreign loans were substantial – especially during war with China – resulted in substantial debt

Foundations laid during Tokugawa period
- The peasantry also produced craft items, initially for subsistence, later commercial purposes
- Textiles, notably silk and cotton, but nothing approaching modern factory system
- Relatively high literacy rates
- Contact with the Dutch

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

- **Beasley:** Argues “The attitudes of the men who took part were profoundly influenced by their experiences”
- **Wood:** Contends “Western activity was to be critically evaluated and shaped to suit Japan”
- **Hiromatsu:** Highlights that the “Task of these missions was to survey modernisation for adaptation to the Japanese cause”.
- **Reischauer:** Suggests “The great wealth and broad base of the combines (Zaibatsu) enabled them to finance promising new fields in the economy and thus increase their share in its fast-growing industrial sector”
- **Macpherson:** Argues “Two fundamental conditions for modern economic growth were the Tokugawa legacy and the role of the government”
- **Hunter:** Suggests that “Part of Japan’s strength has lain in her responsiveness to a changing economic environment and the adaptability of her industrial structure”
Question 3

The focal point of the Meiji Restoration was ‘restoring’ the neglected Emperor to a role at the head of Japanese society. This question is asking candidates to evaluate the extent to which it can be argued that this actually happened. It would be expected that candidates would explore the political and social position of the Emperor before reaching a conclusion.

Symbol of national identity

- Emperor Meiji only 15 years of age when the Restoration occurred, so open to exploitation and manipulation by new Restoration oligarchy
- Real political authority lay with the clan leaders from Satsuma and Choshu who led the rebellion
- Political power had only really shifted from one political elite to another
- Charter Oath really written by Kido Koin and issued in the name of the Emperor
- Constitution largely written and shaped by Hirobumi
- Emperor’s position as a living deity exploited as a means of political control, to push through reforms and edicts the politicians had written, to ensure there was minimal opposition
- Greater emphasis placed on Shintoism to reinforce the unquestionable position of the Emperor, which made it very difficult to challenge any reforms or edicts being issued in his name

Real powers

- As soon as the Restoration was announced, legal edicts, such as the Charter Oath, were issued in the name of the Emperor, which marked a huge shift compared with the role of the Emperor during Tokugawa times
- The position of the Emperor was used to unite all the disparate domains of Tokugawa Japan into a centralised political system
- Emperor relocated to the political centre of Japan, to Tokyo
- Constitution a gift from the Emperor, bestowed upon the people
- The Emperor’s position was legally established within the Meiji Constitution, which declared his inviolability and allowed him wide powers (on paper)
- The Emperor had the right to declare war, make peace, conclude Treaties and adjourn the Diet
- The Army was answerable only to the Emperor
- Imperial Rescript of Education placed Emperor at the centre of Education

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

- **Storry** contends that ‘the nominal head of the new government in Tokyo was a court noble but the real controllers of power were men from much junior rank from the western clans’
- **Waswo** highlights the ‘impressive proclamations and edicts were issued in the Emperor’s name calling upon people to support the building of schools, hospitals and factories and to render service to Japan’
- **Beasley** argues ‘The Emperor’s importance as a source of legitimacy for the Meiji leadership has never been in doubt’. To the Meiji leaders he was ‘useful as a symbol and occasionally as a weapon of last resort’
- **Wall** states ‘At first the new government made a show of being open; soon, however, power was concentrated in the hands of the samurai from the western clans’
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to analysis the Tripartite Intervention as a cause of the Russo-Japanese war. This is an isolated factor question, so the candidate would be expected to give due consideration to the given factor before moving on to discuss other relevant factors. Candidates will eventually reach a conclusion regarding the significance of the Tripartite Intervention in causing the conflict.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

**Tripartite intervention**
- Japan had been delighted when, in the aftermath of their defeat of China, they were awarded their first foothold in the Asian mainland in the form of the Liaodung peninsula.
- However, the Russians, who were in the process of expanding their interests in the region, were unhappy with this.
- Russia instigated this intervention, the Tripartite Intervention, with France and Russia, and forced Japan to hand back its recently won foothold onto the mainland (the Liaodong Peninsula).
- Such humiliation sparked further military reform and a profound desire for revenge.
- Public opinion firmly behind a strong stance against Russia in 1904.
- Russia later leased the Liaodong Peninsula which further angered Japan.
- The consequence was a profound anti-Russian sentiment within Japan, which was later fuelled by the completion of the Trans-Siberian railway.

**Japanese reaction to the Russian action during the Boxer Rebellion**
- Japan's reaction to Russia's behaviour during the Boxer Rebellion was, arguably, highly influenced by the Tripartite Intervention.
- Events during the Boxer Rebellion exacerbated the existing anti-Russian sentiment and the fear of their expansionism.
- During the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, Japanese Prime Minister Yamagata took the lead in organising and manning the international force of European, American and Japanese troops.
- The Boxer Rebellion in China (1900) led to an 8 nation occupation of Beijing to re-establish stability.
- Russian troops failed to withdraw completely when they were supposed to, and occupied part of Manchuria.
- 6 Feb 1904 – Japan cut diplomatic relations and launched attacks on Russian held territory.
- 10 Feb 1904 – war declared.
- Russian occupation of Manchuria was certainly a catalyst to war, but Japan had been looking for an excuse to challenge and prevent what they perceived to be Russian expansionism in Asia.

**Other relevant factors**

**Concerns over Korea**
- Historically, Korea had played an important role in previous conflict between Japan and China.
- Although Korea had come under Japan's sphere of influence after the victory over China, she was still not formally a colony, so still could be potentially exploited by others.
- The Korean peninsula was Japan's obvious means of accessing the Asian mainland, and was also the 'dagger pointing into the heart of Japan'.
- There was a growing fear of Russian expansion into this area, especially after the completion of the Trans-Siberian railway.
- Russia's failure to withdraw from Manchuria was perceived by some as a threat to Japanese interests in Korea.
**Alliance with Britain**
- Japanese confidence grew in 1902 when the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was signed
- Mistrust of Russia was widespread in Britain
- The alliance with Japan was seen as a means of containing Russian expansion in the East, avoiding a Russo-Japanese partition of NE Asia and preserving the British treaty system in China

**Desire to be perceived as equal with the west**
- Some aspects of Unequal Treaties were still in place – belief amongst some that the best way to overcome them was to become like western powers
- The Iwakura Mission had raised awareness about world powers and the empires – inspiring imperial expansion in Japan
- Fear that if they themselves did not embark upon imperialism through conflict, they could be colonised
- An expansionist foreign policy would also give Japan access to raw materials and overseas markets to aid industrial expansion that was seen as an important part of overturning all the final vestiges of the Unequal Treaties

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

- **Gordon**: Argues ‘The Russians came to rival the Japanese position on Korea. They challenged it in Manchuria as well as by seizing the leasehold for the tip of the Liaodong peninsula in 1898’
- **Benson & Matsumara**: Contends that ‘the European powers’ growing interest in Asia could scarcely be overlooked and this encouraged Japan’s development of a more aggressive foreign policy’
- **B B Oh**: Argues that ‘for Japan, imperialism was a means of attaining equality with the west’
- **Barnhart**: Highlights the importance of the 1902 Alliance with Britain in encouraging the Japanese to adopt a firmer line with Russia ‘Japan had obtained recognition – in treaty form no less – of its own great power status in an alliance between equals with one of the greatest nations of Europe’
- **Buruma** argues that the Russo-Japanese war was the high point of Meiji militarism. Japan had been feeling bruised after the western powers had forced them to hand over some of their victory spoils in 1895, including the southern tip of Liaotung peninsula in Manchuria, which was then leased to Russia’.
Question 5

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate is to explore the progress Japan made within international politics between 1912 and 1920. It should be possible to present evidence to both support and challenge this view before reaching a conclusion.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support
- Japan had already made much progress before 1912, with the final Unequal Treaty being eventually overturned in 1911, and victories over China and Japan, but there was still significant progress made in the Taisho years
- Taisho years was a period of stabilisation after rapid reform of Meiji years, within the context of peaceful co-operation with the major Western powers

Impact of WW1
- Japan joined the conflict on the winning side, acquiring Germany’s Chinese sphere of influence in Shantung, extending its control of Manchuria and its overall influence on China
- Taisho years witnessed imperial expansion becoming more aggressive and planned – 21 Demands in 1915, which was interpreted by the West as an attempt to bring China under its control
- From 1915 Japanese industry underwent considerable expansion because it was able to capture markets from European powers actively involved in the war eg the Indian markets for textiles had been dominated by Lancashire products before 1914
- Japan emerged on the winning side in 1918 virtually as a non-combatant without having incurred any of the costs of war, unlike Britain and America
- Significance of Japan’s participation in Paris Peace Conference – confirmation of Japan's changing status as a nation and evidence of their increasing influence in international politics
- Became a council member of the new League of Nations
- The expansion of other Japanese industries, for example ship building and heavy engineering

Taisho Democracy
- Political parties in the Diet came to dominate the cabinets – influenced by other world powers and their interactions with them
- Influenced by foreign developments (such as Russian Revolution, establishment of Labour Party) led to demands for more social justice and equality, advanced by social movements of the period
- First ‘commoner’ Prime Minister, Hara Kei, first to be an elected member of the legislature

Factors which may contradict

Evidence which suggests Japan still not viewed as a world power
- Attitude in US to Japanese immigration – 1908 they attempted to limit the flow of Japanese migrants, not allowed to own land in California
- Japan’s desire for racial equality clause as part of League of Nations Charter was not accepted
- Although maintained control of the former German Mariana Islands, it was through a League mandate rather than outright ownership

Evidence which suggests Japan had achieved world power status before the Taisho years
- Signing of Alliance with Britain in 1902
- Victory over China then Russia
- Overturning final vestige of Unequal Treaty in 1911
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Ayira Iriye**: Contends that ‘the Japanese were rewarded by being invited to the peace conference, the first time Japan attended a conference as a fully-fledged member’

- **Benson and Matsumura**: Takes the view ‘The rejection by the Powers of Japanese proposals for the inclusion of a racial equality clause in the Versailles Settlement heightened the grievance of the Japanese towards the unequal treatment to which the coloured races were subjected by Western peoples’

- **Storry**: Suggests that during the Taisho period ‘It was not long before Japan became a creditor instead of a debtor among the nations’

- **Pyle**: Holds the view ‘The outbreak of WW1 in Europe in the summer of 1914 provided (Japan) extraordinary opportunities to advance the twin objectives of empire and industry’
Japan: From Medieval to Modern State (1850s – 1920)

Part 2

Question 1

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source A as evidence of the significance of the caste system within Japanese society in 1850 in terms of:

Provenance:
- Title of publication 'An Attempt at Interpretation' of Japan', with the author himself acknowledging that he might not have a full grasp of Japanese society
- The author moved to Japan in 1890, almost 20 years after the caste structure had been abolished so he did not experience the caste structure directly himself
- This is a highly positive, arguably romanticised view of the caste structure, with no direct reference to any of the specific social groupings contained within it

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- ‘Conditions under the Caste Structure tended toward general happiness as well as toward prosperity’. ‘There were not, in those years, any struggle for existence’ – belief that everyone within the caste structure was happy with the rigid social hierarchy and that it prevented individuals from falling into poverty
- ‘Every man had a master to provide for him or to protect him’ – the caste structure meant that every caste had one above them to look after and provide for them
- ‘Ranks and incomes were fixed; occupations were hereditary’ - within the caste structure your position was dictated by birth, which also fixed the wealth you would accumulate
- Regulations limited the rich man’s right to use his money as he pleased

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- The Tokugawa shoguns had adhered to a strict caste structure after they secured control in 1603, which dictated everyone’s place in society and, in theory, prevented any mobility between castes
- The caste structure was a hierarchal system with one social grouping above the next
- The caste structure was strictly hereditary – you could not move out of the caste you were born into, which in turn dictated your position within society
- Each caste was regulated by a code of behaviour centred on loyalty and piety, such as the bushido code for the samurai
Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source

- The author of the source, perhaps a consequence of the fact he did not actually experience the caste structure himself, mentions none of the specific castes within Japan.
- The samurai and peasants were two of the important castes; the former were individual warriors tied to a daimyo who were responsible for maintaining law and order, the latter were responsible for producing Japan’s staple food source and form of currency – rice.
- Although the Shogun, based in Edo, held real political power, the Tokugawa did keep the emperor as the nominal figurehead of this social structure, in an attempt to legitimise their rule.
- Tokugawa society did see the foundations put down for industrial development, with some peasants diversifying into commercial activities, and merchants (in theory a very low caste) assuming greater power and control by 1850.
- The source fails to mention the Daimyo, the landowners, who were so crucial within the Tokugawa social structure and control mechanisms.
- These were divided into those that were loyal (Feudai) and those that traditionally had not been loyal (Tozama) who were carefully controlled.
- Source does not capture the blurring of the caste structure that was underway by 1850.
- Source also does not mention the Eta caste within the social structure.
- Source also fails to mention the importance of Neo-Confucianism with Japanese society, along with Shintoism and Buddhism.
- Relatively high literacy rates in Japan by 1850.
- By 1850 there was growing dissatisfaction within many social groups, which the source clearly does not capture.

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

- **Waswo**: States that ‘conditions in Japan most closely resembled those of high feudalism in Europe’.
- **Hane**: is of the belief that ‘in order to ensure political control and social stability the Tokugawa Bakufu set out to fix a rigid class system’.
- **Hunter**: states that ‘a rigid hierarchy of hereditary caste continued to prevail both in theory and to a large extent in practice.’
- **Storry**: highlights the blurring of caste divisions that were occurring by the mid nineteenth century. ‘The whole regime had been under indirect attack for many quarters inside Japan long before 1850’.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source A is useful as evidence for investigating the significance of the caste structure within Japanese society in 1850.
Question 2

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)

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

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)

These 10 marks will be awarded for:

[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians' views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources B and C about differing views of the importance of foreign forces as a reason for the downfall of Tokugawa regime, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source B

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views

- On Perry's arrival – 'the political ossification of the Bakufu was at an advanced stage and the system seemed incapable of operating' – on Perry’s arrival the political system of the Tokugawa was already weakened and they were struggling to maintain control
- ‘The Bakufu was a system of patronage that was bankrupt in terms of effectively managing the crises it faced’ – on Perry’s arrival the ruling Bakufu were experiencing severe economic difficulties effecting its ability to control Japan
- ‘The force that held it together was the anxiety of those who profited from its continued survival regardless of its incompetence and saw no alternative’ – those who had control were not prepared to acknowledge any other systems of control as this could affect their own influence and power
- ‘The events of 1853-4 were to provide precisely such a demonstration’ – the arrival of Perry had the profound impact of being a catalyst, bring all the inherent weaknesses of the Tokugawa government to a head

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source

- By Perry's arrival the important control mechanisms utilised by the Tokugawa were beginning to fail. The important distinctions between castes were blurring
- Daimyo and Samurai were getting into debt to the merchants as a result of their often lavish lifestyles. Samurai were selling their privileges to merchants and disregarding the Bushido Code
- The Bakufu suffered from a profound sense of inertia and tried to halt social and economic change that was occurring in Tokugawa society through the Tempo Reforms
- The arrival of Perry carrying the demands of the American Government highlighted the inability of the Tokugawa Bakufu to make a decision, as they approached all Daimyo and the imperial court to seek their advice, which they then disregarded
Source C

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- ‘Domestic changes contributed to the crisis by enhancing the sense of urgency.’ – internal problems had a role to play in contributing to the crisis faced by Tokugawa Japan
- ‘Sufficient numbers of Japanese in positions to shape national affairs resolved to replace what they saw as the out dated political order of the Tokugawa era with one that seemed more adequate to the requirements of the day’ - there was a growing number of influential individuals within Japan who felt that the Tokugawa system of Government was no longer suitable for Japan
- ‘By the nineteenth century difficulties in government financing seem to have worsened relationships’ – source highlights the economic difficulties many within Japan were encountering which was having an impact on relations between different social groupings at all levels
- ‘Intelectuals and nationalists such as Hirata Atsutane increasingly spoke of problems and their solutions in terms of nationwide perceptions’ – there was a growing Nationalist movement critical of the Tokugawa regime

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Change from a rice based to money based economy an internal problem that was undermining the Tokugawa control mechanisms before the arrival of Perry – challenging the importance of the latter.
- There was a growing number of Samurai, especially lower level Samurai, who were critical of the Tokugawa decentralised system of government.
- Peasants were beginning to engage in localised uprisings as a result of the increased burden of taxation placed upon them because of the debt of the Samurai and Daimyo. Merchants becoming more influential in society.
- There had been a growing Nationalist school of thought, latterly focused on the Shinto religion, which had been questioning the Tokugawa system of government and its neglect of the Emperor.

Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources
- There is a difference in emphasis in the two sources: Source B highlights internal weaknesses in the Tokugawa regime but sees the arrival of the Americans in 1853 as a key catalyst to their downfall. Source C highlights the growing criticism of the regime by key individuals, unhappy with the inability of the regime to deal with these issues.

Other impacts of the arrival of Perry include
- Lacking the means to oppose Perry’s fleet the Bakufu signed the Kanagawa treaty in 1854
- The treaty opened two (remote) ports to US ships
- They also agreed to provide proper treatment of ship-wrecked US sailors
- There was a further commercial treaty signed in July 1858 – treaty of Amity and Commerce
- This led to the opening of 3 more ports for trade and 2 more a few years later
- There were also agreements on tariffs (only 5% on foreign goods)
- Edo and Osaka were opened for foreign residents in 1862 and 1863
- US citizens were granted extraterritorial rights and freedom of worship
- Great Britain, France, Russia and the Netherlands followed with similar treaties
- These treaties were known as Unequal Treaties because they gave extraterritorial rights to citizens of signatory nations
- But these Unequal Treaties created serious internal difficulties – they were signed without imperial consent – gave pro-imperial and anti-western factions a cause and can be ultimately linked to the downfall of the Tokugawa Bakufu
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Hane** argues - ‘Most important event that provoked this was the arrival of western powers’
- **Storry** contends ‘as…scholars examined the concept of loyalty, a corner-stone of the Neo-Confucianism so firmly endorsed by the Bakufu, they began to think that after all perhaps the Japanese owed loyalty not so much to the Tokugawa Shogun as to the rather neglected line of emperors, who lived in tolerable comfort but without any power…Thus among the educated…there was already, by the 1850s, a mental climate prepared for a return of the emperors to the centre of the stage’
- **Bolitho** highlights the weakness of the Tokugawa system of government. ‘One by one the control mechanisms of the system failed: in the countryside the frequency, and the scale, of agrarian risings mounted…in the towns and cities reports of riots and looting told a similar story; the foreign crisis after 1853 make it clear the Tokugawa government, entrusted with the duty of protecting the emperor and empire from foreign aggression, was unable to do anything of the kind’
- **Kornicki** argues ‘it is more appropriate to see the pressures upon Japan as international in nature and stemming from the expansionist drive which was working itself out among the Great Powers, and to understand the changes in Japan’s position in the world that took place at that time as Japan’s entry into international society’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Sources B and C** is helpful in offering a full perspective on the importance of foreign forces as a reason for the downfall of the Tokugawa Bakufu.
Question 3

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source D as an adequate explanation of the nature of education reforms after 1868:

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

**Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views**
- ‘Progressive because of the predominance of a western liberal viewpoint— the early years of Education reform were influenced English, American and French structures
- ‘These were years when textbooks were often translated without regard to their applicability in a Japanese context’ – there was often the whole scale copying of western textbooks without any concern for the relevance to the Japanese context
- ‘Old Confucian texts were dropped in favour of American or French books’ – influential Confucian texts which had shaped education prior to 1868 were now disregarded
- American advisors, an Anglo-American philosophical viewpoint, and ‘Foreign consultants and instructors were also common throughout the system’ - foreigners were brought into Japan to offer advice, and sometimes engage directly, in the educational system in Japan

**Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source**
- 1871 Ministry of Education was established
- Arinori was Minister of Education between 1885-89 and had visited Europe and American and was influenced by their highly centralised systems
- Fundamental Code of Education slogan ‘no community with an illiterate family and no family with an illiterate person’
- Early stages of educational reform were highly influenced by observations and information gathered on the Iwakura Mission
- Those who controlled educational policy included men who had studied the systems in Western countries
- Arinori assassinated in 1889 because many felt the reforms he initiated had been too western
Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source

- Backlash against the excessive westernisation of Education in the 1890s
- The basis of the pre-war education system was laid by Mori Arinori, Minister of Education 1885–9
- Imperial Rescript on Education (1890) stressed the duties and loyalty to the Emperor
- Strongly influenced by the Confucian view that the state is essentially a moral order
- Propaganda and education taught children loyalty and patriotism were supreme virtues
- Relationship between emperor and people compared to that of a father and his children
- Japan was a family state – ruled in a patriarchal manner; people owed emperor total obedience, loyalty and love
- The divine descent of the emperor was reinforced
- Intensive drilling of Japanese children with lessons in patriotism
- All children had 4 years of elementary education (in 1907 this was increased to 6 years)
- This was co-educational
- Higher education consisted of 5 years of middle school. This was single sexed
- A minute proportion went on to elite higher schools and then to university
- 1886 – Tokyo became the Imperial University
- 1897 – second university was established at Kyoto
- These were closely supervised by the bureaucracy
- The Imperial University trained most of the nation’s leaders
- Foundations laid by the Tokugawa – high literacy rates
- During main period of Meiji reforms, attendance rates were low. Elementary school education not compulsory or free
- 1885 only 46% of children of statutory school age were in school
- Fees abolished in 1900
- By 1905 this had risen to 95%
- Goal of educational reform was the provision of skills and patriotic morality among many to produce a literate and pliable workforce and the production of a skilled elite with highly sophisticated training

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

- **Hane**: “The government needed literate soldiers, factory workers, business employees, and government employees to achieve its goal of enriching the nation and challenging the Unequal Treaties”
- **Hunter**: “There is often a misleading image of compliance to the dictates of the state which conceals the true diversity of intellectual and religious life in pre-1930s Japan and takes no account of popular sentiment”
- **Buruma**: “The Imperial Rescript was profoundly Confucian. The idea that people are to be controlled through moral exhortation and enforced intellectual conformity is Chinese in origin.” After 1868 “the source of power remained the source of the truth”
- **Hane**: “By the mid1870s officials began to realise that an opportunity to promote a sense of identity among the younger generation was being missed. Thereafter, role models from Japan’s own past began to appear more frequently in the textbooks produced”

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source D is helpful in offering a full explanation of the impact of education reforms after 1868.
Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow candidates to discuss the implications for the new republic of the political and economic decisions Ebert made during the early days of the republic. Candidates might choose to discuss, for example, Ebert’s dilemmas and options in 1918-19 and then the pros and cons of the choices he actually made and their impact on the Weimar Republic by 1923.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which support the view that Ebert’s decisions caused problems faced by the Weimar Republic:

- Ebert never intended to bring in radical reform but instead sought to build on Max von Baden’s October reforms and for this reason was irritated by Scheidemann’s proclamation of a republic (9th Nov 1918)
- The Ebert-Groener Pact (10th Nov 1918) ensured that the army officer corps would remain unreformed and that in turn meant that at the heart of the new Republic there remained an influential conservative group that did not support either the revolution or the Republic
- The forces of conservatism were also assisted by Ebert’s decision not to purge the civil service, the judiciary and academia
- Ebert’s decision not to use the soldiers’ and workers’ councils to begin a fundamental restructuring of society mean that an opportunity was lost, one that never came again, thereby convincing conservatives that they could limit any concessions they might make to the new regime
- This was reinforced by Ebert’s suppression of the Spartacists in January 1919. The use of the Freikorps (far more than the army) ensured that the nationalist right remained centre stage in the new regime and that their influence was never really destroyed. Indeed the Freikorps were not simply right wing; they were counter-revolutionary. This was important because it meant that committed, fierce and indeed murderous anti-republicans were not only tolerated but in fact legitimised by the new regime
- The suppression of the Spartacists in such a murderous fashion meant that the Left was never united. From now on the KPD never trusted the SPD and refused to cooperate with them. This fatally undermined the Republic from the start
- Ebert’s decision not to nationalise the economy and instead to work with industrialists may have been as pragmatic as his other decisions, but it also meant that capitalism was never seriously threatened or reformed and it would only be a matter of time until the industrialists reasserted their power
Factors which do not support the view that Ebert’s decisions caused problems faced by the Weimar Republic:

- Ebert’s decisions in fact saved Germany from total collapse
- The Ebert-Groener pact did not in fact mean that the army would inevitably thereafter be disloyal to the Republic. Indeed for the most part the army stuck to the pledge made on 10th November 1918 to defend the Republic
- Ebert’s decision to crush the Spartacists may have been based on an overestimation of the threat they really posed to the Republic, but it was a right decision based on the fact that the far left was never going to be reconciled to the Republic because it had not resulted in a Bolshevik Germany. Dealing with the Spartacists was a matter of the moment and had no real bearing on the ultimate fate of the republic
- Ebert had little choice but to work with the industrialists because he had to ensure that the economy was rebuilt as quickly as possible otherwise there would have been total collapse in Germany
- The hyperinflation ‘crisis of capitalism’ was more the consequence of events in 1923 itself than of decisions made by Ebert in the early weeks and months of the Republic
- Ebert’s decision to organise an interim government, which then set about organising elections and a new constitution for Germany, resulted in a constitution that was extraordinarily democratic. Any problems the constitution created for the Republic later on are not attributable to Ebert
- Ebert’s decision to organise elections for January 1919 and the constitution that the Reichstag then agreed to in August 1919 meant that he was able to deal highly effectively with attempts by extremists on the Left and the Right to destroy democracy and the Republic during the years 1919-23.

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentaries to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Carr**: the achievements of the revolution ‘were undoubtedly limited. The structure of Germany was hardly affected by the revolution. The spirit of Imperial Germany lived on in the unreformed civil service, the judiciary and the officer corps. Nor did the powerful industrial barons have much to fear from the revolution’
- **Henig**: Groener correctly surmised that Ebert was as anxious as the army to stop Bolshevism. The telephone deal enabled Ebert to deploy the army against the Spartacists in January 1919 but this action permanently split the Left in Germany. It could be argued that this split had disastrous consequences for the republic in later years. The revolution ‘did not result in the wholesale removal of the existing economic or social structures.’ A Marxist revolution had been prevented and ‘the forces of reaction and strident nationalism made a swift recovery and emerged by 1920 as the most potent enemies of the new republic’
- **Peukert**: Ebert’s decisions from 9th November 1918 to January 1919 signalled that ‘the revolution was to be confined to constitutional and corporatist measures.’ The existence of a democratic tradition in Germany before the revolution and the complexity of Germany’s industrial and social structure ‘meant that any radical break with the past was impossible’
- **Weitz**: Ebert’s deal with Groener was one of the many compromises he made aimed at ‘steering Germany from the chaos of defeat and revolution towards democracy and economic revival. And they were fateful compromises.’ The army and the other forces of the old order were willing to work with Ebert because they feared much worse. The old elites and the Social Democrats ‘were together in the grips of panic’. But once the panic had passed, ‘the old elites would look for other allies, which they found, ultimately, in the Nazi Party…’
- **Winkler**: The best opportunity to alter fundamentally structures that stood in the way of democracy was in the period immediately after 9th November 1918. It was not taken. Ebert’s decisions reflected an excessive degree of social continuity between the authoritarian second empire and the new republic, which stopped many social democrats from identifying with the new state. This weakened the new parliamentary democracy considerably and so gave extra impetus to the already strong anti-parliamentarian bourgeoisie
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow candidates to discuss the extent to which political and economic developments 1924-1929 made the Republic more stable following the crisis years 1918-23. Candidates might choose to discuss political and economic developments that did make the Republic more stable by comparison with 1918-23 and 1929-33, or they might choose to argue that political and economic developments led to an illusion of stability but in fact left the Republic as, or more, vulnerable than it was after 1918.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which suggest/support the view that political and economic developments made the Republic more stable:
- The success of the democratic parties in the Reichstag elections 1924-1928 was an optimistic sign though middle class liberal parties remained small
- Political assassinations diminished and political calm was restored, and there were no serious attempts to overthrow the Republic
- The election of Hindenburg as President in 1925 was regarded by many as an indication that the Republic would be strengthened and the constitution upheld
- Hyperinflation was curbed never to return again
- Reparations were reorganised on a more reasonable level in the Dawes and Young plans
- Economic recovery was present in industry - industrial production grew - and Germany benefited from growth in investment mainly from the USA
- Nominal hourly earnings, real hourly earnings and real weekly earning net of tax all grew
- The welfare reforms were very popular among those who stood to benefit most

Factors which suggest/support the view that political and economic developments created an illusion of stability:
- Political violence did not completely disappear
- Extremist parties did not gain mass support but their impact was still felt on the streets where there were still frequent clashes between the Communists and the Nazis, for example
- The decline of the middle class DDP had serious consequences because it indicated that the middle classes were not convinced by democracy
- The Centre Party moved to the right and some of its leaders, such as Heinrich Bruning, favoured a more authoritarian government
- The likelihood of stability was undermined by the fact that there were six coalition governments between 1924 and 1929, each one short-lived. Parties found it difficult to cooperate and voters were alienated by the horse-trading that was needed to establish each of the coalition governments (because voters were excluded from that process)
- There was growth of narrow sectional interest parties encouraged by the PR system
- A series of minor issues highlighted the deep divisions within Germany. For example, there was fierce controversy over the new national flag originally adopted by the 1848 revolutionaries and hated by conservatives
- The negative ‘stab-in-the-back’ myth continued to exercise a powerful grip on public imagination
- The Republic lacked charismatic leaders
- Hindenburg’s election was a disaster because it meant that the President of the Republic went to someone who was not committed to democracy and whose values were those of the old Kaiserreich
- There was continuing and growing resentment of the Republic among opinion shapers. For example, industrialists hated the welfare system and resented the influence of the trade unions and the workers
- Few among church leaders, school teachers, lawyers and the army officer corps made much effort to promote democracy and democratic values
- There was economic growth but it was patchy rather than across the economy and country as a whole
There was a growing trade deficit
Unemployment stayed above 1 million putting an enormous strain on welfare services
Agricultural prices fell sharply after 1927 and this bred resentment of the Republic among farmers
The extension of the welfare state after 1927 was costly and many resented these increased costs passed on in the form of higher taxes
Investment from USA was short-term and the economy became too dependent on this investment
By 1929 production was back to 1913 levels but was significantly smaller than in other European countries
Prosperity returned for many, but others harboured resentment at the loss of their savings in 1923 and felt insecure

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

- **Henig:** It has often been asserted that by 1928 the Republic was putting down roots and was gaining in acceptability and in support. This was not in fact the case. Strong opposition to the Republic was becoming widespread and achievements in the economic and political sphere were being turned against the Republic in a broad nationalist campaign designed to discredit it and to replace it with a more authoritarian political system. Even before the onset of the depression the fate of the Republic was balanced on a knife-edge
- **James:** Stabilisation of the currency in particular produced such confidence that foreign funds flowed into Germany. These were used by businesses to finance investments. They also went into public sector enterprises, municipalities, the state and the central government. But dependence on foreign money reflected a major vulnerability and set the stage for a financial and banking crisis
- **Kolb:** The years from 1924 to 1929 are commonly described as a period of ‘relative stabilisation’ of the Republic. This is true if the stress is laid on the word ‘relative’. There was certainly progress in foreign affairs and in establishing law and order and consolidating the regime politically. The economy also revived to some degree. But this stabilisation was fragile and superficial. The Republic did not in fact succeed in consolidating its political and socio-economic system so as to be capable of facing a serious crisis
- **Peukert:** In describing the years between 1924 and 1929 as ones of relative stability, we should not forget that they seem stable only by contrast with the periods of crisis that preceded and followed them. The period 1924-1929 was marked by a good number of smaller and greater crises that were indicators of deeper structural tensions in German society. It could be argued that the unresolved contradictions inherited from the period 1918-19 that remained throughout the years 1924-29 were to be the undoing of the Republic from 1930-1933
- **Weitz:** The stabilisation programme carried out from 1924 had its successes. It secured German territorial identity and put an end to revolutionary attempts on the extreme right and left. It gave Germany a sound currency. All of this created the conditions for an economic revival, financed by the influx of American capital. Gross national product increased and in 1927 industrial production reached the 1913 level and surpassed it in the following two years. These were the storied ‘Golden Years’ of the Republic evident in statistics but also in lifestyles
Question 3

The aim of this essay is to allow candidates to discuss the directly related issues of where power lay in the Third Reich and the nature of Hitler’s dictatorship. Candidates might be expected to examine in particular Hitler’s leadership, the structure of the Nazi dictatorship and the way Nazi Germany was governed and its effects, or they might select one or two key areas and examine each of these in depth.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which suggest Hitler’s rule was chaotic:

- Chaos resulted from the charismatic nature of Hitler’s leadership. Everyone relied on the leader with no clear power structures
- Power was concentrated in the hands of the Fuhrer, but beneath him there was a confusing array of state and party institutions cutting across each other’s jurisdictions but all seeking to ‘work towards the Fuhrer’
- Just as barons owed loyalty to a feudal monarch so Nazi leaders owed loyalty to the Fuhrer. Hitler saw loyalty in personal not institutional terms so he did not mind Goering or Himmler building up great power so long as they remained completely loyal to him. The result was that the Nazi leaders constantly quarrelled with one another and the overall structure of government was reduced to a mess of constantly shifting power bases or warring factions
- This system created jealous rivalries, which served to enhance Hitler’s power but seriously undermined efficient government
- Although there was a complex police system its efficiency was dependent on the willing cooperation of millions of Germans

Factors which suggest Hitler’s rule was to a degree efficient:

- Internal rivalries generated a degree of efficiency as rivals sought to outdo each other in pursuit of policies that Hitler would approve of
- The extensive police machine and the popularity of Hitler’s policies made opposition very difficult
- Hitler inherited and used effectively an already well-established administrative and industrial structure which he did not disrupt and which continued to function
- Traditional institutions such as the civil service cooperated with the regime
- The Nazi Party had a series of sections reaching right down to local block units seeking to ensure that all Germans complied with the regime. The key positions were the Gauleiter, at the top of the regional structure, and the block leader at the bottom. But although the component organisations of the party greatly expanded, the party’s power did not develop to pose any threat to Hitler
- Hitler’s place at the centre of the regime was never seriously challenged
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentaries to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Brozsat**: The Hitler state was chaotic and polycratic and he had to operate against a background of changing structures and institutional circumstances.
- **Kershaw**: Hitler’s was charismatic rule and though his personality should not be overrated it should not be ignored either. He was undoubtedly powerful, but his leadership also meant that government was unstable because it caused chaos and depended on continued successes and the avoidance of the usual routines of governing and government.
- **Kirk**: Powerful leading figures in the party built personal empires, which were semi-independent of any other control than Hitler’s approval. The result was chaotic government characterised by internal rivalries and conflicts.
- **McDonough**: In some ways Nazi rule was indeed remarkably efficient. So, for instance, the fusion of the SS and the police enabled fanatical SS leaders, who were imbued with the revolutionary Nazi spirit of the pre-1933 party, to build themselves an impregnable position within the state. They could now use the bureaucratic police apparatus to launch an effective and brutal campaign against the enemies of the Third Reich.
- **Noakes**: Hitler’s tendency to create new offices and agencies without establishing clear lines of demarcation of responsibility with existing government departments produced a continual struggle for dominance over spheres of responsibility. The outcome was an extreme fragmentation of government.
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow candidates to examine the aims of Hitler’s foreign policy and the extent to which revision of Versailles was the main reason Hitler pursued the foreign policy he did. Candidates might choose to explore in depth the role of revision of Versailles as the main factor in determining Hitler’s foreign policy, or they might opt to compare the importance of revision of Versailles with other reasons lying behind Hitler’s foreign policy. Candidates might also choose to discuss the aims of Hitler’s foreign policy within the context of the intentionalist/structuralist debate and/or the broader context of the planner/opportunist debate.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors that suggest that revision of Versailles was the main aim of Hitler’s foreign policy:
- In *Mein Kampf* and the *Second Book*, Hitler made it quite clear that the main driving force behind his foreign policy was revision of Versailles.
- In speeches throughout the 1920s and early 1930s Hitler again made it clear that revision of Versailles was the main aim of his foreign policy (“Smash Versailles”).
- In October 1933 Hitler withdrew Germany from the League of Nations because he resented what he saw as discrimination against Germany over armaments and because he disliked the multilateral nature of the League. Crucially, he disliked the League because it had been set up as part of the Versailles settlement.
- In carrying out his foreign policies from 1933-1939 Hitler consistently and successfully placed the destruction of Versailles at the centre of his actions.
- The announcement of conscription and of the rebuilding up of the *Luftwaffe* (March 1935) were policies that directly breached the conditions of the Versailles settlement.
- The remilitarisation of the Rhineland (March 1936) was another direct attack on the Versailles peace treaty.
- The *Anschluss* with Austria which Hitler achieved (March 1938) was expressly forbidden by the Versailles Treaty.

Factors that suggest that Hitler’s foreign policy had other aims besides revision of Versailles:
- Although Versailles was a major determining factor in Hitler’s foreign policies it was by no means the only one. Hitler wanted to make Germany great not just by smashing Versailles but also by uniting all Germans into one empire. This racial element was central to his foreign policy.
- The racial dimension of Hitler’s foreign policy was also apparent in his quest for *Lebensraum*. He argued that there were not enough resources within Germany itself to be able to meet the needs of all Germans and so Germany had to expand eastwards.
- *Lebensraum*, Hitler thought, would ultimately lead to a confrontation with the USSR because in order to meet the needs of all Germans it would be necessary for Germany to subjugate the inferior Slavs and use them and their lands for the benefit of Germans and the German Empire.
- Conquest was, therefore, another reason behind Hitler’s foreign policy. He wanted to be able to put himself in a position that would enable him to take on the might of the USSR at some date in the future.
- There was also a powerful strand of anti-Semitism behind Hitler’s foreign policy expressed in the view that there was a world conspiracy of Jewish-Bolshevism that would, if left unchecked, destroy the Aryan race.
- Another motivating factor in Hitler’s foreign policy was the changing international context. He read the West’s appeasement policies as a sign that there was no will to oppose him and so he was surprised when, in the end, the German invasion of Poland on 1st September 1939 provoked declarations of war against Germany from Britain and France.
• Economics were also a key factor behind Hitler’s foreign policy. Germany increasingly required resources to meet the needs of its rapidly expanding armaments industry and at the same time to satisfy the demand for goods and services in Germany.

• Propaganda was also an important aim of Hitler’s foreign policy. He needed to ensure that he could win and maintain a broad range of support for the regime. Foreign policy successes were an important way for him to do this thus sustaining the ‘Hitler Myth’ and through it support for the regime. So, for example, Hitler was never more popular than in the immediate aftermath of the Anschluss.

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

• **Kirk**: Hitler’s thinking on foreign policy developed in the context of Germans’ shock at defeat in WWI, hatred of the Treaty of Versailles (especially the ‘war guilt’ clause) and the ‘stab-in-the-back’ myth. So, for instance, ‘Hitler’s early speeches on foreign policy were dominated by hysterical tirades against the injustices of Treaty of Versailles’.

• **Mommsen**: Hitler’s foreign policy was largely an opportunist exercise aimed at enhancing Hitler’s image and satisfying the Nazi Party’s demand for action.

• **Stackelberg**: ‘From the start of his rule Hitler was determined to achieve several major aims in foreign affairs: the reversal of the Treaty of Versailles, the creation of a greater Reich of all German-speaking peoples, the conquest of lebensraum in the east and the establishment of a new order in Europe dominated by the “Germanic race”’.

• **Taylor**: Hitler was a pragmatist whose foreign policy was to a great extent a reaction to the initiatives of other powers.

• **Weinberg**: Hitler had ‘clearly defined ideas about the future of Germany and the appropriate foreign policy to be followed. In a series of wars, in which victory in each would broaden the basis for Germany to win the next one, the Germans would come to dominate the globe’.

• **Williamson**: Hitler’s priorities in 1933 were to destroy the Versailles settlement, dismantle the French alliance system in eastern Europe and escape from isolation by securing alliances with Britain and Italy. Only then would he be able successfully to confront France and gain a free hand against Russia.
Question 5

The aim of this essay is to allow candidates to examine the issue of how much opposition to the Nazi regime there was and where that opposition came from. Candidates might wish to discuss the nature of the opposition to the regime in the context of the historical debate about what constituted opposition, or they might choose to examine a range of types of opposition and the degree to which each type had active popular support.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which suggest that opposition to the regime was limited in scope, in numbers and in its effectiveness because there was no active popular support:
- Opposition though wide ranging was not strong enough to pose any real threat to the regime
- Successful economic and then foreign policies helped the regime to maintain broad support and made it hard for opposition to gain a foothold
- Although the resistance mobilized tens of thousands of people it was not centrally organised and was disorientated
- The Gestapo terror successfully kept the opposition fragmented and security police were able to penetrate resistance groups effectively
- Opposition groups were isolated and unable to cooperate
- Institutions such as the churches and the army provided the best opportunities for opposition but even here it was not strong or organised enough to do the regime real harm
- Many Germans were discontented with the regime but only a few exceptional people dared to express their opposition openly. The harsh treatment of these opponents was a powerful disincentive for others tempted to follow their lead

Factors which suggest that opposition to the regime, though unsuccessful, did have active popular support:
- Opposition to the Nazi regime needs to be seen as encompassing not just outright and very public opposition such as the criticisms of the Nazis by, say, the Protestant Dietrich Bonhoeffer in 1933 or by the Catholic Bishop Clemens von Galen in 1934 but also the refusal of some young people to join the Hitler Youth. Dissident behaviour could include verbal but private criticism of the regime, listening to BBC radio broadcasts, continuing to attend church and to listen carefully to pastors and sermons that were hostile to Nazi policies
- The successful protest against the Nazis’ attempt to remove crosses from Catholic schools is a striking example of opposition that did indeed have active popular support at least among German Catholocs
- There was opposition from early on in the regime among some army officers. General Beck’s plan to have Hitler arrested in 1938 was foiled by the success of the Munich Conference. There was also opposition in the German military intelligence organisation (the Abwehr) led from 1935 by Admiral Canaris
- Even within the government to begin with there were some critics. Papen spoke out for greater freedom in June 1934 and Schacht criticised anti-Semitic violence in August 1935
- Some judges tried to maintain standards of justice within an increasingly arbitrary system
- Many workers, especially among those who had long time connections with the trade unions and the SPD or the KPD, continued to maintain their links with banned socialist organisations
- Active popular opposition was also at the root of workers’ slow-downs and other forms of industrial sabotage
- The SPD in exile (SOPADE) organised some underground groups to distribute leaflets and propaganda
- The KPD formed underground cells including in the DAF
- Among some of the traditional elite there was considerable discussion of replacing Hitler. Count Helmut von Moltke’s Kreisau Circle centred on a group of army officers and professionals who came together to oppose Hitler beginning in 1933
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Peukert**: We must distinguish ‘between the many and varied expressions of nonconformist behaviour.’ The resistance mobilised tens of thousands of people into performing acts of courage and sacrifice, but remained decentralised, disorientated and ineffectual. Even so, ‘everyday life under Hitler was not mere conformity on the one hand and loss of rights and freedoms on the other… Ordinary people made their choices among the varying greys of active consent, accommodation and nonconformity’

- **Kershaw**: Political dissent and opposition to specific measures of the Nazi regime ‘were indeed widespread’, but “resistance” in its ‘fundamental sense lacked a popular base of support’

- **Fulbrook**: To begin with ‘there were common aims between the Nazi leadership and the key elite groups in the economy, the Army, the civil service and among national conservatives.’ This only began to break down as the regime became more radical in the late 1930s. There was ‘much popular support for certain aspects of the regime’ and ‘widespread complicity in the regime’s treatment of those seen to be potentially dangerous’

- **Benz**: ‘Not all Germans made their peace with the National Socialist state.’ Members of the SPD, the KPD and the churches all opposed the regime in one form or another. Mention must be made in particular of the Jehovah’s Witnesses who were ‘the only community of faith that resisted the Nazis unconditionally.’ Jehovah’s Witnesses refused to perform the Hitler salute and refused to join the army. The Nazis responded ‘with implacable persecution, arresting nearly 10 000 of them’

- **Kirk**: Only a tiny minority were involved in active resistance but it seems that opposition to the Nazis ‘occurred on a number of levels ranging from industrial sabotage in factories… to small principled acts of defiance, such as refusing the Hitler salute… Popular opposition was often a temporary and limited response to specific policies’
Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War

Part 2

Question 1

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source A as evidence of reasons for the German Revolution of November 1918.

Provenance:

- An eyewitness account from the *Memoirs* of Phillip Scheidemann (1865-1939). The most important member of the SPD after Friedrich Ebert, it was Scheidemann who actually proclaimed the Republic from a Reichstag balcony on 9th November 1918.
- Scheidemann's account of the tumultuous events of 9th November is meant to be a defence of his actions because at the time Ebert, SPD leader and interim Chancellor following the departure of Max von Baden, was deeply unhappy about the proclamation. Ebert had wanted to keep the monarchy and he thought that only a newly elected constituent assembly should have had the power to proclaim a republic.
- The date of Scheidemann's *Memoirs* is highly significant. The *Memoirs* were published ten years after he had been appointed by President Ebert as Chancellor (13th Feb 1919) following the elections to the first National Assembly of the new regime. Throughout his career Scheidemann was convinced that the SPD should keep its distance from the KPD and it was he who therefore set the pattern for the future by going into coalition with other parties.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views

- Scheidemann is at pains to stress that the demand for change was popular/coming from the working people ('Working men and women were going in and out... A crowd of workers rushed into the hall... They demanded that I come out and speak to the thousands of people gathered in front of the Reichstag’)
- Scheidemann also sets out his view that proclamation of the Republic was vital because the Bolsheviks were about to attempt to seize the revolutionary initiative ('Liebknecht was already speaking from the balcony of the Schloss intending to proclaim a Soviet Republic!')
- Scheidemann notes that the monarchy has collapsed ('The Kaiser has abdicated .... The old and rotten – the monarchy – has broken down... Long live the German Republic!')
- Scheidemann also notes that the interim solution initiated by the revolution from above has failed also ('Prince Max of Baden has handed over his office as chancellor to Ebert.')
Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source:

- 9th November was a chaotic day in Germany following the revolutionary events of October 1918. Popular discontent had not abated in spite of the radical nature of Baden’s October Reforms. Indeed it had if anything grown throughout October.
- The events of 9th November are perhaps best viewed as the culmination of events known as the revolution ‘from below’.
- This revolution ‘from below’ was symbolised by the naval mutinies at Keil and Wilhelmshaven and by the springing up of soviets in cities across the country.
- Among the most vocal of those calling for yet more radical changes were the Spartakists and they were regarded by the SPD as a serious threat to the establishment of the liberal democracy that the SPD favoured.
- On the 9th November Baden had made it clear that he could not contain popular discontent and feared a total breakdown of law and order. For these reasons he handed power to Ebert in order to avoid the kind of revolution that had recently occurred in Russia, a revolution that was bloody, extremely violent and had plunged that country into a brutal civil war.
- The Kaiser was forced to abdicate but that also created a power vacuum and the Spartakists, led by Karl Liebknecht, thought they saw a chance for the setting up of a Soviet Republic perhaps in part because events in Germany seemed to be mimicking those that had taken place in Russia in 1917.
- Although Ebert was unhappy about the proclamation of the Republic he nevertheless moved swiftly to set up an interim administration to oversee the organising of democratic elections to a new Reichstag and to deal with the threat from Bolshevism/Spartakism. On November 10th 1918 he made a deal with the Chief of the Army, Groener, to the effect that the army would support the Republic if the new government did not purge the officer corps or attempt to turn the army into a popular revolutionary militia.
- Ebert wanted to establish a broad coalition of support for his regime and he knew that the middle classes in particular were terrified of Bolshevism. The pact with Groener would help him to deal directly with the Spartakist threat as he saw it even though numerically the Spartakists were few.

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

- The revolution ‘from below’ needs to be seen against the backdrop of the revolution ‘from above’. The revolution is often presented as occurring in two ‘stages’. The first of these was the revolution ‘from above’ when the Generals, fearing the army would be blamed for defeat, handed power to Max von Baden and the Reichstag.
- Baden then implemented the October Reforms, which established a parliamentary monarchy.
- Baden’s reforms did not go far enough for German socialists and radicals, and popular discontent grew to such an extent that Baden feared a Bolshevik-style revolution unless he handed power to the Social Democrats (the biggest party in the Reichstag since 1912) led by Ebert.
- Baden’s inability to contain revolutionary fervour in Germany, and the mutinies at Keil and Wilhelmshaven, accompanied by the setting up of soviets across the country - the revolution ‘from below’ - culminated in the events of 9th November including the forced abdication of the Kaiser and the proclamation of the Republic by Scheidemann.
- Although soviets had sprung up quickly, they were not dominated by Spartakists but the SPD leadership feared this is what might happen and so moved quickly to establish an interim government that included the radical USPD (which had broken away from the SPD in 1917).
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Bookbinder:** ‘Scheidemann’s proclamation of a republic was considered premature by Ebert but was designed to forestall action by the more radical elements. Ebert would have preferred a constitutional monarchy on the British model rather than the total elimination of the monarch. The high ranking and long term civil servant Arnold Brecht, who loyally supported the Republic, argued at the time and later that a more gradual move to a constitutional monarchy would have brought the new government a larger pool of potential supporters and increased its chances of survival.’ However, the violence on the streets suggested to Scheidemann that ‘the luxury of a more gradual, staged move away from the Wilhelmine regime was an illusion’

- **Carr:** ‘It was certainly not Ebert’s fault that a republic was declared on 9th November 1918. The SPD stumbled into this decisive event quite by accident.’ Scheidemann was informed that Liebknecht was about to proclaim a soviet republic and, determined to prevent any Bolsheviki-style seizure of power, rushed to a balcony of the Reichstag building and proclaimed a republic. Ebert was furious saying that Scheidemann had had no right to proclaim a republic for only a constituent assembly could do that. Ebert had hoped to save the monarchy by avoiding any mention of the word ‘republic’. Scheidemann’s speech ‘buried this hope for good’

- **Kolb:** The total and unexpected collapse of the existing order in the autumn of 1918 took all of the political parties by surprise and none was properly prepared. The political right seemed paralysed and accepted the fall of the monarchy without resistance. The bourgeois parties were equally surprised and their chief concern was the threat of a radical overthrow of the social order. The Social Democrats had achieved most of their objectives in the October Reforms and only crossed the rubicon on 9th November with reluctance. Until the last days of October even the radical left had not reckoned with the sudden collapse of the imperial regime

- **Nicholls:** By the 9th November it was too late to save the monarchy. It became known that Karl Liebknecht was going to proclaim a republic. Once again the danger loomed that the SPD would lose command of events to a really radical group. Faced with this situation, Scheidemann went to a window in the Reichstag and declared a republic to cheering crowds below

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful as evidence of reasons for the German Revolution of November 1918.
Question 2

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)
Candidates may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of each source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)
These 10 marks will be awarded for:

[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians’ views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources B and C on the role of political intrigue in the appointment of Hitler as chancellor in January 1933 and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source B

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Explaining Hitler’s appointment as just the result of political intrigue is to take too narrow an approach; Hitler’s appointment took place within a ‘broader social context’
- While economic problems are not by themselves the explanation for Hitler’s appointment, economic problems are the broader context within which that appointment must be viewed
- In particular the failure of industrialists and the SPD and trade unions to come to some sort of agreement about dealing with the economic depression ensured that parliamentary democracy could not be revived
- The unwillingness of industrialists and the SPD and trade unions to compromise created a crisis that in turn led to wrong decisions that ultimately paved the way for the appointment of Hitler

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- The economic depression was a key reason why people voted Nazi in the presidential elections of spring 1932 and then in the Reichstag elections in July which gave the Nazis 37% of the vote, making them the largest party in the Reichstag
- The fact that the Nazis had become the largest party in the Reichstag persuaded members of the elite such as Papen that a deal had to be struck with Hitler
- The economic depression had resulted in the rise of presidential government from 1930 so the chancellors after Muller were appointed by decree. Parliamentary government was in decline long before Hitler was appointed
- The actions of the chancellors before Hitler - Bruning, Papen, Schleicher - moved the country towards authoritarian government and reduced the power of parliament
- Bruning’s chancellorship in particular made the economic situation worse not better and this precipitated the crisis of 1932 that ended in the appointment of Hitler in January 1933
- The economic depression convinced members of the elite of the need to look for alternatives to Weimar democracy. They increasingly came to the view that they should try to use the mass support behind Hitler to establish a more authoritarian system
Source C

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- The intrigue of Papen and Hindenburg’s closest advisers was the key reason for Hitler’s appointment
- Hitler’s appointment was not greeted with much enthusiasm except from Nazi Party supporters so it is not right to suggest that he won power or even that he seized power
- Hitler was handed power as a result of negotiations among the political elite
- Although those who negotiated with Hitler represented ‘a broader circle of powerful interests’ the final decision to appoint Hitler was nevertheless taken by a ‘small unaccountable group’ around Hindenburg, and ultimately by Hindenburg himself

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Papen worked behind the scenes to ensure that whatever happened there would be no return to parliamentary democracy
- Papen’s chancellorship was an attempt to govern through the elite (the ‘cabinet of barons’) and had no support in the Reichstag at all
- Papen actively sought the support of the Nazis. He lifted the ban on the SA that Bruning had imposed and, even more seriously, he used emergency powers to depose the SPD-led coalition state government of Prussia
- It was Papen who agreed to new elections in July 1932 that resulted in the Nazis gaining 37% of the popular vote
- In January 1933 Papen agreed to serve in a Hitler government in the belief that he would be able to control the leader of the Nazis (‘We’ve hired him.’) This was a serious miscalculation on Papen’s part
- Papen was not the only intriguer among the political elite around Hindenburg. Schleicher was also a central figure. He had advised Hindenburg to get rid of Bruning and appoint Papen as chancellor in May 1932. Schleicher then advised Hindenburg to dismiss Papen and appoint himself [Schleicher] as chancellor in December 1932

Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources
- It is true that by 1932, and largely as a consequence of the economic depression, many if not most Germans were thoroughly fed up with democracy and the republic
- This was demonstrated not just in the increase in the vote for the Nazis but also in the increase in the vote for the Communists. The economic depression polarised politics, with voters moving to the extremes. The collapse in the support for the more moderate, pro-democracy parties occasioned by the economic crisis was a disaster for the republic
- Other conservative and elite interests worked and intrigued for a Hitler government. Some industrialists – notably Bosch, Thyssen and Krupp – sent a letter to Hindenburg in November 1932 asking him to appoint Hitler as chancellor. The impression was given to Hindenburg that support for Hitler among industrialists was much larger than it actually was, an impression which Hindenburg’s son, Oskar, encouraged
- In November 1932 the Nazis lost 2 million votes in the Reichstag elections and the party was almost bankrupted by the expense of campaigning in elections. Yet Hindenburg still appointed Hitler
- Although Hindenburg’s options in December 1932 were limited, he did have options. In the end he chose to appoint Hitler on the advice of those closest to him
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Martin Brozat**: It was during the ‘Papen era’ [between June and November 1932] that the presidential system was tilted towards the extreme right… This was the phase when concessions were made that created the conditions for Hitler’s appointment as chancellor.

- **R J Evans**: The economic depression helped to make the Nazis a ‘catch-all party of social protest’, appealing to a greater degree to people from virtually every social group in the land.

- **Conan Fischer**: ‘The translation of Nazi popularity into power… owed much to the disastrous miscalculation of the elites.’ It is true that, in the context of the economic depression, millions of middle class Germans sought deliverance by the Nazis from Communism, but the presence of millions of working class Germans was unmistakeable. The Nazis benefited from the economic and political crisis.

- **Mary Fulbrook**: By late January 1933 the elites ‘were not prepared to uphold democracy at any cost; most wanted some form of authoritarian government.’ The Nazis no longer seemed so dangerous and in these circumstances Hindenburg was persuaded by a small group, that included his son and Papen, to appoint Hitler as chancellor.

- **Ian Kershaw**: ‘The handover of power to Hitler on January 30 1933 was the worst possible outcome to the irrecoverable crisis of Weimar democracy. It did not have to happen. It was at no stage a foregone conclusion…’ But in the end, ‘the presidential palace became the focal point of intrigues of power brokers who conspired with guile and initiative in private wheeler-dealings to further their own power ambitions… Hitler needed the elite to attain power’

- **Stephen Lee**: Hitler came to power largely ‘through a conspiracy’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Sources B and C** reveals different perspectives on the role of political intrigue in the appointment of Hitler as chancellor in January 1933.
Question 3

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source D as an adequate explanation of the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews in Germany between 1933 and 1939 in terms of:

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

**Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views**

- Hertz highlights the beginnings of the Nazi persecution of the Jews from 1933 (‘On 1st April 1933 there was a boycott of Jewish shops.’)
- Hertz also notes how non-Jewish Germans often sought to capitalise on the Nazis treatment of the Jews (‘... a competitor across the street... chased people away from our store...’)
- Hertz also notes how the Nazis tried to instil anti-Semitism in young people via the Nazi youth organisations (‘The Hitler Youth in my school sang songs about killing the Jews.’)
- Hertz also points to the radicalisation of Nazi anti-Semitic policies (‘During Kristallnacht... our furniture store was destroyed. The synagogue in the street where we lived was set on fire.’)

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

- Although the boycott of 1st April 1933 was a failure, over the course of the next few years Nazi anti-Semitic policies became increasingly more severe
- Between 1933 and 1938 Nazism, and its central ideological component anti-Semitism, became everyday and ordinary for many Germans culminating in the routinisation and normalisation and legalisation of persecution of Germany’s Jews
- The Nazis used a combination of intimidation and legislation to create a mood of hostility towards Jews
- The *Law for the Protection of German Blood and Honour*, for example, was one of a series of anti-Semitic laws passed in September 1935 following a speech by Hitler to the party faithful at the Nuremberg rally
- This law was accompanied by the *Reich Citizenship Law*, which effectively made it absolutely clear that Jews were not Germans and were not entitled to the same rights as Germans
- The *Reich Citizenship Law* attempted to define for the first time who was to count as a Jew in Nazi Germany. The Nuremberg Laws fell back on religion as the only way to define Jews because there were, of course, no reliable markers of appearance or blood type or any other physical traits that Nazi ‘experts’ could use to separate Jews from ‘Aryans’
- The Nuremberg Laws not only reflected Hitler’s personal hatred of the Jews but were also a response to demands for more action against Jews from radical elements in the Nazi Party, demands that had been building throughout the period since 1933
- The Nuremberg Laws gave legal sanction to persecution of the Jews and made that persecution routine
- The Nuremberg Laws also considered the problem of people who had ‘mixed blood’. These *Mischlinge* were people who had two grandparents of the Jewish faith
- Anti-Semitic actions were radicalised even further in the attacks on Jewish property and people in the pogrom of 9th November 1938, known as Reichskristallnacht
Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source

- The boycott of 1st April 1933 did not really catch on. Many non-Jewish Germans who were adversely affected by it because, for example, they were not able to access their usual shops, objected.
- The Nazis learned lessons from this early experiment in anti-Semitic policy. In future, they were more careful to prepare the ground first. The boycott made them consider carefully how they might best go about excluding the Jews from society in ways that would not make non-Jewish Germans uncomfortable in the way that the boycott had.
- The Nuremberg Laws were a crucial step towards the destruction of Germany’s Jews because all kinds of attacks on Jews were now sanctioned even legally mandated.
- Following the ‘Night of the Long Knives’ (30th June 1934) the SS emerged as an ideologically dynamic organisation that combined the functions of a conventional repressive ‘security’ force with a drive to implement Hitler’s racial views, and especially his anti-Semitism.
- The year 1938 was marked by a heightened wave of aggression in Nazi anti-Semitic policies. The most dramatic expression of this was the attack on Jews in Germany and Austria on the night of 9th-10th November. This pogrom - Reichskristallnacht - was the peak of anti-Semitic policy before the outbreak of war.
- Nazi propaganda presented the pogrom as a spontaneous expression of hatred of the Jews on the part of the majority of Germans whereas in fact it was carefully prepared. The date - 9th November 1938 - coincided with the date of Hitler’s Munich putsch in 1923.

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

- Benz: ‘Anti-Semitism served the Nazis as an explanatory model for the national, social and economic misfortunes the Germans had suffered since their defeat in the First World War, and it was the spur that Hitler used to goad his followers into action… The pathological ideas in Hitler’s worldview culminated in his malignant caricature of the Jews and in fantasies of a Jewish world conspiracy linking it with what many perceived as the life-threatening danger of Bolshevism’.
- Bergen: ‘Hatred of Jews was the centre of Nazi ideology. Nazi propagandists labelled all of Germany’s Jews as deformed and criminal and compared them to handicapped people and Gypsies, whom they described as monstrous and dangerous.’ Between 1933 and 1939 Nazi anti-Semitic policy became increasingly radicalised culminating in the pogrom of 9th November 1933.
- Kirk: ‘Racism was the fundamental guiding principle of Nazi ideology, and the effects of racial ideology on policy-making were pervasive. The focus of the regime’s obsessive racism was the relentless persecution of the Jews’
- Stackelberg: Jews became the primary victims of Nazi persecution in the Third Reich. Approximately 500 000 Jews lived in Germany at the time of the Nazi takeover [three quarters of one percent of the German population]. However, ‘the Nazis were able to use the disproportionate representation of Jews in certain sectors of the economy, the professions, the press and the entertainment industry to give credence to their conspiracy theory, according to which Jews controlled the German economy, society and culture…. Anti-Semitism was not the main reason for Hitler’s popularity, but his brutal campaign to oust Jews from German society in no way diminished his appeal to the mass of the German population’.
- Williamson: Nazi anti-Semitic policy and actions were often ‘hesitant and contradictory’. Even so, Nazi anti-Semitic policy between 1933 and 1939 was increasingly aggressive and was marked, too, by ‘an increasingly accelerating tempo…’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source D explains the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews in Germany between 1933 and 1939.
South Africa (1910-1984)

Part 1

Each question is worth 25 marks

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the extent to which black labour unrest contributed to the introduction and extension of segregationist legislation in South Africa between 1910 and 1924. A candidate is likely to examine evidence of unrest amongst black workers as well as other socio-economic, political and cultural factors. These factors could include the pressure exerted on the government from the mining industry, the demands of agriculture, support of the legislation from groups including African chiefs and fears of racial miscegenation, thus reaching a balanced conclusion regarding reasons for the introduction of segregationist legislation.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support Black labour unrest
- Pass Laws (The Rand) used to minimise labour mobility and prevent desertion (Not rigidly enforced according to Levy, 1982)
- 1911 strikes by African workers under contract prohibited ensured regular labour
- 1920 African dock worker strikes
- 1920 Black protests at inferior wages compared to whites – 71,000 miners
- Demands of white workers to ensure job security
- Formation of ICU under Kadalie seen as mobilising black worker interests
- ICU membership exceeded 100,000 at its peak
- 1922 African workers seen to side with employers during Rand Revolt against white Workers
- 30 African workers killed in clashes with White Worker Commando during Rand Revolt
- Growth of Wellington protest movement in the Transkei
- 1924 Industrial Conciliation Act limited power of collective bargaining with employers to whites and coloureds

Other factors
- Segregationist thinking was dominated by findings of the 1905 Lagden Commission which proposed racial separation of land ownership and influx control
- Although white political parties were largely in agreement over the policy, disagreement still remained about political representation of blacks in the Cape
- 1911 Mines and Works Act reserved skilled and supervisory work for whites
- 1912 Defence Act created a white ‘Active Citizen Force’
- 1913 Land Act forbade purchase of lease of land by Africans outside of ‘reserves’. Africans forced into migrant labour for mining or wage labourers on farms
- Land Act also forbade sharecropping designed to end competition for ‘poor white farmers’ from Africans
- Marks and Trapido describe a ‘union of gold and maize’. Families who lived in ‘white areas’ were forced to either move or pay rent in terms of labour, illustrating the alliance of the Afrikaner and mining interests which the South African Party represented
- Worden argues that “residential segregation originated in towns dominated not by the mining industry but by merchant and commercial interests” as evidenced by the 1923 Urban Areas Act enforcing residential segregation
- 1920 Native Affairs Act introduced administrative segregation which Dubow describes as a ‘watershed’ as it established the principle that African political activity would be divorced from white political activity
- 1922 Apprenticeship Act made skilled trades more accessible to white youths
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Revisionists**: contend that racial beliefs are not enough and focus on economic reasons for segregation, arguing that racial beliefs are the product of economic aims. They examine the mining industry and the need for cheap labour
  
  **Harold Wolpe**: Contends that the main reason for the 1913 Land Act was to ensure a ready supply of cheap labour for the mines. The Act effectively imposed a system of migrant labour and native reserves which meant mine owners did not need to pay wages which would support an entire family. Known as the ‘Reserve Labour Subsidy Theory’

- **Liberals**: Some saw segregation as a compromise between ‘assimilation’ and ‘repression’. Consequently the government could exploit the ambiguous meaning of the term to appeal to a wide range of groups. Providing cheap labour, protecting culture, countering the threat of miscegenation, preventing the emergence of a black proletariat
  
  **Swanson**: Takes the unusual view that a ‘sanitation syndrome’ developed following the 1901 Cape Town plague whereby Africans were removed from the city centre. Popular racial imagery developed with regards to pollution and disease. Argues that medical theory led to segregationist policies

  **William Beinart**: Suggests that the policy of segregation was influenced partly by the views of rural Africans. Migrancy was attractive to them as some wished to retain a stake in their local communities. Chiefs encouraged young men to be migrant workers to bring back wages without diminishing their authority. “Migrancy could be seen to have arisen as much out of the dynamics of African societies as the demands of the mines”

  **Bozzoli** argues large-scale migrancy was only possible as mines and African societies shared common interests in the system

- **1970s Radicals such as Martin Legassick**: Identify segregation as originating from the era of the South African War. Milner in particular played a key role in elaborating segregationist ideology and that imperialism, capitalism and segregation were inextricably linked
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess how significant the role of National Party leadership was in the rise of Afrikaner nationalism throughout the 1930s. A candidate would be expected to directly contrast the role of the National Party with other contributing factors such as socio-economic conditions and the role of other organisations such as the Dutch Reformed Church, thus reaching a balanced conclusion regarding the influence of the National Party in promoting Afrikaner nationalism.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support the leadership of the National Party
- The NP tried to consciously unify the diverse strands of nationalist thinking in the 1930s including the campaign for Afrikaans language and ‘Christian National Education’
- Changes in the leadership of Afrikanerdom; leaders of the break-away Purified National Party were young, urban intellectuals (unlike the older, rural Afrikaners who followed Hertzog into Fusion)
- NP emphasised the history of the Afrikaner Volk – Dunbar Moodie acknowledges their role in the development of a ‘Civil Religion’ with rituals and ceremonies
- NP propaganda highlighted fears of poor white Afrikaners, particularly during the Depression
- The NP and Broederbond effectively took control of preparations for the centenary of the Great Trek to be held in 1938 which helped boost support for the NP
- NP won 27 assembly members in the election of 1938
- In his ‘Day of the Covenant’ address to commemorate the Battle of Blood River, Malan told Afrikaners that the fight against the blacks was no longer in the countryside but in the towns and accused Hertzog of diluting the Afrikaner cause
- NP leaders after Hertzog were Broederbond members, although historians disagree over how much the Bond intended to dominate politics. Given the influence of the bond in setting up the FAK, the ‘Voortrekkers’ (Scout movement), Volkskas (People’s Bank) and more, it could be argued that the influence of the NP in the 1930s, through the Bond itself, was far reaching in Afrikanerdom
- National Party propaganda – the newspaper ‘Die Burger’ was loyal to former editor Malan and the NP and the ‘Volksblad’ supported the NP in the Orange Free State
- Malan’s Purified National Party was supported by the Broederbond, FAK, Western Cape Intelligentsia

Factors which may contradict
- NP support limited in the Transvaal and Orange Free State to those who felt threatened by Fusion (teachers, academics, clerics)
- Large amounts of political and cultural material was published, including Gustav Preller’s ‘Voortrekker’ series commemorating the Trek
- Role of the Dutch Reformed Church and rise of Christian Nationalism. While Malan was a former minister, much of the literature generated by the DRC and mythology surrounding Afrikaner history were used by, not initiated by, the Nationalists
- 80% of Afrikaners attended church regularly and were taught the values of the DRC
- Failings of the United Party in solving Afrikaner’s immediate problem increased support for the NP such as the plight of the poor whites identified by the Carnegie Commission
- 50% of Afrikaners were urbanised by 1936
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Worden**: “The action of Afrikaner nationalism had to be consciously forged rather than growing spontaneously”
- **Serfontein**: Contends that there was a Broederbond conspiracy to take over the state through infiltration of the NP based on 1934 documents calling for ‘the Afrikanerization of South Africa in all its spheres’.
- **Dunbar Moodie**: Takes issue with the significance of the Bond, arguing it played a ‘watchdog’ role over the political parties
- **Liberals such as Giliomee**: Place emphasis on ethnic mobilisation whereby Afrikaner identity was constantly redefined in response to historical circumstances. That growing Afrikaner nationalism was shaped by the desire to secure collective economic advantage
- **O’Meara**: Is the Marxist revisionist who argues the rise of Afrikaner nationalism was an expression of class interests. After 1934 there was a conscious effort to mobilise Afrikaner nationalism politically
- **Grundlingh**: Suggests that the NP developed a ‘new message’ in this period whereby the British were vilified and the history of the Afrikaner raised up
Question 3

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the impact of participation in World War Two on South African society in order to determine whether or not the reinforcement of racial divisions (between whites in society and between blacks and whites) was the most significant impact of war. The candidate would be expected to examine several factors which might include the economic impact of the war, political developments as a result of entry to and participation during the war including the outcome of the 1948 election and the social impact on race relations within South Africa. They should reach a balanced conclusion regarding the extent to which the reinforcement of racial divisions was the most significant impact of the war.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support the reinforcement of racial divisions as the most significant impact

- The formation of the breakaway Afrikaner Party
- The formation of the OB
- Emergence of black trade unionism and strike action amongst blacks
- Reunion of the Malan and Hertzogite Nationalists as the HNP in 1940 in response to the UP entering war on the side of Britain
- Continuing political divisions between Afrikaners
- 1943 election, with Malan’s NP forming the official opposition
- Commissioning of the Sauer Report and recommendations including physical separation of the races
- Smuts increasingly criticised by Nationalists as an ‘apostle of the kaffir state’
- Increasing racism in workplace as black urbanisation grows
- Reaction of demobilised soldiers to relaxation of the Pass Laws
- White workers in skilled and semi-skilled positions in industry felt threatened by the breaches in the colour bar

Factors which may contradict

- Rent strikes and bus boycotts
- Growth of squatter camps
- Boost to secondary industry and manufacturing
- Increased number of skilled black workers
- Consequences of urbanisation for South Africa’s farmers
- Defeat of the United Party in the 1948 election by the National Party
- Increasing black protest including the Alexandria bus boycotts (1940-45) and mineworkers strikes (1946)
- Smuts increasingly sees himself as a ‘trustee’ of government over blacks
- 1939-45 gross output doubled. White employment up by 20%, black by 74%
- Housing shortages for blacks and whites
- All races aid the war effort (though blacks in restricted roles)
- Fagan Commission appointed to assess urban blacks/labour provisions
- ANC re-organisation during the war, opens membership to all
- Post war immigration schemes to attract European workers (1946). Nationalists felt this would ‘plough the Afrikaner under’
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Dan O'Meara**: emphasised the economic mobilisation of Afrikaners during and immediately after the war to create a single economic identity by 1948. He argues that the war enabled Malan to create a new class alliance under the banner of ‘Afrikaner Nationalism’

- **Grundlingh**: Points out that the solidarity engendered by common wartime experiences (among whites in the armed forces) was not readily translated into a common post-war political consciousness. The war did not radicalise black ex-servicemen

- **Barber**: “The war exposed the very questions that Hertzog and Smuts had pushed aside: neutrality and loyalty to the crown”. He argues that Afrikaner nationalism was deeply divided

- **Worden**: Sees socio-economic impact of war as part of a lengthier process. The war accelerated what was already happening in terms of the drift to towns. Many factories were already employing blacks by the mid-1930s. Indeed **Maylam** argues that the number of Africans living in towns had already doubled between 1921 and 1936, before increasing by two-thirds between 1936 and 1948

- **Beinart**: Had it not been for the war then the compromises hammered out by Smuts and Hertzog may have lasted
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the influence of Steve Biko in the revival of African resistance in the 1970s in contrast with other influencing factors. These factors could include the development of Black Consciousness, the rise of international condemnation of the apartheid regime, the role of militant resistance by MK and POQO, and trade unionism. The candidate should reach a balanced conclusion as to the contribution made by Steve Biko to the revival of African resistance in the 1970s.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support Steve Biko’s contribution has been exaggerated:

- The influence of Dubois and Garvey on the SA Black Consciousness movement
- Possible influence of liberation writers such as Frantz Fanon (author of *The Wretched of the Earth*) on Biko
- Nothing particularly original about BCM / Biko’s ideas: roots can be traced back to at least the beginning of the twentieth century and earlier Africanist movements
- BCM and Biko did not develop coherent political strategy which limited its effectiveness
- Black resistance was dominated after Soweto by the non-racialism of the ANC/SACP
- Late 1970s ANC increasingly focussing on urban areas and building mass organisations
- The end of the 1970s saw emergence of vigorous black labour movement
- Impact of liberation movements elsewhere in Africa (Mozambique and Angola)
- Community based organisations emerging
- After Soweto, the state never regained the total control enjoyed in the 1960s

Factors which may suggest/support Steve Biko as a major cause of the revival

- Steve Biko was the acknowledged leader of the Black Consciousness movement in South Africa
- As a student at Natal Medical School he was initially involved with the NUSAS but later helped form SASO
- 1972 – he became honorary president of the Black People’s Convention
- During 1974 Biko was placed under a banning order by the SA government but nevertheless his ideas remained hugely influential among black South Africans
- Biko argued that the Africans' struggle within South Africa necessitated both psychological liberation then physical liberation
- Biko helped set up the Black Communities Programme in 1970, establishing self-help groups for black communities
- The influence of the BCM in the protests and strikes of 1972-3
- Connection between the BCM and the Soweto riots
- Government response banning, detaining and imprisoning leaders including Biko for *‘endangering the maintenance of law and order’* suggests influence of Biko
- The spread of black consciousness ideas among the ANC in exile as large numbers of activists joined ANC training camps
- Impact of the death of Biko in police custody in 1977 and subsequent domestic and international reaction
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Dubow**: Emphasises the influence of the BC Movement and Biko’s leadership on the Soweto uprising, while Worden describes BCM as ‘an important part of the renewed conflicts’ of the 1970s, while linking the heightened African resistance of the early 1980s to the economic recession which caused African living standards to fall

- **Adrian Guelke**: Questions how far the influence of Biko’s ideas and BCM actually extended beyond intellectuals and students

- **Hirson and McKinley**: Marxist historians downplay the importance of the BCM and Biko, claiming that they did not fundamentally threaten the immediate interests of the apartheid state because the movement failed to develop a coherent political strategy

- **Ross**: Argues that ‘The leaders of the BCM had little immediate affinity with the working class of the cities’

- **Beinart**: Disagrees with Ross in that he argues the BCM extended the bounds of possibility and that anger and the symbols of resistance survived the death of Biko and the banning of the BC. There remained ‘a strong belief amongst politicised black youths that ‘the system’ was so unjust it could not last

- **Meli**: As an ANC historian, is critical of the contradictions within the BCM, and of its abandonment of non-racial resistance to injustice
Question 5

How significant was the Cold War in influencing international attitudes towards apartheid before 1984?

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to assess the significance of the Cold War in influencing international attitudes towards apartheid before 1984. It asks the candidate to consider a range of factors that influenced international opposition to apartheid which may include economic interests in South Africa, the maintenance of South Africa as an ally against Communism, Limitations of the United Nations and the collapse of white minority rule elsewhere in Africa. The candidate should reach a balanced conclusion as to the significance of the Cold War in limiting international opposition to the apartheid state.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may suggest/support the Cold War was the main factor influencing international attitudes towards apartheid:

- Relations with West, especially the USA, Great Britain, West Germany and France
- Conviction of the West that the South African government had a key role to play in the Cold War struggle against the spread of communism
- Successive South African governments worked hard to convince West only a stable, white minority government could resist communism getting hold
- Reagan’s election in the US increased focus on South Africa as a key player in the struggle against the Soviet Union
- Even the Labour governments of the 1970s were not prepared to support UN calls for sanctions
- USA followed largely pro-South African policy for much of 1970s
- Not until the 1980s and Détente was there a significant change in international opinion
- Botha needed allies in his struggle against the perceived threat of international Communism. Botha befriended Thatcher and Reagan
- Concern in West regarding collaboration between ANC and CPSA in exile
- The USSR was supplying arms to resistance
- “it would surely not be an exaggeration to suggest that should a Soviet puppet regime ever be installed in Pretoria . . . the Soviet Union would by this action grasp the perfect instrument for destroying the industrial and technological supremacy of the West”. South African Ministry of Information (1982)

Factors which contradict the influence of the Cold War in shaping international attitudes to apartheid:

- Exaggeration of USSR’s support for resistance groups as a result of Cold War paranoia
- Issue of apartheid raised frequently in the UN but, as a result of vetoes in the Security Council, it was not until 1977 that an arms embargo was imposed
- SA’s administration of South West Africa threatened to bring it into direct confrontation with the world community
- 1960s and 1970s saw growing anti-apartheid movement as South African activists in exile spread their message. More influential after the Soweto Uprising with the contribution of western media
- The US government sought a ‘constructive engagement’ with South Africa
Other factors which may have influenced international attitudes more:

- Between 1965 and 1980 British governments were more preoccupied with Rhodesia
- Enormous economic importance of South Africa to the West who looked to SA to supply them with valuable minerals
- South Africa as important trading partner to West, buying machinery and technology not available in South Africa
- Large amounts of Western capital – over $26bn – was invested in South Africa
- Platinum, chromium, cobalt, manganese – essential in manufacturing planes, trains, oil refineries etc
- West had indirect investments in SA in the form of bank loans and shares in mining corporations
- More favourable attitudes of the Thatcher government
- The role of the United Nations’ resolutions
- Economic sanctions, disinvestment and trade boycotts
- The anti-apartheid movement and the contribution of sporting boycotts and artistic bans
- Transfer to black majority rule taking place throughout Africa
- Only in the mid-1980s, with daily coverage of township violence and the brutality of the security forces’ response, that there was significant change in international opinion

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

- **Thompson**: argues that whilst South Africa helped foster the argument about her role as a defender against communism “South Africa foreign propaganda was well tuned to the Cold War fears and prejudices of Europeans and Americans”. But **Thompson** also recognises that “Southern Africa never had a high priority on the Soviet agenda”
- **Lipton**: claims that “apartheid and capitalism were in conflict”. She argues that segregation was no longer appropriate to the changing needs of the South African economy and its trading links
- **Guelke**: Argues that Botha sought to influence Western opinion towards SA directly through domestic reform. The west was tolerant towards South Africa as it was “regarded for many years as a reliable bulwark against communism precisely because of its hostility towards notions of human equality”
- **Bradley**: notes that Thatcher and Reagan’s reluctance to support the ANC and other anti-apartheid measures was “rooted in their fear of a Communist backed ANC government coming to power” which would prove detrimental to their own interests
- **Roberts**: Allowing Soviet influence and control over South Africa would have created the perfect instrument for destroying the industrial and technological supremacy of the West
- **Giliomee**: Botha’s main aim was the “defence of the white state” based on the priorities of security and constitutional reform rather than economic necessity
South Africa (1910-1984)

Part 2

Question 1

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)
Candidates may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of each source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)
These 10 marks will be awarded for:

[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians' views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources A and B about the ineffectiveness of resistance movements in the 1930s and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source A

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Division amongst resistance groups over the acceptability of segregationist legislation
- The nature and make-up of the ANC (as a small and weak party) limited its effectiveness
- Like other nationalist organisations, it was middle class
- Resistance organisations were divided along racial lines

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Different aims of organisations resulted in a lack of universal appeal
- Early ANC leaders were disdainful of popular agitation
- The Communist Party (CPSA) failed to create a mass movement in spite of its’ intention
- Women’s protest limited to the Black Sash, especially as they were not allowed in the ANC
- Early leaders drawn from educated, Christian elite. Described as ‘Black Englishmen’ with basic acceptance of British values
- Communist Party seen to be dominated by whites, led to distrust particularly corresponding to the rise of Garveyism
Source B

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- African politics fell mute in the 1930s
- The ANC lacked a voice in the 1930s due to Seme’s leadership
- Seme became pre-occupied with dealing with other nationalist groups
- Seme did not tackle root problems causing the lack of co-ordination

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- The diversity of African resistance movements resulted in limited co-operation between the ANC, ICU, Communist Party, Wellington Movement
- The ANC did not support the development of a mass movement at this time and played a secondary role throughout much of the 1920s and 1930s
- The nature of white rule in southern Africa after 1910 increasingly restricted the avenues resistance could explore to protest against government legislation
- ANC leaders became fragmented and divided with Africanists and Communists in opposition

Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources
- Rural discontent was often aimed at relieving specific/immediate problems
- The extension of state and employer control made co-ordination of resistance harder
- The ICU and its success was short lived, it failed to identify with everyday problems of ordinary Africans
- Financial scandals and internal disputes destroyed the ICU, in spite of membership peaking at 100,000
- The early methods of protest included deputations and petitions
- Strikes by Africans had been made illegal and were harshly put down
- Impact of the Depression arguably brought other matters to the forefront as protestors concerned with more immediate issues

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Lodge: Contends that ANC leadership was out of touch with the masses as leaders were middle class men who feared ‘being thrust back into the ranks of the urban and rural poor’
- Beinart & Bundy: Have shown through localised studies that there was widespread involvement of ordinary Africans in rural areas in attempt to resist the extension of government intervention (resistance to taxation and sheep dipping)
- Worden: “African protest lacked the link to political mobilisation”. “The national political organisations largely failed to identify with the kinds of struggles and grievances of the majority of South Africans”
- McKinley: Holds the Marxist view and suggests that movements (most notably the ANC) failed to establish grassroots organisations among the masses and that leadership was preoccupied by petit bourgeois interests such as obtaining a free market. The ANC’s policy of working with those in political power bound them more closely to the ruling class
- Marks & Trapido: Disagree with McKinley and argue that powerlessness inclined resistance movements towards cooperating with the state

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources A and B is helpful in offering a full perspective on the reasons for the ineffectiveness of resistance movements in the 1930s.
**Question 2**

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of **Source C** as an adequate explanation of the reasons for the introduction of apartheid legislation in the 1950s in terms of:

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

**Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views**

- The maintenance of the migrant labour system so as to provide cheap labour for the mines
- Extend the system to the manufacturing sector
- To prevent the development of a black working class in the towns thereby protecting white workers
- To ensure a labour supply for farmers too

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

- The Tomlinson report proposed the relocation of industry on the outskirts of the reserves to remove / limit black workers in urban areas
- Marxist historians interpreted Apartheid in terms of the changing economic needs of white South Africa
- Influx control legislation would restrict the process of black urbanisation, which had grown rapidly in the 1940s, and which threatened to create an urban proletariat
- Afrikaner farmers feared insufficient labour in the aftermath of Smuts’ relaxation of the pass laws to facilitate war time industrial growth
- 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 – policy pursued with greater vigour after 1959
- Urban Areas Act, especially Section 10. **Posel’s** analysis of influx control suggests apartheid more flexible than was once believed

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

- Evidence of apartheid policies to preserve the dominance of the white race
- The aftermath of the Second World War saw a boom in manufacturing which also asserted its influence on government policy making
- White workers were drawn to the NP in the 1948 election under assurances of economic protection and improvement
- Conflicting views of those demanding total separation and those advocating more flexible policies, in order to meet the needs of manufacturing
- White/Afrikaner fear that equality of the races would lead to the eventual disappearance of the white nation in South Africa
- Apartheid as a policy of self-preservation and to prevent miscegenation as suggested by the Immortality Act, Mixed Marriages Act, Population Registration Act and Bantu Authorities Act
- Omer-Cooper identifies the 1950s as a period of ‘baaskap apartheid’ which was designed to ensure white supremacy but there was no overall agreement on how this should be achieved
- Apartheid as way of protecting Bantu by allowing them to develop as separate people
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Posel**: Argues that there was no overarching plan for apartheid. The primary imperative was for preservation of white racial political superiority while simultaneously promoting white economic prosperity.
- **Wolpe**: A radical historian who argued that apartheid ideology was a way of justifying the extension of the economics of cheap labour to the manufacturing industry. Wolpe also emphasises the crumbling nature of the reserve economies and the need to restore them.
- **Afrikaner historian Giliomee**: describes apartheid as ‘a radical survival plan’ rooted in the Dutch Reformed Church. He argues that scholars of anthropology and law figured prominently in the construction of apartheid such as Verwoerd.
- **Marxist historian O’Meara**: sees a fully developed blueprint for subsequent action in 1948.
- **Posel**: regards the Sauer Report as an ‘internally contradictory and ambiguous document’.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source C** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the reasons for the introduction of apartheid in the 1950s.
Question 3

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source D as evidence of the nature of African resistance in the 1960s.

Provenance:
- Document seized by police at the ANC occupied farm at Rivonia in 1963
- Internal ANC planning document reflecting the proposed strategic changes in the move to militancy led by Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK)
- ANC banned after the Sharpeville Massacre by the Suppression of Communism Act and forced underground, clandestine planning at Rivonia as a consequence
- Used as evidence of treason against ANC leaders in the 1964 Rivonia Trial in which 8 were found guilty and sentenced to life imprisonment

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- The nature of white rule has only left one choice for those opposing it – overthrow by force/violence
- Mass revolutionary action is required
- The mood of the people suggests a readiness to carry out violent (potentially suicidal) campaigns
- Reluctance of the people to participate in orthodox protest methods

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Government use of force against protestors at Sharpeville suggested to many that peaceful protest was no longer an option
- Establishment of MK (Umkhonto we Sizwe) to lead the armed struggle in the early 1960s
- Examples of violent campaigns - Targets included electricity pylons, Post Offices, Bantu Administration Offices and railway stations
- MK largely organised in townships
- ANC in disarray and unable to operate within South Africa
- Mandela argued it was better to turn to violence with or without the ANC so it would be better to channel and control violent resistance
- The trial provided good publicity for the ANC and Mandela who provided his own defence
Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source

- Banning of the PAC also led to the establishment of POQO
- Joe Slovo (Former Communist), member of High Command identified reasons for sabotage: moral responsibility for slide to civil war would remain with government; sabotage was a form of propaganda
- ANC and PAC headquarters set up abroad. Oliver Tambo given job of winning international support for the ANC
- Poqo aimed to lay the foundations for a general rising
- Poqo’s tactics included the murder of police officers and informants, Murder of tribal chiefs who ‘collaborated’, random attacks on whites
- In the 1960s African resistance was gradually transformed from a loosely organised movement into a clandestine revolutionary elite
- Economic growth of the 1960s arguably limited resistance. GNP grew at 5% pa. Black unemployment fell to less than 10%
- Limited international support, although the UN was highly critical of the SA government by the end of the 1960s
- Problems facing the exiled organisations in terms of training, limited funds and the SA government's effective propaganda alleging the link between the SACP and the ANC
- Organised opposition was difficult when measures were taken to forcibly remove Africans from urban areas – the traditional breeding ground for organised opposition
- 1969 Morogoro Conference summoned to deal with issues of poor organisation, poor leadership and discipline experienced during the 1960s

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

- **McKinley** writes from a Marxist perspective having been an activist in the SACP until his expulsion in 2000. He regards the ANC as being out of touch with popular resistance and therefore methods used were also criticised. ‘The ANC was no closer to seizing power than it had been in the late 1950s’
- **Dubow**: An ANC historian emphasises the negative effect of the Treason Trial. “It absorbed political energies, disrupted the momentum of popular mobilisation and created a serious power vacuum within the ANC”
- **Leonard Thompson**: ‘Quiescence did not mean acquiescence’ while **Worden** is optimistic stating that ‘the expectation of mass mobilisation raised in the early 1960’s did not materialise’
- **Francis Meli**: finds encouraging signs of continuing resistance: ‘The ANC concentrated on heightening the political consciousness of its cadres and keeping up their morale’

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source D** is useful as evidence for investigating the nature of African resistance in the 1960s.
Soviet Russia (1917-1953)

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to discuss and give an analysis of the failings of the Provisional Government compared to external events such as the Kornilov Affair, but candidates should also consider other events from Feb-Oct 1917 and the impact of alternative groups. There should be a sense of continuous debate and an awareness of the players involved such as the role of Kerensky. Personalities, policies, actions and miscalculations will inform the piece. Discussion should include the key policy issues – social reform, land, economy, national minorities and war.

Relevant areas for discussion might include:

Role of Kornilov

- Mistake of Kerensky in appointing General Kornilov as Supreme Commander of the Russian forces in August 1917 and entering into an agreement with him to restore order to armed forces
- Kerensky’s trust in Kornilov backfired when Kornilov seized upon this opportunity to establish military control
- Worried that he would lose power, Kerensky denounces Kornilov and appeals to the Soviet for help, but this only served to expose Kerensky’s weakness
- Kerensky supplied the Bolshevik Red Guard with weapons to defend Petrograd against Kornilov, which they then used in the subsequent uprising
- Kerensky’s reputation lay in tatters, trusted by no-one with his weakness readily apparent
- Conversely, he inadvertently helped to restore the reputation of the Bolsheviks after their support had declined after the July Days. They were now viewed as the saviours of the Revolution and were elected in large numbers to the Petrograd Soviet, gaining overall control in September. This Bolshevik led soviet which would approve the plans for the Bolshevik seizure of power in October
- Kornilov marked the beginning of the end for the Provisional Government, as the mass of the people completely distrusted the Kadets
- Kerensky was now distrusted by the Left and all moderate socialists that were associated with him were discredited, hence Bolshevik surge of popularity in the Soviet after Kornilov
- He was completely loathed by the Right and the Officer class for betraying Kornilov. Consequently, they were not prepared to defend Kerensky and the Provisional Government in October

The Provisional Government itself

- The weaknesses inherent in the government
- Divided government (Dual Power and the Petrograd Soviet), the composition of the Provisional Government and the Soviet
- The positive achievements at the outset in the ‘honeymoon period’ of the first month.
- The constitutional problem (the Constituent Assembly)
- Different groups with conflicting demands which were difficult to meet, and the resulting splits (eg over the national minorities)
- The undermining of authority in the army by Order No 1 and why the Soviet did not take power at this time should be examined
- The policies the land question and the food crises
Factors which served to exacerbate the problems
- Role of Kerensky and assessment of how his actions served only to bring the Bolsheviks back after the July days due to his mishandling of the Kornilov affair
- The impact of the War, the more sophisticated line of argument leading with the underestimation of the social revolution in 1917, citing desertions from the army after the June Offensive and looking at the July Days as a catalyst for more
- Addressing the fact that in the July Days, the threat of Bolshevism could have been arrested
- A consideration of the right (Kornilov) and the role of Kerensky in Provisional Government in the aftermath of Kornilov Affair ie loathed by right, distrusted by left

The question of the Bolshevik challenge
- The significance of Lenin’s return, the April Theses and the radicalisation of the workers
- Discussion about the seizure of power in October and the roles of the main leaders, Lenin and Trotsky
- The issue of the popular revolution as evidence of the complete failure of the Provisional Government, the coup d’état by the Bolsheviks as further evidence of limited opposition

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- **Pipes**: “The Kornilov Affair, as it came to be known, turned out to be a nail in his own coffin. It merely accelerated the social and political polarisation which had been eroding the base of the Provisional Government since the early summer, and in this sense brought the revolution closer to its October denouement” and ‘it was only a question of time before Kerensky would be overthrown by someone able to provide firm leadership’
- **Read**: argues that support for the Bolsheviks was already on the rise even before the Kornilov Affair
- **Kowalski** noted that the system was also victim to ‘a number of unpredictable accidents and improbable coincidences…such as, for instance, the attempted coup by General Kornilov’
- **Robert Service**: ‘for most of the year the Provisional Government survived on guile and rhetoric’
- **M Howard**: ‘under the immense stress imposed by an industrialised war’
- **Rabinowitch** states that the long term causes of unrest made ‘the desire for an end to the coalition government very nearly universal’
- **Robert Service**: ‘the timing of the collapse of the Provisional Government was more of his (Lenin) work than the consequence of the socio-political environment, or of the actions of the Soviets’
- **Christopher Read**: claims that Lenin was a key figure, but there was also a lot of independent action at local level
Question 2

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to evaluate the success and failures of the Soviet economy between 1917 - 1924 by examining the reasons for the introduction of the policy of War Communism and then looking at the motivation for the introduction of NEP. The economic and political impact of Bolshevik economic management, as well as its role as part of the socialist revolution could be examined in order to further the analysis of the degree of success of the programmes.

Relevant areas for discussion of reasons/rationale for introduction might include:

Immediate Economic Management - candidate could comment on sense of initial economic decisions by the Bolsheviks
- Intentional hyper-inflation introduced to wipe out capital and currency
- Banks taken under state control and industry nationalised
- Foreign debts cancelled and subsequent impact on future investment.

War Communism - Reasons for introduction of War Communism
- The refusal of the peasants to give their produce
- Need to raise agricultural production and the handover of this output
- During civil war so there was a practical necessity in addition to an ideological correct stance
- Lenin’s view of NEP as a temporary "retreat", a “breathing space”
- Dislocation between Party and society evidenced by Kronstadt and peasant rebellions
- Opportunity to woo peasants towards party including establishment of control over them via expansion of party membership
- Increased role of co-ops and expansion of party-driven administrative system
- Need to develop foreign trade to appease foreign critics in age of expansion of foreign trade and drawing up of foreign trade agreements

NEP – its impact and reflection or contradiction of political ideals – Economic
- No grain requisitioning, ban on private trade removed, small business re-opened, state controlled heavy industry
- Shops, cafes, restaurants re-open and cities begin to revitalise
- Nepmen and their success – first three to four years – deals, corruption and ‘get-rich-quick’ mentality
- Walter Duranty – two years on there were over 25,000 private traders in Moscow
- Limitations – progress not even – 1923 Scissors Crisis – some believed it marked the end of the Soviet experiment, return of capitalism
- Problems show ill-thought-out policy – huge unemployment: 1·24 million jobless in 1924 – younger workers hardest hit
- Generated further class divisions within the peasantry
- Impact on intellectual life – sovietisation

NEP Political – impact and effect
- Zinoviev stated it was "a temporary deviation, a tactical retreat"
- Bukharin said it was an economic concession to avoid political concessions
- ‘New Exploitation of the Proletariat’ – attitudes of urban workers in first two years
- 1922 – censorship, writers and scholars deported, pre-publication censorship – Glavlitt
- GPU, secret police and arbitrary imprisonment and death penalty as instrument of social policy
- Attack on rivals, show trials – 34 SR leaders condemned as terrorists, 11 executed
- Crushing peasant revolts – Tambov 1922, salt given as reward for good behaviour
- Attack on Church – Union of Militant Godless, death penalties for leaders of Russian Orthodox Church, thousands of priests imprisoned
Evidence of problems
- 1921 famine – 5 million dead because of drought and requisitioning programme, international aid, one of worst famines of twentieth century
- Economy – industrial output 20% pre-war levels; 1921 finished products 16% 1912 levels; unfinished 12%. (C Ward)
- Peasant threats – Tambov rising August 1920–June 1921, “powerless to resist rebels” March 1921 (Figes)
- Worker opposition – January 1921 bread ration cut by one third in cities, militarized factories, no union representation but controllers for the state
- Party divisions – Workers’ Opposition – Shlyapnikov and Kollontai
- Problems from Kronstadt – March 1921 rebellion and mutiny, authority had to act

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

- **Walter Duranty**: “To the Communists and to the small group of proletarian leaders ... NEP was doubtless repugnant.” (witness)
- **Figes**: War communism was a political response to the urban crisis of 1918
- **Fitzpatrick**: a radical measure to cope with a desperate situation; NEP the compromise – because of failure to recover economically and protests – Tambov and Kronstadt the “symbolic parting of the ways between the workers councils and the Bolshevik Party”. A betrayal reintroducing the bourgeois experts, Nepmen, kulaks, a compromise in ideology for long-term gain
- **Katerina Clark**: it was the heyday of the intellectual not particularly committed to one particular party
Question 3

Candidates may consider Stalin’s ability to manipulate both favourable and dangerous situations to his advantage and examine how these contributed to Stalin’s emergence as leader. They might also consider the other factors and their relative merit in explaining why Stalin emerged as leader of Soviet Russia. Thus the theme of manipulation could run through all of the contributing factors.

Stalin’s personality and cunning manipulator
- His wisdom in defending “socialism in one country” against Trotskyists and Bukharinists
- Ruthlessness associated with ‘Asiatic’ (Leonid Krasin)
- Manipulating allies and enemies alike (Robert Conquest/Robert Tucker)
- Allying with Right and Left
- Failings of the other contenders – Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, and Stalin’s manipulation
- Naivety of Trotsky over Lenin’s Testament and Stalin’s manipulation of him
- Death of Sverdlov in 1918 & Dzerzhinsky in 1926 and his capitalising on their vacant posts
- But his unique predisposition to succeed is a difficult argument to sustain – he manipulated – so did others; he changed his mind – so did others
- Trotsky – the fear of Napoleon, when Stalin was the loyal and trustworthy servant
- Stalin had little to say on the burning issues of the day: ‘socialism in one country’ was Bukharin’s; but his support of it was genuine and he gained the support from the workers

Legitimate heir
- Lenin’s funeral and Stalin positioning himself as his heir
- Lenin believed that the ‘vanguard party’ would have to be tightly controlled with a strong central committee
- Organisation, discipline and centralisation would be a vital key to the move to a socialist utopia
- 8th Party Congress 1919 put Russian party’s Central Committee above others (Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia)
- Emphasis on ‘democratic centralism’: 9th Party Congress 1920 ‘iron discipline’
- ‘vertical centralism’ also embedded and vital to success of the Party
- Anti-democratic views explained in ‘On Party Unity’
- These points gave Stalin the backdrop he needed to succeed
- Other contenders became victims of the machines they created

Stalin and the Party and State machinery
- The organisation gave him the means to succeed
- Narkomnets gave him the breadth of power across the Republic and USSR
- Control of Rabkrin allowed promotion of friends, and dismissal of enemies
- Power locally became ‘Stalinist’ in nature as much as it did centrally
- In central politics others might win the debate, but Stalin won the vote
- Stalin had a confidential personal secretariat briefing on other leaders
- Because the old pre-revolutionary proletariat had disappeared, institutions (Soviets) atrophied, or drifted away from the party line, so appointment began to replace election and the Cheka dealt with ‘counter-revolutionaries’
- The development of the governing institutions made Stalin powerful because of his links between Politburo, Secretariat and Orgburo. Stalin was well placed at the centre of all of this
Change in Bolshevism
- Civil War opened up membership to a range of people
- Because of this the need to control led to the language of ‘attack’ and ‘struggle’ becoming part of leadership
- Lenin Enrolment opened up a chaotic mix of members who would strike against tyrannical objects of policy, than managers. The party masses were now the objects of policy and the dictatorship of the proletariat now became Bolshevik dictatorship and the dictatorship of the leader
- Middle-ranking party leaders (emerged during the military stress of the Civil War) were eager to obey (not debate) and to command (not persuade); ideal for Stalin and his bureaucratic empire

Ideology and policy - more than the façade for ambition
- NEP and the danger of restored capitalism and the pace of industrialisation
- ‘Permanent Revolution’ v ‘Socialism in one country’ genuine belief or a policy to oust Zinoviev and win support from Trotsky?

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

- **S Cohen**: that Stalin’s policies gained support from Bolsheviks who believed in his pragmatic solutions
- **E H Carr**: Stalin’s victory “was a triumph not of reason but of organisation”
- **Dmitri Volkogonov**: “The greatest secret of Stalin’s invulnerability, his diabolical strength, was his monopoly on Lenin.”
- **Christopher Ward**: states that Stalin’s policy of ‘socialism in one country’ made sense to many
- **I Deutscher**: states that Trotsky did not attack Stalin because he felt secure
- **R Conquest**: highlights Stalin’s ability as he manoeuvred the political situation
Question 4

Candidates may define their terms (i.e. 'high culture' of art, film, drama, literature etc, or broader 'popular culture' in the everyday lives of the people) and consider the impact of these changes to Soviet society. Candidates could compare specific developments and changes between Lenin's Russia and the emergence of a distinct 'socialist offensive' from 1929 - 31 under Stalin with the goal of ridding Soviet society of old bourgeois cultural values by utilising a vision of a transformed socialist future which encompassed the new Soviet Man or Homosovieticus. Candidates may assess the extent to which these changes were undertaken and the subsequent short and long-term impact these changes made upon family life, culture, education, religion and women.

Candidate may be expected to use evidence such as:

Changes in society (in education, the family, religion, and Socialist realism in the arts)
- the Cultural Revolution should be addressed with its vision of new cities, communal living spaces, and emergence of 'homosovieticus'.
- creating the new Soviet man who was to embody the values and characteristics of a good Soviet citizen was an integral part of the cultural revolution, candidates may assess the extent to which this was achieved in reality.
- the motivation and reasoning for the introduction of the Cultural Revolution should also be discussed as well as the extent to which it gained a momentum of its own.
- how this was carried out by considering the role of the agents of change and their impact would include the Komsomol, Pioneers, Shulgin and the influence of similar in education, RAPP, Association of artists, cinema makers.
- role of cinema in raising cultural level of the masses and propaganda for emphasising socialist ideals.
- impact of the cultural revolution and socialist realism on art, literature and cinema.
- role of socialist realism and the view that art and literature should educate workers in the spirit of communism.
- family & women - assessing the success this brought to this 'new society' should be assessed alongside its impact on the family, impact of divorce on women, abortion.
- balancing this with the upheavals, homelessness and crime by the mid-thirties saw a move to more rigid censures on society, called by some the 'Great Retreat' because it was a return to the values of pre-Communist days.
- the candidate might evaluate the Family Code of May 1936.
- education - Shulgin’s ‘withering away of school’ should be balanced with the impact of ill-trained workers as a consequence and the abandoning of this policy from 1931.
- consideration of the changes in education with the move from the abstract and the class struggle to that of the heroic and the imperial, using terminology like ‘motherland’.
- the creation of the new society, perhaps mentioning Zamyatin, highlighting the limitations in its success.
- opposition to the Stalinist ideal did exist and was not eradicated. Although at this stage ‘career communists’ did seize their chance and did change society, the ordinary people still held to their own beliefs.
- member of the Komosomol was seen as preparation to the Communist Party.
- impact of the cultural revolution on religion - only one in 40 churches was functioning by the end of the 1930s.
The end of the Cultural Revolution

- the long term impact of the cultural revolution should be considered in terms of the extent to which the changes imposed on society under the cultural revolution were permanently adopted or abandoned after 1931

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

- Kowalski states that propaganda, education and cultural developments were central to building socialism
- Service: “No great work of literature was published in the 1930s and all artistic figures went in fear of their lives.”
- Beryl Williams notes that the traditional gender roles were maintained
- Sheila Fitzpatrick states that family came first at this time
- Robert Service notes that there was a very positive response of the youth to the Komsomol
- Richard Stites notes the negation of all existing culture because it is better to have no culture rather than bourgeois culture
- Sheila Fitzpatrick notes the difficulty of ‘spontaneously’ creating this Proletkult, to be proletarian and distinct from the formerly dominating bourgeois culture and that it was halted in its infancy, its idealism and aspirations smothered by the desire to control on the 1930s
- Moshe Lewin: “Quicksand Society” created from the constant movement of people and building of new cities built with no firm societal foundations due to impact of industrialisation and forced collectivisation
Question 5

Candidates may be expected to debate the key factors which allowed Russia to emerge victorious in WWII. The heroism of individuals, the economic strength of the USSR and the weaknesses of the enemy are the key points in the traditional viewpoint of the outcome of conflict. In this essay the exploitation of soviet propaganda in defence of the motherland is vital in provoking the dedication and tenacity of the population.

Relevant areas for discussion might include:

Propaganda
- Propaganda in the armed forces and link to patriotism - over 1000 writers and artists joined the campaign to report from the front, monitored by Sovinformburo, all information was checked for ideological mistakes and they deployed a network of political officers to each regiment
- Role of the ‘Red Star’ newspaper which exaggerated Soviet victories and ignored soviet losses
- People were imprisoned for ‘defeatist talk’
- The war for the Russian Motherland not the USSR, and loyalty to Stalin and the Motherland became inseparable
- Stalin’s address to Red Army Parade in Red Square called upon soldiers to emulate their ancestors, thus linking to patriotic identity and his own cult of personality
- Stalin made speeches at critical moments evoking defence of Mother Russia such as defence of Moscow in November 1941
- Role of propaganda and the Orthodox Church, turning the negatives around of rationing, conscription, loss of homes. War was described as a ‘Holy War’ by the regime and Stalin exploited the popular support for the church to support the war effort. The war for the Russian Motherland now not the USSR, and loyalty to the Motherland and to Stalin
- The Stalin Myth. The role of Stalin in rallying the people - Generalissimo and his refusal to leave Moscow
- Stalin had a unified system of command in the STAKVA, Supreme Command which co-ordinated political, military and economic strategy

Leadership
- Initial mistakes of Stalin refusing to listen to intelligence about Operation Barbarossa
- Stalin’s insistence on an offensive war initially and refusal to allow his troops to retreat and regroup showed both a misunderstanding of the situation and a poor use of tactics
- Stalin’s initial lack of control when the German’s invaded, missing for 11 day, Kenez speaks of “Stalin’s momentary loss of control”
- The role of Stalin in rallying the people and his status as Generalissimo combined with the impact on the people of his refusal to leave Moscow
- Stalin had a unified system of command in the STAKVA, Supreme Command which co-ordinated political, military and economic strategy
- Stalin had able individuals such as Molotov (diplomacy), Voznesensky (economic planning), Kruschev (administration) and Zhukov (military). The latter commended Stalin on his readiness to learn about military strategy
- Mistakes made in ruthless purging (especially in national groups) were compensated by his ability to command the loyalty of the nation to fight for ‘Mother Russia’
Industry
- The readiness for war – that after 1937 major industrial works were completed and economic growth resumes by 1941 which meant survival at the beginning of the war
- The relocation of industries to beyond the Urals (evacuation of approx 10 million people)
- The scorched earth policy
- The economic system was already suited to war because of established central planning, unlike Germany which did not have total war economy until 1942
- Russian strengths might include the economic stability attained allowing the supply of the military with adequate material; the constant upgrading of the Red Army; opening up new fronts and Allied support; Kursk-evidence of Russian military development enough to beat the Germans in tank battles
- Victor Kravchenko criticised the view of relocation. He states that a minor part was moved, that Stalin had actually supplied Hitler during the period of the Nazi-Soviet Pact and that the retreat after the invasion left Hitler rich resources and abandoned millions

Geo-strategic issues
- The Russian traditional strategy of trading space for time and taking the Germans deeper into a Russian Winter, when the Germans were far from prepared for a long war, the size of the country, climate etc made it difficult for the Wehrmacht
- Stalingrad may be discussed in terms of the type of fighting required; suiting the Russians: the use of snipers; manipulating the war zone. Stalingrad is seen at this level as ‘a matter of prestige between Hitler and Stalin’, which alongside the ‘dogged, rugged, Siberian obstinacy’ and ‘the stamina of Soviet soldiers was incredible’ shows the determination involved. Considering enemy weaknesses (dealing with Russian climate, land mass meaning Germans over-stretched and could not apply same tactics as in France), and so errors occurred – altered the focus of the offensive and delayed the attack on Moscow
- Effects of Allied bombing of Germany; Allied invasion in the West
- Answers may take a longer perspective to explain victory

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

- **Richard Overy**: notes the strengths and the weaknesses of the Soviet forces as reasons for the outcome. He also highlights the “uneasy symbiosis” of the “efforts of the people in defiance of the system they inhabited” and the role of the state and the leader
- **Roy Medvedev**: criticises the Generalissimo as being “short sighted and cruel, careless of losses”
- **Chris Ward**: notes the economic, military and the political, but also points out the importance of the social factors – the people’s war. He also notes Hitler’s blunders
- **Richard Sakwa**: notes that Stalin “appeal(ed) to Russian pride rather than Marxism or Leninism as inspiration for resistance”
- **Peter Kenez**: notes that Nazi policy gave the people no option, they were fighting against Nazism, not for Stalinist Russia
- **John Laver**: highlights the establishment of a command economy and authoritarian rule and the appeal to patriotism in order to galvanise support for ‘Mother Russia’
- **John Laver**: notes the suitability of Russia economically to the demands of total war
- **Geoffrey Hosking**: stresses that productivity was impressive in terms of military output
Soviet Russia 1917-1953

Part 2

Question 1

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source A in understanding the reasons for the overthrow of the Tsar in terms of:

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

Alekseev, General who wished to contain and control the Revolution.

- Leading General who had support of many leading Generals in his actions
- Possibly involved in a palace plot with Duma politicians to overthrow Tsar
- Precise timing of the Telegram and background urging the Tsar to sign the abdication proclamation

Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant views

- “danger of anarchy spreading over all over the country”
- “disintegration of the army” desire to continue war without Tsar in control
- Necessity to give power to “Duma politicians” “to settle the situation”
- Desire to control revolution and prevent: Left elements from taking control

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

- Tsarism in decline because of Nicholas himself, personality, German wife, reliance on Rasputin. Plus his failures previously eg Russo-Japanese War
- Duma undermined by Tsar, limiting power. Tsarina and Rasputin dismissing ministers on a regular basis when the Tsar had gone to the front
- The conduct of the war – failed offensives, Tannenberg, Masurian Lakes, war weariness by 1917 with Tsar directly in charge from September 1915
- ‘Bread’ reflecting the economic privations of the time – shortages, queuing for 24 hours, excessive inflation
- Actions of the elites (Yusupov) in 1916 killing Rasputin – but this was more about the crumbling Romanov dynasty – his death a means of the elites saving autocracy. Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source
- Demonstrations and strikes were not uncommon, but the key leaders were not Bolshevik. Schliapnikov the leading Bolshevik scoffed at the idea that this was a revolution “What revolution?” he asked a local meeting of the party leaders on the 25th “Give the workers a pound of bread and the movement will peter out” (Figes)
- February 23rd International Womens’ Day – the temperature rising to -5 degrees, more people on the streets, Putilov workers join and the soldiers mutiny
- 1916 bread ration from 2-5lb to 1.5lb, prices rise six fold in Petrograd
- By 1917 the average working woman was spending 60 hours a week in bread lines
- War casualties 1917 1,700,000 deaths and 6,000,000 wounded
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Figes**: stated that the mutiny turned disorder into revolution
- **Peter Kenez**: “there was not to be found anywhere in the country any groups of the population... which were ready to put up a fight for the old regime.”
- **Robert McKeen**: “the Great War acted as the spark which set the combustible of mass discontent alight.”
- **R Pipes**: “rebellions happen, revolutions are made.”
- **Shapiro**: “the only solution lay in the complete democratisation of the system of government.”

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is useful for explaining the reasons for the overthrow of the Tsar in February 1917.
Question 2

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)

Candidates may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of each source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks). These 10 marks will be awarded for:

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

The candidate considers the views in Sources B and C on the success of the programme of rapid industrialisation during the Stalinist period, and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source B

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

Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Use of propaganda to exaggerate the outcome of first plan to motivate the workers to produce
- ‘myth’ of the plan and the ‘gloss’ placed on figures damaged its success
- Politburo only emphasising heavy industry targets and ignoring poor results
- “Quality” of products in question in drive for quantity of productivity

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- The first Five Year Plan was very much a propaganda device to push citizens towards the goal of an industrial socialist utopia. Competition between Gosplan and Vesenkha bidding targets up. Detailed planning at first did not exist – broad directives and therefore local officials and managers made the decisions
- Magnitogorsk designed as the socialist city of the future. Dnieprostroy Dam, the world’s largest construction site for two years, increased Soviet electric power output fivefold in the 1930s, part of ‘gigantomania’
- Others – Moscow-Volga canal, Moscow metro. Thousands of skilled workers came from Britain and America
- Komsomol – the Young Communist League as part of the Cultural Revolution endorsed the vision of the new cities, of ‘soviet man’, the ‘soldiers of production’ one of the directors of the Magnitogorsk site stated they were “the most reliable and powerful organising force of the construction”. The ‘shock brigades’ who reported back
- But there was use of forced labour, the purge of the managers, technicians and planners and the development of the ‘quicksand society’ (Lewin)
Source C

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

Points from source which show the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Success in increased “productivity of labour”
- “enthusiasm” of workers and building “socialist construction”
- Transformation of the country to “country of metal” at “accelerated tempo”
- ‘Russian backwardness’ left behind

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- The Stakhanovite movement from 1935 onwards was created to inspire and to discipline workers. Idea of Konstantin Petrov, Party organiser to increase quotas
- Building a “Soviet America”
- Successes were made in heavy industry, but at expense of consumer goods
- Unrealistic targets caused problems, “5 years in 4!”
- Thousands of administrators were dismissed, many were arrested. Engineers and technicians were blamed for low output
- The result was to create an atmosphere of fright and repression
- But there was substantial growth in heavy industry and the USSR was transformed

Points which offer a more critical contextualisation of the views in the sources
- Stalin was also carried away by the momentum of the movement and he had initiated this full-scale industrial revolution with little real awareness of the limits of national resources and the endurance needed by the people
- The workers’ living quarters were “overcrowded and in an extreme state of disrepair” M Fainsod 1937
- That it never became an egalitarian society, that those who were useful prospered
- Command economy had weaknesses – targets, shortages, quality, ill-organised or even chaotic. Industry was imbalanced – heavy industry dominated, consumer goods neglected
- Supplies of materials difficult – competing factories hijacking lorries, ambushing trains
- Untrained clumsy workers damaging expensive machinery, producing poor quality goods
- Role of foreign investments and expertise
- Awareness of other 5 Year Plans

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

- Sheila Fitzpatrick: targets more of a socialist fantasy than a rational calculation; also, her point that the literal building of cities was no different from the building of a socialist state
- A Nove: new targets were far beyond practical possibility
- C Ward: but there were some dramatic advances (by 1932). Ward cites the Urals, Kuzbass, Volga, and Ukraine as well as the gigantic schemes like Magnitogorsk
- Moshe Lewin: highlights the cost in human terms
- J N Westwood: “the Stakhanovite movement brought with it an upbeat message. ‘Life is getting better’ implied that with greater productivity there would be greater consumption. The push for consumer goods did last for the next half century and despite recurrent absurdities would do much to enhance the lives of ordinary people.”

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources B and C is helpful in offering a full perspective on the success of industrialisation during the Stalinist period.
Question 3

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source D as an adequate explanation of why the Purges escalated in terms of:

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Reference to Yezhov’s appointment and fall of Yagoda as signal of escalation of purging against old Bolsheviks
- The use of false claims of embezzlement to get rid of old Bolsheviks like Zinoviev
- “Malenkov (head of the membership registration sector of the Central Committee and a close collaborator of Yezhov’s) had ordered his deputies to check the party files” Use of links to Trotsky or accusations of terrorism to accuse old Bolsheviks
- Expansion of the purges to “leading personnel in industry and transport”

Points from recall which support, develop and contextualise those in the source
- The lies that were told to get rid of others, candidates may mention Kirov (Dec.1934) the popular alternative to Stalin at the XVII Party Congress, and the Show Trials
- Purges used to arrest people for Labour camps in order to provided slave labour for industrialisation
- NKVD had quotas, idea that the Purges took on a life of their own due to culture of denunciations and therefore grew exponentially
- Role of Yezhov in escalation of Purges - “the Bloodthirsty Dwarf”
- Detail on what happened to Kamenev and Zinoviev, as they were linked to Kirov’s assassin, tried and imprisoned as part of the Left Opposition and accused of being Trotsky’s agents. They confessed to crimes which they could not have carried out, not the least of which was conspiracy to murder Kirov
- Bukharin was implicated by Zinoviev and Kamenev along with Tomsky and Rykov, as leaders of the Right Opposition, accused of forming a ‘rightist bloc’. There is no evidence of a plot, but Bukharin did criticise Stalin's economic policies in ‘Notes of an Economist’
- All was justified to safeguard Stalin and the purge of the Party followed by Church and Army
- The problems of division and factionalism had to be controlled and these methods were not new in Russia. Chistka were normal in the party
- The mood of the old Party workers and the Purging of them: officials like Radek and Pyatakov accused of working for Trotsky and foreign governments
- The move then to the Army leadership: 1937-8, 3 of 5 marshals, 14 of 16 commanders, 37,000 officers shot or imprisoned, Navy lost all admirals
Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of the view in the source

- The numbers involved as the Terror escalated. Detail on the numbers involved in the Purges; that Gulag inmates rose by half a million between 1937–39: that two thirds of the 1.3 million inmates in 1939 were described as ‘political criminals’ or ‘socially harmful’
- The extent to which others were responsible – from Yagoda to Yezhov to Beria and the ‘target mentality’ of the NVKD
- The appointment of Beria to stop the over zealous Yezhov and the coining of the period as ‘Yezhovshchina’
- The step to the totalitarian regime and getting rid of all elements linked to ‘class’ – kulaks, bourgeois NEPmen etc
- Purging the Secret Police; not traitors but those now having too much power
- Role of Vishinski
- Stalin’s megalomania and paranoia
- Denunciations and the spread to the ordinary people... and the Terror... for everyone
- That this spread to every aspect of society and perhaps could be justified in that it aims to produce ‘vintiki’ (party followers, party faithful, the true soviet citizen)

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

- **J Arch Getty**: “The Purges of the 1930s were a maelstrom of political violence that engulfed all levels of society and all walks of life.”
- **Geoffrey Hosking**: “What Stalin set in motion had a dynamic of its own...everyone was driven ineluctably on, the interrogators as well as the interrogated.”
- **Richard Sakwa**: stated that the Purges and Show Trials were “masterminded by Stalin personally”
- **Thurston**: “The Terror was too erratic to have been a planned operation with the goal of spreading fear.”
- **Alec Nove**: “The whole process was set in motion from the top.”
- **Bullock**: refers to the Purges as the “Stalinshchina” rather than the “Yezhovshchina”
- **Stephen Cohen**: “Ultimately, you cannot explain the Great Terror against the Party without focusing on Stalin’s personality.”
The Spanish Civil War: Causes, Conflict and Consequences (1923 – 1945)

Each question is worth 25 marks

Part 1

Question 1

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to discuss the degree to which the church in Spain was losing power and influence in Spain during the 1920s. The candidate may emphasise detachment of the church from ordinary people and the lack of attendance at Mass; this can be contrasted with the official position of the church in Spain and its influence in society, for instance in education. Thus reaching a balanced conclusion regarding the extent to which the church was losing power and influence in the 1920s.

Candidate might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the view that the church was losing power and influence in the 1920s

Power
- By the 1920s the attempt at Recatholicism as a response to social problems was largely seen as having failed and was abandoned by most Conservative politicians
- The church was seen as anti-democratic and monarchist, alienating it from the growing republican beliefs in Spain among the political elite
- The Dictadura alienated many of the Monarchy’s traditional allies, leaving the church caught between its traditional support for the King and the landowners and army.

Influence
- Growing anti-clericalism among both liberal, middle class and urban working class
- Declining attendance at Mass in many areas. There was growing disillusionment among the working class and sections of the peasantry who viewed the church as only concerned with the rich, leaving many parishes without a congregation. This was not uniform however
- The church had aligned with the latifundio, further distancing itself from the majority of the people. This meant that they lost support among some of the rural population who could previously have been relied on to follow the church.
- Secular educational establishments had gained some support, lessening the dominance of the Catholic church in this area

Factors which may contradict the view that the church was losing power and influence in the 1920s

- The church in Spain still controlled most of education and the Orders had a great influence on society. The church had a huge advantage as many of the teachers from orders worked without pay
- In many parts of Spain, such as the Basque country and Navarre, the church was still revered and blindly followed by large sections of the population
- The church enjoyed relative stability under the dictadura. Although there were attempted reforms of other parts of society, this was not so with the church
- The reaction to the church’s revival among the upper classes which had led to la Semana Trágica in 1909 was not repeated in any comparable way in the 1920s
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Beevor**: “The Church was detested by the workers and labourers for preaching acceptance of poverty while amassing vast riches.”
- **Thomas**: 1927 Catechism as evidence of attitude - “What kind of sin is liberalism?...a mortal sin.”
  “90 percent of those who were educated in religious schools did not confess or attend mass…”
- “Though (Catholic schools) favoured the status quo and the better off (they) were charitable and educational” “Nearly 20 Spanish provinces had an illiteracy rate of 50 per cent or over”
- **Carr**: (Republicans placed) enormous emotional significance of the Church as a pillar of the *ancient regime.*
Question 2

The candidate is required to evaluate the events of the Bienio Negro in terms of the rising tensions in Spain. The candidate should examine the role of the Left and the role of the Right in raising tensions during this part of the second republic. The candidate should not focus solely on the Asturias uprising, though this may feature prominently. The candidate may take the view that one side or the other was more to blame for raising tensions during this period, or that both were equally at fault. The candidate can therefore come to a balanced conclusion about whether the actions of the Left and those of the Right were equally responsible for raising tensions in Spain during the Bienio Negro.

Evidence which would suggest that the actions of the Right were responsible for raising tensions:
- The regressive nature of Robles' anti-reform legislation
- The failure of Jiménez (the 'White Bolshevik') to secure reasonable reform and the opposition of his colleagues
- The dangerous rhetoric of Robles
- Reactions to FNTT strikes-banning on grounds of harvest being 'sacred', suspension of El Obrero de la Tierra, suspension of strike meetings
- The brutal reaction to the Asturias Rising; brutality of Casas Viejas
- Azaña, Company, Caballero imprisoned (with others)
- Government of Catalonia disbanded, Statute of autonomy suspended
- Martial law introduced
- Hundreds of municipal governments unseated
- Replacement of personnel in key bodies meant workers’ rights and protests were largely ignored
- Re-establishing the domination of the Catholic Church
- Robles' frequent attempts to increase the likelihood of his own advancement, destabilising the government further hoping to be asked to form a government himself
- Labour conditions in Asturias were horrendous and strike action was justified

Evidence which would suggest that the Left was responsible for raising tensions:
- The left in Catalonia made a Declaration of a Catalan State on hearing of the announcement of CEDA delegates to the Cabinet which was an undemocratic reaction to a democratic move
- The insurrection in the Asturias was inspired by the legal, democratic inclusion of elected members of the largest party in the Cortes to the Cabinet. It appeared that some on the left were only in favour of a democracy when the result suited them and were prepared to abandon it otherwise
- Insurrectionary behaviour of CNT, UGT, FAI. The socialist trade unions and anarchist equivalents openly talked about the need to overthrow the right wing government, especially after the inclusion of CEDA in the cabinet
- Use of strikes as a political tool became commonplace and contributed to a polarisation of society
- Rhetoric and actions of leaders of the Left. Largo declared that the working class should prepare to rise; Prieto was involved in gun-running for the Asturias rising
- Society polarised and arguably both sides were now ‘catastrophists’
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Carr**: "Robles had declared...that socialism must be defeated at all costs."
  "When it (the Asturias rising) was over the nation was morally divided between those who favoured repression and those who did not."

- **Low**: "The total death toll of the uprising was later estimated at 4,000. Many more were tortured in order to get them to reveal the whereabouts of their hidden weapons."

- **Payne**: "The stance and rhetoric of the CEDA were often provocative and threatening."
  "Some degree of electoral reform would have moderated electoral polarization."

- **Preston**: Increasing mimicking of Fascist tactics - "A crowd of 20,000 gathered and shouted ¡Jefe! ¡Jefe! ¡Jefe! and "Our Leaders never make mistakes!"
  'CEDA (under Robles) were driving the Socialists to play with the idea of a revolutionary rising'"

- **Robinson**: Sotelo (believed) that the revolution of 1934 proved that the Left were not willing to accept a parliamentary system which allowed the Right to govern

- **Thomas**: Left also at fault - (After Right's victory) El Socialista regularly argued that the Republic was as bad as the monarchy had been

- **Largo**: "reaffirmed his belief in the necessity of preparing a proletarian rising."
  "a fatal error of judgement"
Question 3

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to discuss the actions of the left in 1936 in the aftermath of the attempted coup. The candidate may argue that the establishment of militia, setting up of collectives and local control of industry and infrastructure by workers in many parts of Spain amounted to a revolution. The candidate could also point out that this did not happen even in all of Republican Spain and so was limited. They may also say that many of the actions were disjointed and could be seen as counterproductive to the Republican war effort. Thus the candidate may reach a balanced conclusion regarding whether or not there was an attempted revolution by the left in Spain in 1936.

Candidates might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the view that there was an attempted revolution by the left in 1936

- In some areas, such as Barcelona, there was huge enthusiasm for collectives, many of which worked well and ‘even the boot blacks’ collectivised
- Durruti believed “Hitler and Mussolini are far more worried by our revolution than the whole of the Red Army of Russia”
- Orwell said, “Above all there was a belief in the revolution and the future – the class division of society had disappeared
- Workers’ militia were vital to the Republic’s defence and were democratic not hierarchical

Factors which may contradict the view that there was not an attempted revolution by the left in 1936

- Regionally, the wishes of those who fought for the Republic varied massively; many were fighting to defend a democratic pluralist state
- Many on the left believed that winning the war was the most important objective
- The Government remained in charge in most areas controlled by the Republicans
- Collectivisation was not universally liked and could anyway be viewed as a necessary way of directing resources to the war effort

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

- **Beevor:** The rising of the right had placed an unplanned revolution into the eager arms of the left
- **Fraser:** The utopian elements of the experiment, mainly the abolition of money, complicated matters
- **Bolloten:** Collectivisation was a means of uplifting the peasant intellectually, farm workers of the CNT and UGT saw it as the commencement of a new era
- **Preston:** (Collectives) all faced the problem of putting into practice what had been up to that point only abstract theory
- (In Monzón and Valencia) there were few clear ideas as to how to run collectives in practice
- War was hardly the best context for massive economic experiments
Question 4

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to discuss the relative importance of the European powers in shaping the outcome and course of the war. The candidate should compare the importance of each of the European Powers including Germany. The candidate may then reach a balanced conclusion on whether the actions of Germany, of all the European Powers were most crucial in shaping the course and outcome of the war.

Candidates might use evidence such as:

Germany
- Logistics, financial, equipment and Condor Legion all crucial. All unqualified with a view to nationalist victory
- German aid ensured the nationalists gained air superiority
- Coup’s initial failure saved by transport planes for Army of Africa
- Condor Legion crucial in major battles, most famously in the destruction of Guernica
- Both Germany and Italy gave more aid when it was required (such as in 1938)

Italy
- The biggest benefit of Italian was in its numerical strength
- Generally of poorer quality than German aid
- Aid was given with the purpose of securing victory
- Italians had by far the largest number of foreign troops on the ground
- The Italians faced some humiliations, such as at Guadalajara
- Role of Italian Navy and submarines

Soviet Union
- Gave the Republic early air superiority
- Vital in terms of both hardware and morale in the defence of Madrid
- Only viable source of arms for the Republic
- Organised the International Brigades
- Cost of aid – loss of gold
- Less than German and Italian aid to the nationalists
- Soviet Union did not send troops
- Communisation of the cause (and government) meant even less chance of support from other countries

Great Britain
- Britain’s ‘appeasement’ policy was nothing more than hypocrisy; regarded by Nehru as: ‘The supreme farce of our time’
- Chamberlain made the controversial decision to send Sir Robert Hodgson to Burgos to be the British government’s link with the Nationalist government in 1937
- When Blum began to argue for an end to the country’s non intervention policy, Chamberlain and the Foreign Office joined with the right-wing press in France and to bring him down
- It has been claimed that the British secret service was involved in the military rebellion in Madrid by Segismundo Casado
- Role of British navy in blockade and British independent ships in running the blockade

France
- France had a Popular Front Government and initially favoured aiding the Republic
- French Government was extremely unstable and action could have united the right in opposition
- French actions on the border
- Non-intervention was initially suggested by the French
- French policy was partly the result of Eden’s veiled threat ‘Be prudent’
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Preston**: western democracies betrayed Spain. Without German and Italian aircraft the rebel generals would not have been able to transport their best troops for use on the Spanish mainland
- **Knight**: timing and quality of aid was more important than quantity
- **Carr**: The war was kept going by Soviet supplies and the Popular Army...very few Russians actually in Spain
- **Brenan**: Stalin saw to it that the arms which he supplied...should secure the predominance of the communist party
- **Beevor**: Although it is hard to establish the exact number (of Soviet personnel), there were never more than 800 present at any one time
  'Britain was inclined by their considerable commercial interests to be...anything but sympathetic to the Republic'
- **Thomas**: (Eden) 'British interests would be best served by a stalemate'
- 'Negrin talked...to Eden who said British public opinion did not want Franco to win
- **Alpert**: 'Britain was an insular society for whom abroad was very far away.'
  Non-intervention was based on the wider aims of GB and France ie an alliance with Italy and appeasement of Hitler
- **Carr**: 'The British stationed at Gibraltar were Nationalist sympathisers to a man.'
- **Thomas**: Non-intervention graduated from equivocation to hypocrisy
- **Moradiellos**: UK wished Franco to win and did not wish to upset the Axis powers
Question 5

The aim of this essay is to allow the candidate to discuss the position of Spain in the aftermath of the civil war. The candidate may discuss the degree to which the country was divided and economically depressed after the conflict. The question also invites the candidate to examine the relatively isolated position Spain was in as most of the countries around the world went to war; thus reaching a balanced conclusion regarding the position of the country after the civil war.

Candidates might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the view that Spain was a broken country with no role in the world

- Return to dictatorship and strict social control
- Military courts in place until 1943
- Franco’s troops behaved like an occupying army rather than one in its own country
- Wide spread retaliation, killing and imprisonment of those who had sided with the Republic
- Secret Police system along with official party - FET y de las JONS intelligence brigade
- Social welfare linked to regime loyalty - power of party official
- Bribery and corruption rife
- Documentary evidence used to persecute individuals connected to TUs
- 26,000 political prisoners by mid-40s.
- Re-establishment of the power of the Church, Army and Landowners
- Repression of opposition in Basque area and, particularly in Catalonia
- Repressive systems of education, employment, policing, courts
- Widespread killings
- Franco’s maintaining of polarisation
- Spain was a dictatorship when almost all the rest of Western Europe was winning a war against dictators
- Franco rebuffed his erstwhile allies, Hitler and Mussolini, by not supporting them more actively

Factors which may contradict the view that Spain was a broken country with no role in the world

- Spain possessed some raw materials vital to other countries in their war effort
- Franco laid the foundation for a future “economic miracle” in Spain
- Spanish Neutrality in WW2 meant that far from being isolated, Franco was courted by both sides in the second world war
- Left Spain in position to secure reasonable relations with West and to maintain them in the post war period due to its anti-Communist nature
- Franco’s staunch anti-communism would stand him in good stead with either the western allies or the axis powers, regardless of which was victorious
- Unity was secured in Spain
- Eventual recognition by all major powers
- Regime was to be the basis of Spain’s most economically successful period for centuries
- The regime was popular with many
- Franco was never removed and his appointed monarch was popular enough to remain through the transition to democracy
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Beevor:** The post war years would have been desperate, whatever government was in power.
- **Preston:** ‘Wages were slashed, strikes treated as sabotage’
  The CNT and UGT were crushed. Travel and search for jobs were controlled.
  Every effort was made to maintain the division between the victors and the vanquished.
- **Carr:** Franco’s aim was ‘to destroy the nineteenth century’; that is, parliamentary liberalism.’
- **Ellwood:** Plurality and diversity were replaced in every sphere ...acts of individual cruelty, however brutal, were easily surpassed by the collective cruelty of the Dictatorship: ‘even children who had participated in union-organised picnics were listed.’
The Spanish Civil War Causes, Conflict and Consequences 1923 – 45

Part 2

Question 1

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source A as an adequate explanation of the lack of success of Azaña’s agriculture reforms in terms of:

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Lack of resources for compensation of property-owners
- Complexities of reform were exploited by a ruthless opposition
- The government itself was divided
- Handed over to peasant settlers an area the size of one huge estate.

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- The reforms became bogged down in the Cortes and bureaucracy
- The statute was drawn up by conservative agronomists and property lawyers
- The ruling coalition contained those for whom agrarian reform was a distant problem and others who wished to collectivise all land
- Largo Caballero called the Agrarian reforms “an aspirin to cure appendicitis”

Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source
- Reforms limited nature gained no new ‘friends’ on left but alienated Centre and Right
- There was bad weather leading to poor harvests in 1930/1931
- There was not enough time for the reforms to work before they were dismantled during the Bienio Negro
- In reality many of the new laws were ignored by the landowners and life for many peasants did not change
- Other demands for time and money on the government, including social and military reform
- The landowners organized their opposition and were supported by many elements in the press
- The Civil Guard remained loyal to the landowners
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:

- **Preston:** Azana was caught between two fires, that of the left who wanted reform and that of the right who rejected it. The laws of obligatory cultivation were effectively ignored and the reforms did nothing to abate the revolutionary nature of the countryside.

- **Thomas:** The Reforms adversely affected migrant workers if it had been carried through effectively it might have had a striking effect.

- **Brenan:** Unless very radical land reforms were introduced Spain would cease to be governable.

- **Payne:** Caballero's 8 laws gave better pay, power, conditions and respect and constituted an impressive achievement. However Caballero stated it would be unreasonable to go “beyond the limits established in the most advanced countries of Western Europe”. Republican reforms tended to reflect fragmentation rather than provide the means to overcome it.

- **Malfekis:** The nature of the rural oligarchy and its operation of the large estates may have made land reform economically justifiable, they did not thereby make it especially practicable in economic or political terms.

- **Thomas:** The law of *Términos municipales* adversely affected migrant workers. Its effect was to prevent a further drift of labour to the cities…”if it had been carried out fairly…, it might have had a startling effect…But the reform was not properly introduced at all. “…the only real solution to the agrarian problem was to find a way to reduce the population on the land by encouraging industry.”

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source A** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the lack of success of Azana's agrarian reforms.
Question 2

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source B as evidence for the reasons for the military coup in 1936.

Provenance:
- The quote is by General Franco on 22 July, 4 days after the beginning of the coup
- At this time Franco was one of the Generals who had risen against the Government and is already concerned at the lack of speed of the coup
- It was broadcast to all of Spain to convey the idea of the coup as a progressive attempt to respond to workers’ resistance which at the time was already showing that the rising was unlikely to achieve a swift victory

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Wishes of the great majority of Spaniards
- The sole aim of saving Spain
- Our movement is dangerous only for those who live like princes, for those who use trade union funds without rendering accounts, for those who do nothing but attack the republic
- Franco claimed there were savage attacks on monuments and artistic treasures

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- There was a general feeling among those on the right that they were fighting to save Spain
- The Trade Unions were seen by many on the right as a blight on the country who were responsible for the conflict and unrest in the country
- There had been hundreds of political assassinations and attacks since the election
- CEDA had utilised Catholicism as the vehicle for unity, Franco’s ‘Crusade’ did the same
- Many in Spain saw Communism as the ‘real’ threat giving unified purpose.
- The election had been fought on the basis of civilisation versus barbarism
- CEDA had declined and ‘Catastrophists’ had gained support
- Apparent communist support for the government caused alarm and the army was given the message that a coup might be the answer
- A struggle against communism and separatism
Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source

- Many Catholics wished to defend the Church.
- There were aspiring fascists who wished to destroy democracy.
- There were those who wanted a restoration of the Monarchy.
- Some feared that the country would become a Bolshevik or Anarchist state.
- Many of the Generals saw a chance for personal gain in terms of power and prestige.
- Some believed that the Popular Front Government would break up Spain by conceding to the regions.
- Many in the army thought that it would be further attacked by the Government as it had been three years earlier.
- For many on the right, the election of the Popular Front showed that the accidentalists were wrong – the catastrophe had arrived.
- Coup was carefully planned by the army and was supported by the Falange, the monarchists and the Carlists - all wanted a traditional Spain without liberal democracy.
- Loss of election in 1936 had convinced the Right that violence was needed and ended split with ‘Accidentalists’.

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

- **Preston:** The Generals saw the government as ‘helpless to stop...the break up of Spain’ and responsible for the policies that were undermining the structure of society and many groups agreed.
- **Beevor:** Carlists famous for their ‘ferocious rejection of modernity’.
- **Robinson:** Sotelo (believed) that the revolution of 1934 proved that the Left were not Willing to accept a parliamentary system which allowed the Right to govern.
- **Thomas:** (between February and June 1936 according to Robles) “...160 churches had been burned to the ground, 269 mainly political murders and 1,287 assaults...69 political centres had been wrecked, there had been 113 general strikes and 228 partial strikes, while 10 newspaper offices had been sacked.” The conditions in the country and the *regime* were as grave as Robles described them. This unified the right behind the ‘Crusade’.
- **Payne:** ...a very large number of people wanted a new Spain—which would be worthy of Spain's great past...
  Murders for political reasons (in 1936) were reported almost daily...

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source B** is useful as evidence for investigating the reasons for the coup in 1936.
Question 3

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)
Candidates may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of each source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)
These 10 marks will be awarded for:
[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians' views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources C and D about the contribution of the International Brigades to the Republican war effort and offers a structured evaluation of the two perspectives in terms of:

Source C

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Eventually pushing back into the areas it had previously retreated from
- They had successfully stemmed the advances of the nationalists, and more than held their own. Because of this, Jarama was seen as something of a victory for the Republican side
- Losses were heavy; well over a quarter of the 500 British Battalion men who had gone into battle were killed, and a comparable number wounded
- Bolstered by the events at Jarama, in the middle of 1937 the British Battalion planned for their first offensive of the war, at Brunete, to the west of Madrid

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- The battle of Jarama was a crucial one in the early part of the war, with the IB bolstered republicans preventing the encirclement of Madrid
- The International Brigades were often described as fighting with courage and many of them were trained soldiers
- The victory at Jarama did not seem likely in the early stages and was a great boost to morale
- The Brigades went on to fight in other battles, often displaying the same skill and courage
Source D

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Already knew how to lead in the trade unions and set an organised example
- The British volunteers were, numerically, only a small part of the Republican forces
- They were united in their aims and prepared to fight for them
- Provided a shock force while the Republic trained and organized an army from an assemblage of individuals

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Many of the brigaders from Britain and elsewhere were veterans of political campaigns and used to organising men and resources
- There were under two thousand British IB volunteers and around 35 000 in the International Brigades in total over the period of the war
- The brigaders were highly motivated. Many of them had escaped fascist regimes elsewhere in Europe and were prepared to fight for their beliefs
- They made a large impact on the early stages of the war, especially in the defence of Madrid and at Jarama and Guadalajara

Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources
- The International brigades were important both in terms of their numbers (important though not massive) and for the morale boost that they gave to the Republicans, but it can be argued that their importance has been exaggerated
- There were militia and citizens groups set up in many areas at the start of the war, but they were often poorly organised and lacked military strategy
- Other parts of the Republican forces were at least as vital. About half of the military personnel and around forty percent of the officers remained loyal. The Republican army retained most of the military hardware as well as most of the airforce and navy
- In the early stages, including the battle for Madrid, the arrival of Soviet aid, including planes and tanks were vital to the Republic's survival

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians' commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Sheehan - The International Brigades suffused the total effort with a moral value more precious than their lives.
- Beevor - So successful was Comintern propaganda that the British Ambassador was convinced that only foreigners defended Madrid
- Carr - The war was kept going by Soviet supplies and the Popular Army the International Brigades were shock troops whose losses were among the heaviest in military history
- Thomas: 'Locally) militias of sorts existed since 1934 under the guise of athletics association 'the Republican army had checked Varela before the arrival of the (12th) Brigade...The bravery and experience of the Brigades was, however, crucial.'
- Payne: 'In Madrid...the revolt never had much chance of success. The organised revolutionary groups were so large compared to the military

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Sources C and D is helpful in offering a full perspective on the contribution of the International brigades to the Republican war effort.
Britain at War and Peace (1939 – 1951)

Part 1

Each question is worth 25 marks.

The aim of this question is to allow the candidate to evaluate how effective an international statesmen Churchill was during the Second World War. The candidate is likely to concentrate on Churchill’s wartime conferences with Roosevelt and Stalin and to a lesser extent de Gaulle. Clearly Churchill did not get everything his own way especially as the war progressed and Britain’s relative importance declined. The candidate ought to be aware of the fact that Churchill himself, wrote a definitive history of the Second World War and this has influenced the debate ever since. “History is written by the victors,” Churchill

Candidates might use evidence such as:

Factors which may support the claim that Churchill’s international statesmanship was impressive

- Churchill’s evening broadcast on the radio on the 22nd June 1941 offering immediate aid to the USSR in their fight against Nazi Germany
- Britain and the USSR signed a Treaty of Friendship in May 1942
- Churchill disliked communism and the USSR but he put aside his strong ideological objections to ally with one dictator – Stalin - to defeat another - Hitler
- After the fall of France Churchill understood that Britain could not defeat Germany without the help of the USA and Churchill worked tirelessly to get them involved in the conflict
- Churchill persuaded President Roosevelt that the defeat of Germany was the first priority of the Allies even after the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbour
- Churchill was a skilled diplomat who improved Britain’s chances of success such as securing Lend Lease, March 1941, from the United States. Lend – Lease provided Britain with the materials to continue the fight against the Nazis
- Churchill and Roosevelt signed the Atlantic Charter in August 1941. It outlined the Allied goals for World War 2
- Churchill was involved in several conferences normally with Roosevelt including the Arcadia conference, December 1941 and January 1942 which pledged that the defeat of Nazi Germany was the top priority
- Washington and Moscow Conferences in 1942
- Casablanca Conference in 1943. Discuss cross channel invasion in 1944 and declaration of “unconditional surrender” of the Axis Powers
- Tehran Conference 1943. First meeting of the Big 3, plan the final strategy for the war against Nazi Germany and its allies, set date for D-Day
- Yalta Conference February 1945 final plans for defeat of Germany, postwar Europe plans and, conditions for the Soviet Union’s entry in war against Japan
- Britain borrowed large sums of money from the U.S. $4.3 billion (£2.2 billion) at two per cent interest rate, a triumph for Churchill who had exerted considerable diplomatic pressure in his efforts to win the loan from the Americans
- He made friendships and alliances with countries that were decidedly more powerful than Britain; USA (more natural) and the USSR (overcoming his anti-communism). It was Churchill’s skill as a negotiator and diplomat which bound together the vital alliance of Britain, USA and USSR and forged victory in the war
Factors which may support the claim that Churchill’s international statesmanship was not impressive

- Churchill’s Lend-Lease has been criticised by some historians as it is claimed that it tied Britain to the USA for years to come. This helped the US to become a superpower while at the same time contributing to Britain’s relative decline.
- The signing of the Atlantic Charter by Churchill arguably undermined Britain’s empire as it stated that both countries, “respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live.” This may have led to the breakup of the British Empire.
- Churchill’s insistence on the unconditional surrender of the Axis powers at the Casablanca Conference prolonged the war claimed his critics.
- Churchill was party, with Stalin, to the so called “Naughty Document” (name given by Churchill) which decided the fate of several East European countries.
- Churchill’s reluctance to open a Second Front infuriated Stalin.
- He has been accused by some historians of being responsible for the decline of the British Empire.
- As a result of Britain’s debt and colonial decline her influence on the world political stage diminished. Churchill has been blamed by some for this state of affairs.
- His diminishing influence in the end-of-war conferences in which Stalin and Roosevelt dominated.
- Despite his best efforts Churchill failed to convince Roosevelt to declare war on Germany. Hitler declared war on the United States which brought about the entry of the US and ultimately an Allied victory.
- As the war progressed Churchill’s freedom of action was so severely restricted that he had no choice but to make the sacrifices necessary for alliances with the USSR and the USA.
- He was often brusque. Churchill had a poor relationship with De Gaulle, leader of the Free French.

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. They may include reference to:

- **Sir Martin Gilbert**: Churchill’s official biographer. Has researched Churchill’s actions from the huge amount of the primary source materials and written numerous books on Churchill. Pro Churchill.
- The revisionist **John Charmley** is a severe critic of Churchill. Charmley believes that in winning the war Churchill betrayed his core values of British independence, Empire, and anti-socialism. Charmley argues that this betrayal was also shown when Churchill made Britain subservient to America.
- **John Lukacs** defends Churchill’s record arguing that the price paid for victory over Nazi Germany was worth paying, given that regime’s immoral character. He argues that Churchill by ensuring that Germany failed to win the war in 1940, laid the groundwork for an Allied victory.
- **Clayton** believes that Churchill had no option but to sign the Atlantic Charter as due to Britain’s poor financial position Churchill had to “place himself entirely in Roosevelt’s hands.”
- **Andrew Roberts**: is credited for works about Churchill’s diplomatic skills with our allies. He has also published work comparing the leadership styles of Churchill and Hitler.
Question 2

The aim of this question is to allow the candidate to discuss the role the British Army played during the Second World War. The candidate should discuss several of the key battles in which the British Army fought, those not only in Europe but also further afield in the Middle East and in Asia. Candidates may discuss the varying capabilities of the British generals in addition to British weapons, most notably tanks.

The candidate may be expected to use evidence such as:

**The British Army before El Alamein; its failures (and successes?)**

- Background detail on the army; the BEF - its size and composition at the outbreak of war in 1939
- Introduction of conscription in May 1939. September 1939 age range increased. Raised again to include all fit men between 18 and 41
- The quality of British armour during the war Tommy Gun, Sten Gun, Churchill tank, Sherman tank
- BEF sent to France after the declaration of war. Backed by the Territorial Army. German attack in May 1940 pushed army back to Dunkirk
- Dunkirk, 340,000 British and French soldiers evacuated. Operation Dynamo, 26th May to 4th June. Most of the army’s equipment was left behind in France
- After the evacuations from Dunkirk were complete, the British Army had 1,650,000 men.
- After the fall of France, the British Army was mainly used to protect the British Empire. This included sending troops to Egypt, Singapore and Burma. Operation Torch. British and US assault landings in Morocco and Algeria on 8th November 1942. 1941 - Victory over an Italian army in North Africa but soldiers sent to Greece on Churchill’s instructions
- Army defeated by Rommel’s Afrika Korps
- British strategic military errors. For example Norway (1940) and Greece (1941) Battle of Crete. 1941 Defeat. Thousands of prisoners taken in Greece
- War against Japan, commenced in December 1941. Surrender of Hong Kong and Singapore. Singapore was not well defended. British army had few tanks as they completely miscalculated the tactics the Japanese used. 130,000 British soldiers surrendered. Humiliation for army
- “Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning” Churchill
- Axis losses in North Africa were greater than Axis losses at Stalingrad
- August 1942. Dieppe raid failed. Lessons learned that helped D Day to be a success

**The British Army after El Alamein; its successes (and failures?)**

- 8th Army under Montgomery defeated Rommel at the Battle of El Alamein
- The contribution made by the 8th Army to the defeat of the Italians and Germans in North Africa by May 1943
- The Italian Campaign. Sicily then Italian mainland. Heavy fighting in the Battle of Monte Casino
- The impact of the invasion of Italy and the subsequent German counter-attack and the eventual Allied victory in Italy
- Operation Overlord. D Day landings, 6th June 1944. The ultimate contribution of the army to the Normandy landings in June 1944
- Operation Market Garden, Battle of Arnhem, September 1944
- General Slim and 14th Army in Far East against the Japanese
- The varying abilities of the British generals. Montgomery, Alexander, Sir William Slim (Burma)
- Fighting in Germany and surrender of Germany in May 1945
- British Army was 2.9 million strong in June 1945
- Army casualty rate during the war. Total British Army casualties amounted to 385,000 dead and wounded, with a further 180,000 made prisoner of war during the course of the conflict
Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. They may include reference to:

- **David Fraser** is critical of the state of preparedness and performance of the army at the beginning of the war but claims that it improved dramatically during the war and played its role in the defeat of Nazi Germany.
- **John Keegan** is critical of some of the army’s weaponry especially British tanks. He claims that the British never built a tank which was capable of taking on their German counterparts.
- **Correlli Barnet** in his book The Desert Generals is highly critical of the British high command.
- **Max Hastings** is also critical of the British Army in World War 2. He argues that as an institution it was a disaster. It was the Royal Navy and RAF that deserves praise.
- However **Richard Holmes** praises the British Army in the Second World War.
Question 3

The aim of this question is to allow the candidate to evaluate the various reasons why the Labour Party won the 1945 General Election. The candidate will examine the importance of the Beveridge Report and its electoral significance. However, the question leads the candidate to explore other reasons behind the Conservatives defeat such as their poor election campaign and the apparent shift to the left in the British electorate.

The candidate will assess the validity of the view in the terms of such evidence as:

The Beveridge Report and its influence on the 1945 General Election

- The Beveridge Report sold a very impressive 635,000 copies, Published December 1942
- The contrasting response of Labour and the Conservatives to the Beveridge Report of 1942
- Labour firmly tapped into the mood of the nation for a "New Jerusalem," a better future for all post war
- The Conservatives appeared reluctant to engage in a national discussion about future welfare reform
- Churchill stated that Beveridge was "windbag and a dreamer"
- Churchill said that decisions about the Beveridge Report must await the outcome of the election at the end of the war
- The perceived success of large scale government intervention in all aspects of daily life during the war led many to believe that such an approach to government should be tried in peacetime and that Labour was the only party advocating such an approach
- Many would argue that the 'Tories' lukewarm response to the Beveridge Report sealed their fate at the election and that the electorate trusted Labour far more with the task of reconstructing Britain and delivering the 'New Jerusalem'

Other factors that possibly influenced the electorate at the 1945 General Election

Churchill and the Conservative Party

- Churchill broadcast a very negative speech about the Labour Party in the run-up to the 1945 election, his ill-judged "Gestapo Speech". He expressed views that the public largely rejected and subsequently the Conservatives lost votes at the election. However the decline in electoral support due to this is hard to quantify but there is evidence to suggest that these ideas were abhorrent to the majority of the public who could scarcely believe that Churchill would round on his coalition colleagues with such venom a few weeks after VE day
- The Conservatives took for granted a public gratitude for winning the war which they wrongly assumed would result in support at the polls. Churchill was reliant upon his war reputation to attract votes from the electorate
- The Conservatives focused too much on Churchill's charismatic leadership
- The Conservative and Labour manifestos were very different in emphasis
- The Conservatives were associated with the policy of appeasement and the poverty and unemployment of the 1930s, "the Ghost of Neville Chamberlain." There's little doubt that the 'never again' mentality was well to the fore in 1945 and that fears of a return to mass unemployment and the hungry 30s persuaded many to vote Labour.
The Labour Party

- The Labour Party ran a coordinated election campaign
- Labour campaigned in favour of full employment, nationalisation of industry, social security and housing
- The Conservatives complained that the Labour Party’s election agents had been in place throughout the war whilst theirs had been serving in the forces. Hence the Conservatives were not well organised when an election was called
- The Labour Party was much more organised than the Conservatives. Indeed, some constituencies were not contested by the Conservatives and the prospective candidates effectively were handed a seat in parliament.
- Ministers such as Attlee, Dalton, Morrison and Bevin were high profile and had gained a great deal of experience during the war of organising the Home Front. The popular view was that they had the experience to run the country during peacetime.
- The General Election of 1945 was not a betrayal of the greatly revered Winston Churchill; rather it was a positive vote in favour of a dream - the New Jerusalem that so many wanted to build and they trusted Labour to build it.

Other factors which may have influenced the outcome of the 1945 General Election

- The importance of the armed forces vote which generally went to Labour
- The influence of organisations such as ABCA which were accused by the Conservatives of encouraging the members of the armed services to vote Labour.
- The significance of the ten-year election gap. Prior to 1945 there had not been an election since 1935 due to war. Arguably if there had been an election in 1940 the Labour Party would have won many seats. The number of Labour MPs was “artificially low.”
- The role of the media. Left wing ideas and beliefs were increasingly promoted.
- JB Priestly Postscript on the radio.
- Conservatives were blamed for the military defeats at the beginning of the war, “Tories were unlikely to win any general election after the evacuation of British forces from Dunkirk in June 1940,” Paul Addison.
- The Soviet Union had a planned economy and the Red Army had been pivotal in defeating Nazi Germany. The Labour Party was associated much more with central planning than the Conservatives were.

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

- **Paul Adelman**: who assesses the importance of the Conservative smear campaigns as a factor in losing the election. He criticises the use of such tactics and he tells us they ‘backfired’ as a plausible vote winner.
- Historians such as **Paul Addison** (*Road to 1945*) are more inclined to believe that the ‘Gestapo speech’ had only minimal impact on the election and that the result was decided long before the war ended. He points to a consistent Labour lead of 10 points in the polls from 1943 onwards. The success of anti-Conservative parties in wartime by-elections is often seen as a sign of a swing to the left in British politics between 1940 and 1945 with the collectivism of wartime government policies being hugely approved by the public.
- **Henry Pelling**; however, justifies the overwhelming support for Labour as a reaction to Conservative rule in the 1930s.
- Whilst **Jefferys, Pugh and Addison**: all agree that the responsibility for the ‘Home Front’ held by Labour members of the Coalition Government were a major vote winner. Nevertheless, we cannot discount **Clark's** view that Armed Service votes and the contribution of organisations such as ABCA played a major role in the defeat of the Conservatives.
- **Steven Fielding**: His hypothesis is that the winner of the election would simply be the party who whole heartedly advocated the social change proposed in the Beveridge Report regardless of label and campaign style.
Question 4

The aim of this question is to allow the candidate to assess how effectively Attlee’s Government managed the economy. The Labour Governments had to address the serious financial issues which Britain faced between 1945 and 1951 The Labour Governments’ determination to implement the Beveridge Report and to introduce a costly welfare state which the country arguably could not afford. The 1947 winter and its serious effect on the economy. The success, or otherwise, of Labour’s policy of nationalisation, the levels of unemployment and the general standard of living.

Evidence which suggests that the Labour Government successfully managed the economy such as;

**Britain in 1945**
- Britain’s National Debt had risen to £3,500 million in 1945
- Loss of overseas markets during wartime
- Exports were down by two-thirds
- Lend Lease had been ended by the US the week after the defeat of Japan which added to Britain’s financial woes
- Britain’s poor economic situation in 1945 “Financial Dunkirk” as described by Churchill

**Trade**
- Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1945-1947, made it clear that the overriding priority of economic policy was to substantially increase overseas exports, cut back on non-essential imports and find a way to reduce the balance of payments deficit. The economy was therefore geared towards producing exportable commodities at the expense of domestic consumables
- Balance of payments surpluses in two of the years showed some degree of success in this sphere. Labour was successful in providing the climate for economic growth over their 6 years in office
- Exports increased threefold in this period and that industrial output also increased significantly

**Employment**
- There was no return to the mass unemployment suffered by the industrial heartlands of Britain in the thirties through a sensitive handling of demobilisation
- Unemployment was held at a steady 2 and a half per cent
- This was partly attributable to the nationalisation of strategic industries

**Nationalisation**
- The first organisation to be nationalised was the Bank of England in 1946 followed by Cable and Wireless Ltd. The coal industry was nationalised in 1947; railways in 1948 and iron and steel in 1949. For miners, there were clear improvements. The National Coal Board offered paid holidays and sick pay
- There was little opposition to coal and the railways being nationalised as both were unprofitable but there was much greater opposition to iron and steel being nationalised as it was making a reasonable profit at this time
- Labour nationalised 20% of the British economy
Finance
- Inflation was kept to a minimum of 5 per cent through wage and price controls
- The extent to which demand management and tight fiscal controls helped the economy to recover
- $3.75 billion loan from the US negotiated by John Maynard Keynes. US insisted on the convertibility of sterling
- $1.25 billion loan from Canada
- The European Recovery Programme, better known as the Marshall Plan from April 1948 benefitted Britain more than any other European country
- That the creation of a fully-fledged welfare state was achieved against this kind of economic backdrop

Evidence which suggests that the Labour Government’s management of the economy was not successful using evidence such as;
- The government did not tackle the fundamental weakness of the economy in areas of over-manning in traditional industries
- Strikes in the 1945–51 period
- During the fuel crisis of 1947 Shinwell, Minister of Fuel and Power (July 1945 - October 1947); mishandled the situation. In 1947, Britain experienced an exceptionally severe winter coupled with a serious coal shortage. Shinwell was widely criticised for his failure to avert this crisis
- By 1947 sterling was freely convertible to dollars, which seriously affected the £ as a trading currency
- Critics also refer to the frequent Sterling crises and the devaluation of the pound and over-reliance on US economic aid
- Critics claim the bureaucratic nature of the planned economy - stifled enterprise and individual initiative
- Critics from both ends of the political spectrum claim that Labour either introduced too much socialism or that Labour did not introduce enough socialism as wealth was not redistributed
- “Age of Austerity” associated with Sir Stafford Cripps. The failure to meet the demands of the public for consumer goods which cost them dearly at the 1951 General election
- Labour Governments paid out too much money to maintain the British Empire
- Rationing became increasingly unpopular. Many foods and clothes rationed

Nationalisation
- Arguably nationalisation was not a popular policy with much of the electorate
- David Vincent claimed that nationalisation did not give the workers more say in the running of these industries
- Problem within nationalised industries such as the pay of miners did not improve as the strikes in the coal mines clearly indicated

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. These may include reference to:
- Kenneth Morgan: is a staunch supporter of Labour’s economic record, citing Attlee’s government as one of the most successful governments of the 20th century
- The revisionist historian Correlli Barnett argues that nothing was done to regenerate British industry or recapitalise it in terms of plant and capacity. Equally he criticises the creation of an expensive welfare state, ill-affordable in a time when there were other more pressing priorities such as education and which led, he says, to a dependency culture from which Britain has never broken free
- Critics from the left such as Jim Tomlinson and Steven Fielding criticise the lack of genuine socialism in its policies, criticise Labour’s nationalisation plans for not incorporating workers’ representatives on boards of management and failing to pursue redistributive taxation policies
Question 5

The aim of this question is to allow the candidate to discuss Correlli Barnett’s damming but controversial indictment of the condition of Britain in 1951. The claim that Britain had lost its pre-war position as a world superpower is not in dispute. What the candidate has to consider is whether the extent of this decline in world power status has been over-played or whether Britain’s continued belief that it had a huge part to play in shaping world affairs was merely a delusion. In answering this question, the candidate would be expected to make reference to Britain’s post-war economic, military and imperial decline as well as balancing that out with reference to more positive aspects such as relations with Dominions and creation of the Commonwealth, membership of NATO and the UN and the possession of an independent nuclear deterrent.

The candidate may be expected to use evidence such as:

Imperial role
- Reference to specific examples of decolonisation, in particular India and Pakistan independence (1947) but also Transjordan (1946), Burma and Ceylon (1948), Palestine (1948) and Libya (1951)
- The loss of India was a major blow to Britain’s military and political presence east of Suez Indian independence and the issue of further decolonisation. Successfully achieved and a noble foreign policy initiative or an abandonment of the Indian sub-continent to civil war with undue haste? How far our decision to decolonise was forced upon us by the superpowers for different reasons and how far was it a rational decision taken for sound political and ethical reasons?
- However despite the independence of India in 1947, Britain still retained control over substantial parts of Africa as well as the Caribbean, Hong Kong and interest in the Suez Canal
- By 1951, Commonwealth relationships had undergone a fundamental transformation, the full effects of which were only just becoming apparent and in Malaya and Iran the emerging conflicts there clearly marked out some of the limits of British world power status in the post-war world

World Role
- The sterling area still accounted for over half the world’s trade in the immediate post-war years and Britain retained close commercial ties with her Dominions despite interference from the USA
- From being a great creditor nation with the world’s most powerful currency, Britain ended the war in debt to the tune of £3,500 million, a huge balance of payments deficit and an enormous loss of overseas markets. By July 1947, sterling was freely convertible to dollars, threatening to wipe out Britain’s dollar reserve and virtually destroying the £ as a trading currency
- After the financial crises of 1947, 1949 and 1951, Britain’s economic capacity to remain a world power, even with US aid was severely challenged by the fragility of her trading and financial position
- Britain continued to see herself as the world’s third greatest power and to that end retained a military presence in significant and strategic areas of the world
- But faced with financial ruin, Britain was forced to reduce some of her overseas commitments resulting in military withdrawal from Greece, Turkey and Palestine
- Britain was a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and as such wielded considerable influence in international affairs
- The formation of NATO and the securing of US membership was a considerable feather in the cap of Britain’s Foreign Secretary, Bevin and strengthened Britain’s position as a key element in a Western European security system
- Britain’s ‘special relationship’ with the USA and its Cold War policies
- The possession of an independent nuclear deterrent was a significant factor in allowing the British to see themselves as the third world power, and if nothing else, the gap between Britain’s status in the world and any other countries apart from the USA and USSR was enormous
- Bevin’s actions and abrasive personality which impacted on Britain’s foreign policy
• The extent to which Bevin’s personality and views coloured British foreign policy in this period and whether his personal intervention in a number of key areas secured for Britain, a more satisfactory outcome than at first appeared possible
• Britain found itself in a difficult position relative to the new world order of the competing superpowers of USA and USSR and whether Bevin himself was in any way responsible for the onset of the Cold War mentality. Specific foreign policy issues should be referred to including the breakdown in relations with the USSR and the abandonment by Bevin of the Labour philosophy of “left speaking to left” in our relations with the USSR. Did Bevin see through the Russians before the USA and hence distance Britain from her erstwhile ally before the USA did?

Relations with Europe
• An examination of our relations with Europe and the argument that Britain “missed the bus” in this period of enhanced European co-operation to be at the heart of an integrated European community despite Bevin’s success in obtaining Marshall Plan funding for European (and British) economic regeneration
• Bevin should have considered joining the European Local and Steel Community

Candidates may bring a range of appropriate historians’ commentary to support their views. They may include reference to:

• Correlli Barnett: is disparaging about Britain’s dreams and illusions of continued great power status and cites this misguided pursuit of a seat at the top table as primary cause of the country’s decline as an industrial nation in the post-war decades
• John Darwin: is less convinced that world power status had been lost by 1951, citing the fact that Britain’s continued influence on the development of world affairs was still considerable
• Peter Hennessey: still sees much value in considering Britain as the third superpower at least, that is, until the Suez debacle which finally did dispel any notions of world power status whilst more left leaning historians like Steven Fielding bemoan Britain’s subservient position between the two superpowers and focus on the degree to which Britain slavishly followed US foreign policy
• Ronald Hyam portrays the recovery from the Second World War, Britain’s special relationship with the USA and the expansion of communism as factors involved in Britain’s imperial decline
Britain at War and Peace (1939 – 1951)

Part 2

Question 1

Interpretation (maximum 6 marks)
Candidates may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of each source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source.

Contextual and historical interpretations (maximum 10 marks)
These 10 marks will be awarded for:

[i] the quality and depth of the contextual recall
[ii] the quality and depth of the wider perspectives
[iii] the range and quality of historians’ views
[iv] provenance comment [if appropriate]

The candidate considers the views in Sources A and B about the offers a structured evaluation of the issues surrounding the significance of the Phoney War in terms of:

Source A

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from the source which show, by more than mere repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- The phoniness has been overdone - it wasn’t that phoney
- The German battleship Graf Spee was forced up the River Plate in Uruguay by Royal Navy ships where her captain scuttled her
- At Scapa Flow, the battleship Royal Oak was sunk by a German U-boat with the loss of 833 men
- Chamberlain was under the illusion that “Hitler has missed the bus”, but Hitler invaded Denmark and Norway anyway, showing war wasn’t phoney

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Graf Spee sinking, December 1939, which Churchill as First Lord of the Admiralty took full advantage of to boost morale
- U-boats attack British shipping. On 3rd September Glasgow built passenger ship the Athenia sunk by U-boat. Over 100 passengers were lost
- British aircraft carrier Courageous sunk in September 1939
- Sinking of the World War One battleship, the Royal Oak, was a blow to British morale as Scapa Flow was considered to be impregnable
- Chamberlain’s lacklustre wartime leadership came under increasing criticism from within and outwith parliament
- German and British forces invade Norway at the same time. German forces soon gained the upper hand and British forces had to withdraw from Norway
Source B

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- The civil population became increasingly bored by the stalemate in Europe, and it had a demoralizing effect upon the government itself
- Chamberlain’s administration did not manifest any conspicuous energy in using this respite to organise itself for war, or to organize the nation
- Ministry of Supply. Morrison claimed that the output being organised by the department was inadequate, that there seemed to be an inability to make up its mind about the type of tank that was required and not enough tanks were being turned out
- The organisation of labour for war-production was quite unsatisfactory and it was disgraceful that there was still an army of unemployed

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- British public and relieved that the dire threats of heavy bombing and poison gas came to nothing. Casualties as high as 300,000 a week were predicted
- Ministry of Supply was a government department established to co-ordinate the supply of equipment to all three British services
- Chamberlain hoped to fight a “distant war.” Fighting the war in Norway would keep it away from Britain
- Chamberlain still hoped that major bloodshed could be avoided
- Chamberlain hoped that the war would be over by spring as the Germans would realize that, “it isn’t worth their while to go on getting thinner and poorer.”
- Chamberlain’s lacklustre wartime leadership came under increasing criticism from within and outwith parliament
- There were approximately a million unemployed in February 1940 but industry was not working to full capacity

Points which offer a wider contextualisation of the views in the sources
- During the Phoney War the RAF dropped leaflets on Germany encouraging Germans to revolt against the Nazis and bring an end to the war
- Bomber Command attacked German ports but suffered heavy losses in the process
- Germany navy badly damaged by the Royal Navy in the Norway Campaign. These German ships may have been used in an invasion of Britain?
- Chamberlain’s war cabinet consisted of nine members who were long time allies of his. Churchill and Eden included. The Labour Party refused to join “patriotic opposition”
- Norway was a military disaster for the British. Several British ships were sunk. Importance of air power was demonstrated to the British
- German invasion of Norway and subsequent defeat of British forces there was another blow to British morale
- Norway Debate in Parliament. May 1940 Conservative politician Leo Amery, called on Chamberlain to resign, “You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go."
- Chamberlain won the vote but his support in Parliament had plummeted
- Labour Party refused to participate in coalition government under Chamberlain
- Chamberlain resigned, Churchill became Prime Minister on 10th May 1940
- The first few months of the war was an unnerving period during which the life of the average household was not disturbed to any great extent.
- Rationing. Petrol rationed,1939, then some foods including bacon, butter and sugar, January 1940
- ARP wardens enforced blackouts. As there was no bombing their behaviour was resented
- Hundreds of civilians were killed in road accidents due to blackouts restrictions
Evacuation. Commenced on 1st September 1939. Over 3,000,000 evacuated within a few days. Many people evacuated themselves privately to friends and relatives, or hotels, in rural Britain. Several thousand people went overseas to escape the expected bombing. Goods as well as people were evacuated. Including paintings from the National Gallery and the Bank of England. Many, if not most, evacuees returned home during the Bore War /Phoney War as the expected bombing campaign by the Luftwaffe did not materialise.

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

- **Paul Addison** claims that evacuation was a success, “evacuation undoubtedly saved many lives”
- **Angus Calder** claims that “evacuation failed, by the beginning of 1940 four out every ten children had gone home”
- **Paul Adelman** is critical of Chamberlain’s handling of the wartime economy especially his failure to appoint a cabinet member with overall co-ordinating control of the economy.
- **Tony Corfield** claims that Chamberlain’s resignation did not come about due to the failure of the Norway campaign but due to opposition from the labour movement.
- **Richard Holmes** argues that British policy during the war was not foolish but required time to be effective; a commodity which Churchill was not prepared to give.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Sources A and B** is helpful in offering a full perspective on the significance of the Phoney War during the Second World War.
Question 2

The candidate may be awarded up to 3 marks for their ability to establish the views of the source and accurately support that evaluation with comment from the source. The remaining marks will be awarded for the quality and depth of the immediate and wider context recall, including historians’ views that the candidate provides in their overall interpretation of the source’s fullness in explaining/analysing the issue.

The candidate offers a structured evaluation of Source C as an explanation of the effects of wartime work on women’s lives in terms of:

Provenance: appropriate and relevant comments on provenance will earn credit.

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
- Wartime experience of women was not a liberation from their traditional domestic roles
- War brought no more than a modest possible variation in the lives of married women
- The war widened the range of occupations open to women, but it scarcely advanced sexual equality in terms of pay and career prospects
- New roles and responsibilities made women confident about their ability to take on new challenges after the war

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
- Factory work held little real career appeal to many women
- Women who did wish to continue working were in a minority and were in an older age bracket, either unmarried or widowed and likely to prefer their wartime working environment to previous work experience
- Mass Observation surveys tend to reinforce the point of view that wartime work was seen as a temporary phenomenon and that women expected to return to their more traditional roles in society once the conflict ended
- The number of women remaining in full-time work after the war fell significantly thus contradicting the notion that war work was an emancipating experience
- There is little evidence to suggest that women were welcomed into the workforce by either employers or male workers and that very often, the work given to the women workers was monotonous and low paid

Points which offer wider contextualisation of the views in the source
- National Service Act (Number 2) was introduced by the Government in December 1941 allowing conscription of unmarried women aged 20 to 30 years into the armed forces or into vital war work
- Conscription was soon extended to 19 year old women
- The limited opinion polls which exist on this issue suggest that as few as 25% of women war workers wished to continue their wartime employment after the war ended
- By the end of 1943 nearly two million women were in trade unions - double the pre-war total
- Trade unions made it clear that they expected a resumption of normality after the war, particularly in the light of the unemployment situation of the 1930s and their fears of the impact of job dilution during the war
- Arthur Marwick’s theory that the war was a liberating experience for women and that millions of women entered the workplace for the first time, thus changing their perceptions of their role in society and within marriage. That such an experience opened up hitherto unseen career possibilities for women who became an increasingly important feature of the industrial workforce in the post-war period
The counter argument to this view is that war work was neither a new nor liberating experience for women and that many women gave it up as soon as they were able. That lack of opportunity, low wages, sex discrimination (and frequently abuse) low skilled job related tasks and lack of facilities, all convinced many women that a return to domesticity and a pre-war family ideal was preferable to the drudgery of wartime employment. That government policies specifically encouraged such ideas, particularly with the immediate withdrawal of government sponsored nurseries and the philosophy of the Beveridge Report which encouraged women to have larger families through the Family Allowance provision and restrictions on married women’s national insurance entitlements.

Although equal pay was a long way off, the differentials had been eroded during the war and women were better paid for similar type work as men.

In 1946 A Royal Commission advocated equal pay for women but Attlee’s Government failed to pass the necessary legislation.

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

- **Arthur Marwick**: argues that war work was emancipating, drew women, traditionally housebound, into the world of work, giving them a financial independence and an enhanced sense of their status in society.
- **Richard Titmus**: holds the traditionalist line that the war had a profound social impact, war as an agent of social change, and that its effects were to be felt long after its conclusion.
- **Peter Hennessy**: presents the view that women were more influenced by the community in which they lived with regards to their expectations of life and that the prevailing norm of the fifties was a return to domesticity and motherhood.
- **H.L. Smith**: is highly sceptical of the view that war work was either a new experience for women (at best he suggests there may have been fewer than 2.5 million additional women workers during the war and that many of these may well have worked before marriage) or a liberating one, given the difficulties encountered by women in work.
- **Penny Summerfield**: goes some of the way to accepting a degree of psychological change in women’s attitude to marriage but largely rejects the notion of war work as encouraging a feminist dawn.

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of **Source C** is helpful in offering a full explanation of the effects of wartime work on women during the Second World War.
Question 3

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

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

The candidate offers a structured consideration of the usefulness of Source D as evidence for the success of the Labour Government’s welfare reforms in terms of:

Provenance:
• Source is taken from the memoirs of Hugh Dalton. Dalton had been Chancellor of the Exchequer in Attlee’s Government and was one of the leading figures in the Labour Party. Value of a memoir Dalton was clearly biased in his estimation of the Labour Governments as he had been an important member of that Government
• Dalton became Chancellor of the Exchequer and he appointed J.M. Keynes as his personal adviser

Points from source which show, by more than repetition alone, that the candidate has interpreted the significant views
• Labour brought in changes which, in the total, so changed the social and economic life of Britain that, at the end of those five years, a new Britain was emerging
• The extremes of pre-war wealth and poverty had gone
• And we had created in those five years an extended social security system
• We had established a new National Health Service second to none in the world

Points from recall which develop and contextualise those in the source
• The introduction of the welfare state dramatically changed Britain for the better
• There was no return to the unemployment levels and poverty of the 1930s
• The adoption of Beveridge’s recommendations led to a greatly expanded system of benefits. (From the Cradle to the Grave)
• The Labour Party had fulfilled its election manifesto (Let Us Face the Future A Declaration of Labour Policy for the Consideration of the Nation)
• Arguably the Labour Government’s greatest achievement was the establishment of the National Health Service in 1948 despite opposition from within the medical profession

Points from recall which offer a wider contextualisation of those in the source
• The candidate should develop Dalton’s allusion to the raft of legislation passed in this period with specific examples of legislation passed to tackle Beveridges ‘Five Giants’ (Want, Idleness, Ignorance, Squallor and Disease)
• The extension of educational provision
• However little was done to promote education equality through the Butler Act, which set up socially divisive systems and allowed private schools to flourish
• Council housing was given higher priority than private
• Provision of quality, affordable council housing, and the disappointment felt at Labour’s record on this issue by 1951
• Bevan built an NHS system from scratch, despite the formidable opposition of the BMA. The development of the NHS, and an evaluation of its worth as a policy of equality
• The NHS did not eliminate private medicine nor discourage its usage in NHS hospitals
• However the principle of universal benefits might aid those most well off who didn’t require them
• An examination of the principles and workings of the welfare state as a system of universal and comprehensive services, and the degree to which this found acceptance with the public
Universality meant an end to the hated Means Test
The benefit system was based on flat-rated insurance payments was hardly socialist in nature. Some even saw it as a stealth tax on the least well off
Critics most high profile of whom is Correlli Barnett argue the Labour welfare reforms created a culture of welfare dependency and low educational standards, thus creating a “nanny state” and that it was folly pursuing New Jerusalem welfare policies which were expensive in place of economic regeneration
Labour ministers, it has been argued, may have introduced long-overdue social reforms, but they failed to redistribute wealth or to break down rigid class barriers; 1 per cent of the population, for example, still owned 50 per cent of all private capital. Little was done to promote educational equality
But when judged against a range of contemporary yardsticks - the performance of previous governments, the aims of Labour compared with the Conservative Party, and the economic circumstances inherited in 1945 - Attlee’s record emerges in a far more positive light

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

- **Kenneth Morgan** is a staunch supporter of Labour’s economic and social record, citing it as one of the most successful governments of the 20th century. In his book Labour in Power, 1945-1951 in which he states “the Attlee government had a clear record of achievement and competence, which acted as a platform for successive governments, Conservative and Labour.”
- **Henry Pelling** and **Peter Hennessy** also praise Labour’s ability to deliver a large measure of welfarism. They feel that the Attlee era, constituted Labour's finest hour. This was a period that went some way towards satisfying wartime demands for a “New Jerusalem”: the economy recovered from the ravages of war while avoiding a return to mass unemployment, and simultaneously ministers never wavered in their determination to fulfil the Beveridge promise of social protection ‘from the cradle to the grave’
- Critics from the left such as **Steven Fielding** and **Jim Tomlinson** argue that the immediate post-war years were marked by a betrayal of socialist idealism and by wasted opportunities. Instead of using public backing as evidence in 1945 to introduce wholesale socialist change, Labour instead opted for cautious reformism: for example failing to break down entrenched class barriers
- From the right we have the **Correlli Barnett’s** criticism about the creation of an expensive welfare state, ill-affordable in a time when there were other more pressing priorities such as education and which led, he says, to a dependency culture from which Britain has never broken free

The candidate is therefore able to come to a conclusion, using a range of evidence, about the extent to which a consideration of Source D is useful as evidence for investigating the success of the Labour Government’s welfare reforms between 1945 and 1951.