

X259/701

NATIONAL
QUALIFICATIONS
2009

TUESDAY, 2 JUNE
9.00 AM – 12.00 NOON

HISTORY
ADVANCED HIGHER

Candidates should answer **two** questions from **Part 1** and **all** the questions in **Part 2** of their chosen field of study.

<i>Field of Study</i>		Part 1 <i>Page</i>	Part 2 <i>Page</i>
(1)	Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000	2	14
(2)	Scottish Independence (1286–1329)	3	16
(3)	The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries	4	18
(4)	Georgians and Jacobites: Scotland (1715–1800)	5	20
(5)	“The House Divided”: USA (1850–1865)	6	22
(6)	Japan: From Medieval to Modern State (1850s–1920)	7	24
(7)	Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War	8	26
(8)	South Africa (1910–1984)	9	28
(9)	Soviet Union (1917–1953)	10	30
(10)	The Spanish Civil War (1931–1939)	11	32
(11)	Britain at War and Peace (1939–1951)	12	34



(1) Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. How far does the archaeological evidence of settlement suggest that Iron Age society in North Britain was warlike?
2. How great was the impact of Rome's military presence on Northern Britain in the first century AD?
3. To what extent did later Christian missionaries develop a religion which had already taken root during the Roman period?
4. How justified is it to see the Picts as a typical North British barbarian society with wide connections and parallels?
5. "The emergence of Alba, the Scottish nation, was a peaceful process of cultural interaction and political assimilation." How far does the available evidence justify this view?

(2) Scottish Independence (1286–1329)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. How justified is the view that the Bruce family represented the greatest threat to the peace of Scotland between 1286 and 1291?
2. “Recent attempts to salvage the reputation of King John have gone too far.” How valid is this view?
3. How united was the Scottish resistance to English occupation between 1296 and 1304?
4. “Caution in strategy, boldness in tactics.” How far is this an accurate assessment of King Robert’s military campaigns against the English between 1309 and 1314?
5. How destructive was the impact of war on Scottish society between 1296 and 1328?

(3) The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. "The prosperity of the Italian city-states of the early fifteenth century was built upon trade." To what extent is this view valid?
2. "Piety and prestige." Which of these was the dominant motive for patronage of the arts in fifteenth century Florence?
3. How fair is it to argue that the visual arts were transformed by the influence of humanism in the first half of the fifteenth century?
4. How valid is the view that Cosimo de' Medici's involvement in Florentine politics was motivated by dynastic ambition?
5. How accurate is the view that women were confined to domesticity during the Italian Renaissance?

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

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. To what extent was religion a cause of the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745?
2. How great an impact did government policies have on the condition of the Highlands during the fifty years after Culloden?
3. What factors best explain the development of industry in Scotland during the second half of the eighteenth century?
4. How far were the changes that took place in the religious life of Scotland during the eighteenth century the result of the work of a few dominant individuals?
5. “The universities were now committed to satisfying the new needs of society at a time of economic change.” How valid is this comment on the causes of university reform in the eighteenth century?

(5) “The House Divided”: USA (1850–1865)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. How valid is the view that, all things considered, there was more uniting than dividing the North and the South in 1850?
2. How important was nativism in the break up of the two-party system?
3. To what extent has the significance of the Emancipation Proclamation on the conduct of the war been exaggerated?
4. How serious were the problems facing the North in 1864?
5. How accurate is it to describe General US Grant as the greatest general of the Civil War?

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

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. How accurate is the view that traditional Japanese beliefs faced little threat from Christianity?
2. How valid is the view that the caste structure was the most serious obstacle to the successful implementation of the Meiji reform project?
3. How far do the Zaibatsu deserve the credit they have been given for their role in Japan's industrialisation?
4. To what extent did the political system really change after the Meiji Restoration?
5. To what extent has the backwardness of Japanese agriculture up to 1920 been exaggerated?

(7) Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. “Whatever chances democracy had of succeeding in Germany were destroyed by the Treaty of Versailles.” How justified is this judgement on the effects of the Treaty on Germany?
2. How far was continuity rather than change the chief characteristic of German political life from 1918 to 1923?
3. To what extent was Stresemann’s policy of fulfilment a disguise for his aims as a German nationalist?
4. How important were the Nazis’ economic policies in enabling them to build and strengthen their hold on power after 1933?
5. To what extent is it an exaggeration to claim that Hitler was a strong dictator?

(8) South Africa (1910–1984)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. “The lifeblood of the Union.” How justified is this view of the contribution of the mining industry to the South African economy 1910–1984?
2. “The differences between the South Africa Party and Hertzog’s National Party prior to Fusion have been exaggerated.” How valid is this view?
3. What were the most significant difficulties facing the ANC between 1910 and 1948?
4. How important were the Christian Churches in prompting white opposition to apartheid?
5. What factors best explain the developing crisis facing the South African government by the early 1980s?

(9) Soviet Union (1917–1953)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. To what extent was the collapse of Tsarist autocracy by February 1917 due to social and economic, rather than military, factors?
2. How far were Bolshevik ideals sacrificed in the pursuit of power by 1921?
3. How important was the issue of leadership in determining the outcome of the Civil War, 1917–1921?
4. How effective was the policy of collectivisation in achieving its aims?
5. To what extent was the mobilisation of economic resources the key factor leading to Soviet victory in the Great Patriotic War?

(10) The Spanish Civil War (1931–1939)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. How significant was the fall of Primo de Rivera in bringing about an end to the Monarchy?
2. How justified are criticisms of Azaña's programme of agrarian reform?
3. "The behaviour of the Left and Right between 1934 and 1936 means that they should share equal responsibility for the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War." How justified is this view?
4. ". . . it would sometimes have been difficult to realise that the Basque Country was at war (in 1937)." To what extent were the Basques committed to the defence of the Republic?
5. How significant was the United Kingdom's role in determining the outcome of the Spanish Civil War?

(11) Britain at War and Peace (1939–1951)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. How justified is the view that, in 1939, Britain's economy was better prepared for war than her armed forces?
2. "Hostility from the Labour Party was the main reason for Chamberlain's resignation as Prime Minister in May 1940." How valid is this view?
3. "Strategically vital but morally questionable." How accurate is this assessment of the Allied area bombing campaign of Germany 1940–1945?
4. How significant was the impact of evacuation on society as a cause of post-war social reform?
5. To what extent has Britain's post-war decline as a world power by 1951 been exaggerated?

[BLANK PAGE]

(1) Northern Britain from the Romans to AD 1000

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A Strabo, Geography, Book IV Chapter 5 (from the early first century BC)

Most of the island is flat and overgrown with forests, although many of the districts are hilly. It bears grain, cattle, gold, silver and iron. These things, accordingly, are exported from the island. Their habits are . . . simple and barbaric, so much so that, on account of their inexperience, some of them, although well supplied with milk, make no cheese; and they have no experience in gardening or other agricultural pursuits. And they have powerful chieftains in their country. For the purposes of war they use chariots for the most part . . . The forests are their cities; for they fence in a spacious circular enclosure with trees which they have felled, and in that enclosure make huts for themselves and also pen up their cattle—not, however, with the purpose of staying a long time.

SOURCE B from The Life of Hadrian by Aelius Spartianus from the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (written in the 3rd–early 4th century or in the late 4th century)

And so, having reformed the army quite in the manner of a monarch, he (Hadrian) set out for Britain, and there he corrected many abuses and was the first to construct a wall, eighty miles in length, which was to separate the barbarians from the Romans . . . During this period and on many other occasions also, in many regions where the barbarians are held back not by rivers but by artificial barriers, Hadrian shut them off by means of high stakes planted deep in the ground and fastened together in the manner of a palisade . . . there were no campaigns of importance during his reign, and the wars that he did wage were brought to a close almost without arousing comment.

SOURCE C from *Hadrian's Wall* by David Breeze (2006)

Hadrian's Wall is a recognition of the Romans' abandonment of their intention to conquer Britain. They became more interested in controlling the movement of people and goods into and out of their empire, and their once mobile army became fossilised on the frontiers. Hadrian's Wall was the ultimate contemporary method of frontier control . . . Frontier defence was another matter and was the responsibility of the regiments based in the frontier zone . . . For an offensive army such as the Roman, the Wall was an obstacle to movement . . . Ultimately, Roman frontiers were unsuccessful. They were useful for frontier control, but the empire still needed to be defended by its army. When that was no longer possible, the frontier defences ceased to have any value.

SOURCE D Stone slab, scales, weights and sword found in the same grave at the Kiloran Bay Viking boat burial site, Colonsay, Inner Hebrides



- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|---|--------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the economy and society of Iron Age North Britain before the Roman invasions? | 12 |
| 2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing perspectives on the effectiveness of Hadrian's Wall? | 16 |
| 3. How useful is Source D as evidence of the process of Viking conversion to Christianity by the ninth century AD? | 12 |
| | (40) |

(2) Scottish Independence (1286–1329)

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from Edward I's judgement in favour of John Balliol, recorded by English clerks at the Court held at Berwick, 17 November 1292

The King Edward, the lord superior of the realm of Scotland, declares as a matter of law and by way of judgement that the realm of Scotland is not partible [divisible] . . . therefore the king declares by way of judgement to you, John Hastings and to you Robert Bruce, that by this judgment you shall receive nothing of the shares which you demand within the bounds of the realm of Scotland. But to you, John Balliol . . . the king gives you the realm as your due and puts you in possession of it with everything belonging to the realm, and what has come into the hands of the King Edward as lord superior of the realm since the death of Margaret . . . The King appoints next Thursday for swearing to him your fealty for the kingdom of Scotland wherever he may then be and Christmas Day, wherever in his realm he may then be, for doing your homage to him for the kingdom of Scotland.

SOURCE B from the *Chronicle of John of Fordoun*, written some time after 1350

From the beginning of his struggle until his victory at Inverurie, King Robert had been most unlucky in the upshot of every battle; afterwards there could not have been a man more fortunate in his fights. And from that day, the King gained more ground, and became ever more hale himself; while his opponents daily grew less.

The same year [1308] on 21 June, Donald of the Isles gathered an imposing host on foot, and marched up to the River Dee. He was met by Edward Bruce who overcame the said Donald and all the men of Galloway.

The same year, in the week after 15 August, King Robert overcame the men of Argyll in the middle of Argyll, and subdued the whole land unto himself. Their leader, Alexander of Argyll, fled to Dunstaffnage Castle where he was for some time besieged by the King. On giving up the castle to the King, he refused to do him homage. So a safe conduct was given to him and to all who wished to withdraw with him; and he fled to England.

SOURCE C from *Crown and Community under Robert I*, an article by Norman Reid (1998)

The legislation [of King Robert] is generally in the interests of the community, but undoubtedly enhances the position of the King: if by promoting effective trade and a firm and efficient judicial system, for instance, the king was able to benefit the realm, then those acting in prejudice of the king became common foes of the kingdom as a whole, and the community at large would welcome their subjugation in the common interest. The recognition and achievement of this mutual dependence was crucial to the establishment of a King's authority: without the community's support, which was won by good government, there could be no effective kingship . . . That the De Soules conspiracy did not command more support, and that its vigorous suppression seems to have caused little stir, perhaps signify his success.

SOURCE D from *The Scottish Civil War* by Michael Penman (2002)

At a parliament in Scone in December 1318 he [King Robert] attempted to shore up his authority. Another Act of Succession was passed for unquestioned sealing by his subjects, this time recognising Robert's grandson, Robert Stewart (born in early 1316) as a stop-gap royal heir presumptive until Bruce had sons. But such was the threat sensed that Robert's regime also issued statutes ordering weapons practice and outlawing sedition and rumour mongering against the Crown. Bruce was right to be paranoid . . . It was then that a plot by former Balliol men in Scotland to assassinate Bruce and usher in a Balliol coup was discovered in the summer of 1320. Bruce may have further antagonised his former enemies in Scotland by attempting to build up Sir James Douglas' lands as the Crown agent in the south-west (where Soules and some of his confederates had their lands).

Marks

1. How useful is **Source A** for understanding King Edward I's role in the choice of John Balliol as king in 1292? **12**
 2. How fully does **Source B** illustrate the reasons for King Robert's victory in the Civil War of 1306–1309? **12**
 3. How much do **Sources C** and **D** reveal about differing views on King Robert's government of Scotland between 1314 and 1328? **16**
- (40)**

(3) The Renaissance in Italy in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from a letter by Coluccio Salutati c.1400

I grant that the contemplative life is more sublime for its high level of thought; more delectable for the sweetness of tranquillity and meditation; more self-sufficient because it requires fewer things; more divine because it considers divine rather than human things . . . Nevertheless, the active life is to be followed both as an exercise in virtue and because of the necessity of brotherly love . . . The active life is inferior, but many times to be preferred. Although the contemplative life is a matter of choice and the active life concerns necessary things, the latter is not so attached and tied to existence that it does not care about or consider acting well. Therefore do you not believe that this way of life opens a path to heaven? Let us grant that the contemplative life is better, more divine and sublime; yet it must be mixed with action.

SOURCE B from *The Italian Renaissance* by Peter Burke (1999)

As in the case of training, so in status the creative elite formed two cultures, with literature, humanism and science enjoying more respect than the visual arts and music . . . Renaissance artists were an example of what sociologists call “status dissonance”. Some of them achieved high status, others did not. According to some criteria, artists deserved honour; according to others they were just craftsmen. Artists were in fact respected by some of the noble and powerful, but they were despised by others. The status insecurity which naturally resulted may well explain the touchiness of certain individuals, such as Michelangelo and Cellini . . . By the middle of the sixteenth century it was no longer extraordinary for artists to have some knowledge of the humanities; the distinction between the two cultures was breaking down. The social mobility of painters and sculptors is symbolized if not confirmed by the appearance of the term “artist” in more or less its modern meaning.

SOURCE C from *History of Italy* by Francesco Guicciardini c.1530

Having attained temporal power . . . [the popes] gradually forgot divine commands and the salvation of their souls. They concentrated their attention on earthly greatness, used their spiritual powers simply to increase their temporal ones, and began to seem more like secular princes than like popes. Their aim was no longer a holy life; no longer the spread of Christianity; no longer doing good to their neighbour. They became interested in armies, in wars against Christians . . . the accumulation of treasure, new laws, new methods, new stratagems to draw in money from every side. To this end they used their spiritual powers without scruple, and sold both the sacred and the profane without shame.

SOURCE D from *Scourge and Fire* by Lauro Martines (2006)

Monies, plus the promise of offices and benefices, won the election for Borgia . . . Yet many cardinals of the period believed that just such a worldly figure—a consummate politician—was precisely what the Renaissance Church needed in the existing European situation, and particularly in Italy . . . It was to take [until 1450] before popes, now fully re-established in Rome, had the wealth, organisation and soldiers to stand up to the other Italian states in countless disputes over territorial boundaries and intrusive armies. These matters, and governing the Papal State, were a pope’s most immediate concerns, not the condition of the clergy in Germany or England, and still less the task of meeting the spiritual needs of the people of Christian Europe. Somehow—it was supposed—the spirit would look after itself. Income, soldiers, courts of law, diplomacy and an elaborate structure of offices would engage Roderigo Borgia’s exceptional skills and talents, not a gift for piety or love of Christ.

Marks

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. How useful is Source A as evidence of the values of Renaissance humanists before 1450? | 12 |
| 2. How fully does Source B describe the status of artists in the Italian Renaissance? | 12 |
| 3. How much do Sources C and D reveal about differing views on the role of the Renaissance papacy from 1492 to 1527? | 16 |
| | (40) |

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

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from “*Memoire d’un Ecossais*” by Cameron of Lochiel, chief of Clan Cameron (1747)

Being master of the field of Prestonpans, and of all Scotland, excepting only a few insignificant forts, the Prince had only to arm all the loyal Highlanders, summon a parliament, and put together an army which could defend itself. But the Prince allowed himself to be blinded by the ardour of his own courageous spirit. Sir Thomas Sheridan, puffed up with the success the Prince’s enterprise had so far enjoyed, believed that the situation in England was scarcely less favourable than that in Scotland. He was so rash as to maintain, against the near unanimous advice of the Scots, that the presence of the Prince at the head of 5,000 men would bring over a good part of the government troops to his side and persuade the English nobility to declare themselves. Buoyed up with this hope, the Prince made a hasty march into that country and left Scotland without having taken the necessary measures to consolidate his authority there.

SOURCE B from *A History of Scotland* by J. D. Mackie (1964)

The impetus to improve agriculture came from the nobility and gentry. The Honourable Society of Improvers included among its three hundred members dukes and peers, judges and landlords, all interested in the new agriculture. Everywhere English methods came into use. So did the iron plough, which could be drawn by two horses. At Ormiston John Cockburn was a model improver who provided, in a new village, craftsmen and their families to do the work that went with farming. At Monymusk Sir Archibald Grant transformed a miserable property into a prosperous estate, granting long leases to his tenants to encourage “improvement”, providing local industries for those displaced by his enclosures and education for the children.

SOURCE C from *A History of the Scottish People* by T. C. Smout (1969)

The reason for so many of the Improvers’ failure to make farming pay was not only that they were pioneers, or that they were operating in a country where incomes were low and demand for agricultural produce generally slack. It was also that they were not impelled by economic necessity to farm as they did. Their spurs were primarily fashion, patriotism, and the admiration felt by Scots of all political persuasions for a farming system that made the English so much richer than themselves. As a result most tenants were contemptuous of “gentleman farmers”. Many landowners also regarded their improving fellows as hare-brained, especially if they themselves did not have spare cash to indulge in the hobby.

SOURCE D from *The Political History of Eighteenth Century Scotland* by John Stuart Shaw (1999)

The principal Whigs opposing Henry Dundas included Henry Erskine and Sir Thomas Dundas. Sir Thomas was the son of Henry Dundas's old adversary, Sir Lawrence. He therefore had a background of hostility to Henry Dundas (they were, incidentally, only very distantly related). He was also a sponsor, if hardly a champion, of parliamentary reform in Scotland. Henry Erskine had been Lord Advocate during the Fox–North coalition. He showed no sign of liking Henry Dundas, but his motivation may, in any case, have been on ideological grounds as he had good reformist credentials. He led a group of politicians and lawyers who became the centre of opposition activity in Scotland.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|--|--------------|
| 1. How useful is Source A in explaining the failings of Charles Edward Stuart as a leader in the '45 Rebellion? | 12 |
| 2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing views of the significance of the agricultural Improvers? | 16 |
| 3. How fully does Source D explain the problems that Henry Dundas faced in trying to manage Scotland on behalf of the government? | 12 |
| | (40) |

(5) “The House Divided”: USA (1850–1865)

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Dred Scott versus Sandford*, March 6th, 1857

The question before us is whether the class of persons described in the plea [black slaves] compose a portion of the people of the United States, and are constituent members of this sovereignty. We think that they are not intended to be included under the word “citizens” in the Constitution and therefore cannot claim any of the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States.

Upon these considerations it is the opinion of the court that the Act of Congress which prohibited a citizen from holding and owning property of this kind in the territory of the United States north of the line therein mentioned, it is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void; and that neither Dred Scott himself, nor any of his family, were made free by being carried into this territory; even if they had been carried there by the owner, with the intention of becoming a permanent resident there.

SOURCE B from *The War for a Nation* by Susan-Mary Grant (2006)

Southerners . . . saw the Declaration (of Independence of 1776) as an insurance policy against the encroachments of centralised power. The argument that a people had the right to “alter or abolish” a government which no longer guaranteed their “safety and happiness” became more important to (them) than the “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” philosophy that the Republicans believed informed America’s national doctrine . . . Nevertheless, it remained the case that Southerners were far from united on the subject of secession, and the process of dissolving the Union should not be understood as one mad rush for the door on the part of the South. It was a process that gathered momentum gradually and with the very considerable help of pro-slavery ideologues and secessionist politicians—the so-called fire-eaters—whose self-appointed task it was to awaken the whole South to the dangers of which it may have only been half aware.

SOURCE C from a letter by the Northern writer, Lydia Maria Child, to the Governor of Virginia, October 1860.

The people of the North had a very strong attachment to the Union; but, by your desperate measures, you have weakened it beyond all powers of restoration. They are not your enemies, as you suppose, but they cannot consent to be your tools for any ignoble task you may choose to propose . . . A majority of them would rejoice to have the Slave States fulfil their oft-repeated threat of withdrawal from the Union. It has ceased to be a bugbear, for we begin to despair of being able, to give the world the example of a real republic. The moral sense of these States is outraged by being accomplices in sustaining an institution vicious in all its aspects . . . If you would only make the offer of a separation in serious earnest, you would hear the hearty response of millions, “Go, gentlemen, and stand not upon the order of your going, but go at once”.

SOURCE D from the diary of Sam Watkins, a Confederate soldier, 10th May 1865

Our cause was lost from the beginning. Our greatest victories—Chickamauga and Franklin—were our greatest defeats. Our people were divided upon the question of Union and secession. Our generals were scrambling for “*Who ranked*”. The private soldier fought and starved for nothing. Our hospitals were crowded with sick and wounded, and only half provided with food and clothing to sustain life. Our money lost value and our cause was lost. But reader, time has brought his changes since I, a young, ardent and impetuous youth, burning with a lofty patriotism, first shouldered my musket to defend the rights of my country.

Marks

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. How useful is Source A as evidence of attitudes towards the legal status of slavery in the ante-bellum period? | 12 |
| 2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing views on the causes of secession? | 16 |
| 3. How fully does Source D explain the reasons for Southern defeat? | 12 |
| | (40) |

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

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from Richard Perren's article, *On the Turn—Japan, 1900*, in *History Today* (1992)

As early as October 1890 the Imperial Rescript on Education, often seen as the basic tool for inculcating the orthodox philosophy of the state, showed the strong influence of the Confucian view that the state was essentially a moral order. Its central concept of mass indoctrination was an entirely modern emphasis . . . The purpose of educational reform, at its most basic level, was to turn out efficient recruits for the army, factory and farm. This was because political and military modernisation, as well as industrialisation, depended on new skills, new attitudes and broader knowledge. Japan's leaders realised from the 1870s that social and intellectual modernisation was a prerequisite to success in other fields.

SOURCE B from a letter from Kido Koin to Shinagawa Yajiro, who had been sent by the government to observe the Franco-Prussian War, written in December 1871.

It is my plan to open a news office which will publish all the news—both domestic and foreign—for the edification of our people in every province and fief. I feel that it will contribute to their enlightenment. I therefore request you to write to me at every opportunity on anything that will help educate our people, starting with the accounts of the great war between countries . . . the other day one of your letters from New York reached me . . . That letter contained much that was highly instructive . . . I shall forthwith forward them to the news office to be published. Kindly inform Mori Kinnojo, who has been dispatched to America, and Nawa Kan, who has accompanied him, about our plans for this newspaper office. If they will write about America and on other matters of interest to our people, and send them to my address I shall forward them for publication in the same newspaper.

SOURCE C Baron Suyematsu, written in Paris, September 1 1905

Peace has been concluded at Portsmouth (America) between Russia and Japan. Whatever may be the views about the peace terms, one thing seems certain, that Japan has shown a great moral heroism in the cause of humanity and civilisation. Now that peace is assured, the time seems to have arrived for the world to reflect more calmly than ever upon the origin of one of the greatest wars ever recorded in history; and above all, the time has come to observe how faithfully Japan has maintained her ambition of deserving the name of a civilised nation, and to reflect how securely we may take her steady progress as a guarantee of her continued advance in the future. Time was when she was looked down upon by many . . . Our sincere hope is that misconceptions of that kind may now be totally dispelled, and that the world may look upon Japan as a country deserving friendship.

SOURCE D from Conrad Totman’s *A History of Japan* (2004)

On the face of it, the government’s gamble had paid off handsomely; something akin to “ideal relations with the powers” had been attained. However, the cost in blood and treasure had been fearsome. Casualties were appalling; wartime tax and price hikes had caused hardship and angered many. Moreover, government promises and chauvinistic media propaganda had created untenable public expectations, so the terms of settlement, most notably the absence of an indemnity, were greeted with disappointment and outrage. Despite triumphal parades and official ceremonies, press denunciations and public displeasure persisted, culminating in September 1905 in a massive flurry of destructive, anti-government rioting by the common people of Tokyo, and subsequently elsewhere about the country, the first instance of mass demonstrations fuelled by issues of foreign policy.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|--|--------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the significance of educational reform during the Meiji Period? | 12 |
| 2. How useful is Source B as evidence of Japan’s changing attitudes towards the west after the Meiji Restoration? | 12 |
| 3. How much do Sources C and D reveal about different interpretations of the consequences of Japan’s defeat of Russia in 1905? | 16 |
| | (40) |

(7) Germany: Versailles to the Outbreak of the Second World War

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from the Weimar Constitution drawn up in 1919 by Hugo Preuss of the German Democratic party (DDP)

Article 48: In the event that public order and security are seriously disturbed or endangered, the Reich president may take the measures necessary for their restoration, intervening if necessary, with the aid of the armed forces. For this purpose he may temporarily suspend the fundamental principles laid down in those Articles which guaranteed personal liberty, privacy in the home, privacy of letters and phone calls, freedom of opinion, freedom of assembly and the right of private property. The Reich president must without delay inform the Reichstag of all the measures taken. These may be cancelled on the demand of the Reichstag.

SOURCE B from Norman Stone's *Hitler* (1980)

Papen led an intrigue with Hitler that began at the house of a Nazi sympathiser, the banker Schröder. Papen's industrialist friends had been terrified at the possibility of a left-wing government with army support. One after another, Schacht the financier, and Krupp, Thyssen, Bosch and Siemens the industrialists, lobbied Hindenburg and Papen on Hitler's behalf. Papen was asking what Hitler's terms were. They were the same as before: the chancellorship and Hindenburg's backing. Papen wished to associate the Nationalists, under himself and Hugenberg, with the Nazis in a coalition which would have some two-fifths of the Reichstag seats. Hitler agreed. He also agreed that Papen should be vice-chancellor.

SOURCE C from Goering's broadcast from the Reich Chancellery, 30 January 1933

January 30th, 1933, will be recorded in German history as the day when the nation was restored to glory once more, when a new nation arose and swept aside all the anguish, pain and shame of the last fourteen years. There stands the renowned Field Marshal of the World War [Hindenburg] and by his side the young Führer of Germany, who is about to lead the people and the Reich to a new and better era. May the German people herald this day as joyfully as it is heralded by the hundreds of thousands in front of these windows. They are inspired by a new faith that the future will bring us what we fought for in vain for a long time—bread and work for our fellow men, and freedom and glory for the nation.

SOURCE D Hitler's views on race, as recollected by Gregor Strasser in 1930

What we have to do is to select from a new master class, men who will not allow themselves to be guided by the morality of pity. Those who rule must know they have the right to rule because they belong to a superior race. They must maintain that right and ruthlessly consolidate it. There is only one kind of revolution, and it is not political or social, but racial and it will always be the same: the struggle of inferior races against the superior races who are in the saddle. On the day the superior race forgets this law, it is lost. All revolutions—and I have studied them carefully—have been racial.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|--|--------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the concerns of those who prepared a democratic constitution for Weimar Germany? | 12 |
| 2. How far do Sources B and C illustrate differing views on Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on 30th January 1933? | 16 |
| 3. How useful is Source D in explaining the importance of race in Hitler's political beliefs? | 12 |
| | (40) |

(8) South Africa (1910–1984)

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from *A History of South Africa* by Leonard Thompson (1995)

The National Party government applied apartheid in a multitude of laws and executive actions. At the heart of the apartheid systems were four ideas. First, the population of South Africa comprised four “racial groups”—White, Coloured, Indian and African—each with its own inherent culture. Second, the Whites, as the civilised race, were entitled to have absolute control over the state. Third, white interests should prevail over black interests; the state was not obliged to provide equal facilities for the subordinate races. Fourth, the white racial group formed a single nation, with Afrikaans and English-speaking components, while Africans belonged to several (eventually ten) distinct nations or potential nations—a formula that made the white nation the largest of the country.

SOURCE B from *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-century South Africa* edited by William Beinart and Saul Dubow (1995)

Some historians claim that the maintenance of the migrant labour system (was) the centrepiece of apartheid. According to this view, the government hoped to extend the economic and political advantages of a cheap and controlled migrant labour force to the growing manufacturing sector. In order to do so effectively it had to restore the crumbling economies of the African reserves. But this was insufficient in itself as the reserve economy could no longer provide a base for the bulk of African people. Tighter “influx” controls and decentralised industries were therefore designed to inhibit the development of a black urban working class. Labour-hungry commercial farmers, who formed a vital part of the government’s political constituency, also stood to gain from apartheid labour policies.

SOURCE C from the Freedom Charter, adopted by the Congress of the People at Kliptown, 1955

We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know:

That South Africa belongs to all of us who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people.

The People Shall Govern!

Every man and every woman shall have the right to vote for and to stand as a candidate for all bodies which make the laws;

All people shall be entitled to take part in the administration of the country;

The rights of the people shall be the same, regardless of race, colour or sex . . .

All National Groups shall have Equal Rights!

There shall be equal status in the bodies of state, in the courts and in the schools for all national groups and races;

All people shall have equal right to use their own languages, and to develop their own folk culture and customs;

All national groups shall be protected by law against insults to their race and national pride;

The People Shall Share in the Country's Wealth!

The national wealth of the country, the heritage of South Africans, shall be restored to the people;

The mineral wealth beneath the soil, the banks and monopoly industry shall be transferred to the ownership of the people as a whole.

SOURCE D from *Let my People Go*, Albert Luthuli (1962)

In the end the Bantustans (*homelands*) become destitute reservoirs of cheap labour to be kept in order to discipline city workers who might dare to demand higher wages. There will be work enough for good doctors. To us Bantustans means the home of disease and miserable poverty, the place where we shall be swept into heaps in order to rot, the dumping ground of "undesirable elements", delinquents, criminals created especially in towns and cities by the system . . . That is our share of South Africa. Our home is the white man's garbage can . . .

The political aim of the Bantustan is of course to wipe Africans off the South African political map . . . There is no hope in the Bantustan Act for the African. There is not intended to be any. It is the white man's solution, at ruthless cost to Africans, of the white man's problems.

Marks

1. How much do **Sources A** and **B** reveal about differing views on the reasons for the introduction of apartheid after 1948? **16**
 2. How useful is **Source C** as evidence of African aspirations in the 1950s? **12**
 3. How fully does **Source D** explain the consequences of the Promotion of Bantu Self Government Act, 1959? **12**
- (40)**

(9) Soviet Union (1917–1953)

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A “*Why Should I Sacrifice my life?*” written in June 1917 by a soldier of the St Petersburg Machine–Gun Regiment, printed in *Soldatskaya Pravda*, 2 July 1917

Comrades! With the blood of our brothers we’ve won freedom of speech—and what are we seeing now? They’re shutting us up and not letting us speak. All the talking’s being done by the educated and rich, who are yelling about war until total victory. But when I ask them why they don’t go to the Front, if they need a war so much, and why *I*, not *they* should sacrifice my life, they yell at me, “You’re one of Lenin’s lot; you should be locked up.” I’m not a Leninist and I don’t know Lenin; I’m just expressing my opinion. Comrades, don’t forget the 27th and 28th February, when we went out to get our longed-for freedom! Now we’ve got it, are we really going to hand it over to our enemies, the bourgeoisie? Comrades! Don’t worry about being arrested, say what you think everywhere, don’t let the bourgeoisie fool you with fancy speeches!

SOURCE B from Henri Barbusse’s *Stalin: A New World Seen Through One Man* (1935)

Stalin’s power lies in his formidable intelligence, the breadth of his knowledge, the amazing orderliness of his mind, his passion for precision, his inexorable spirit of progress, the rapidity, sureness and intensity of his decisions, and his constant care to choose the right men . . . One may also say that it is in Stalin more than in anyone else that the thoughts and words of Lenin are to be found. He is the Lenin of today. Among all the sources of his genius which is the principal one? . . . He knows how not to go too quickly. He knows how to weigh the right moment . . . Is it not this power that has made Stalin . . . the man who has most practically enriched the spirit of revolution, and who has committed the fewest faults?

SOURCE C from *The Soviet Century* by Moshe Lewin (2005)

Because for the most part Stalin kept his goals concealed, other party leaders were outmanoeuvred. By the time they realised the trap they had set for themselves, it was too late. Lenin himself was fooled for quite a while. When he finally understood what he was dealing with, again it was too late for effective action. Stalin’s rise was greatly facilitated by the fact that Lenin was seriously ill from late 1920 onwards. Openly attacking a healthy Lenin would not have suited Stalin’s calculating, cautious character, but with Lenin’s illness, as General-Secretary, Stalin was charged by the Central Committee with supervising Lenin’s medical treatment, which allowed him unabashedly to spy on the sick man. Lenin’s secretary Fotieva may have reported to Stalin about every piece Lenin dictated to her . . . One can imagine Stalin’s state of mind when he realised that Lenin wanted to demote him from his current position and perhaps destroy his political career altogether.

SOURCE D from Bukharin's letter to Stalin, 10 December 1937

Standing on the edge of a precipice from which there is no return, I tell you on my word of honour . . . I had no way out other than that of confirming the accusations and testimonies of others and of elaborating on them.

There is something great and bold about the political idea of a general purge. This purge encompasses the guilty; persons under suspicion; and persons potentially under suspicion. This business could not have been managed without me . . . What serves as a guarantee for all this is the fact the people inescapably talk about each other and in doing so arouse an everlasting distrust in each other. I am judging from my own experience. How I raged at Radek, who had smeared me, and then I followed in his wake . . . in this way the leadership is bringing about a full guarantee for itself . . .

I know that it would be petty of me to place the question of my own person on a par with the universal historical tasks, resting, first and foremost, on your shoulders . . .

Marks

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the difficulties faced by the Provisional Government between February and October 1917? | 12 |
| 2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing viewpoints as to why Stalin became the leader of the Soviet Union? | 16 |
| 3. How useful is Source D as an explanation of the Purges? | 12 |
| | (40) |

(10) The Spanish Civil War (1931–1939)

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from *The Spanish Civil War* by Hugh Thomas (1961)

Many Spanish officers saw, in their own traditions, a certain idea of a timeless, supremely Castilian Spain, without politics, creating order and banishing all things non-Spanish (by which they understood separatism, socialism, freemasonry, communism and anarchism). They would persuade themselves that their oath, as officers, to “maintain the independence of the country and to defend it from enemies within and without”, took precedence over their oath of loyalty to the Republic. The average Spanish officer was by middle life dissatisfied, irritable, and right-wing . . . the establishment of the military academies during the era of the Restoration had caused the majority of officers to be more conservative than liberal.

SOURCE B from *Spain 1808–1975* by Raymond Carr (1986)

The increasing hostility of the officer corps reflected the conservative reaction of the class it represented. In part it represented the resentment of those officers, whose pasts were monarchical and Catholic, as they observed the rise in influence of a new class of Republican officer—the beneficiaries of Azaña’s military reforms who were alleged to dominate his “military cabinet” and monopolise promotions. The reforms themselves could be defended as a necessary measure for the creation of a modern army—Azaña had no desire to destroy the Army as such—and they embodied changes long advocated by professional soldiers: the pensioning of superfluous officers; the improvement of the conditions of non-commissioned officers, and the abolition of the privileges of the “snob” corps. General Mola bitterly criticised Azaña’s reforms, not so much for their content as for their “vindictive spirit”.

SOURCE C from *The Spanish Civil War, A Modern Tragedy*, by George Esenwein (2005)

Because their plans for achieving complete control of Spain had failed, the insurgent generals and their right-wing civilian allies were forced to conduct a war against the legitimate Republican government. The country was now split into two mutually hostile “red” and “white” zones. The Republicans controlled the major urban and industrial zones in the north (Bilbao), centre (Madrid), north-east (Barcelona) and east (Valencia), as well as Spain’s considerable gold reserves, while their opponents, who referred to themselves as “Nationalists” rather than as rebels, held approximately one-third of the peninsula, including vast stretches of sparsely populated territory and farmland in the central, southern and north-western sections of the country.

SOURCE D interview with Buenaventura Durruti, by Pierre Van Paasen from the *Toronto Daily Star*, Madrid, 1936

For us it is a question of crushing fascism once and for all. Yes, in spite of government. No government in the world fights fascism to the death. The liberal government in Spain could have rendered the fascist elements powerless long ago. Instead it temporised and compromised and dallied. Even now at this moment, there are men in this government who want to go easy with the rebels. You can never tell, you know—the present Republican Government might yet need these rebellious forces to crush the workers' movement . . .

[Pierre Van Paasen interjects: “You will be sitting on a pile of ruins if you are victorious.”]

We are not in the least afraid of ruins. We carry a new world, here in our hearts. That world is growing this minute.

	<i>Marks</i>
1. How much do Sources A and B reveal about differing views on the reasons behind Azaña's plans to reform the Army between 1931 and 1933?	16
2. How fully does Source C explain the difficulties faced by those who organised the coup in 1936?	12
3. How useful is Source D in illustrating the motives of those who fought for the Republic between 1936 and 1939?	12
	(40)

(11) Britain at War and Peace (1939–1951)

Part 2

Study the sources below and answer the three questions which follow.

SOURCE A from *The Second World War* by John Keegan (1997)

The victory of “the Few” was narrow. During the critical months of August and September, when the Battle of Britain was at its height, Fighter Command lost 832 fighters, the Luftwaffe only 668. It was the loss of nearly 600 bombers which made the balance sheet read so disfavouredly to the attacker. Had Hitler and Goering been privy to the extent of their success during the height of the battle, when a quarter of Fighter Command’s pilots became casualties . . . they would undoubtedly have surpassed their effort.

As it was, the pragmatism of Dowding and his Fighter Command staff, the self-sacrifice of their pilots and the innovation of radar inflicted on Nazi Germany their first defeat. The legacy of that defeat would long be delayed in its effects; but the survival of an independent Britain which it assured was the event that most certainly determined the downfall of Hitler’s Germany.

SOURCE B from Dr Christina Goulter (air warfare historian) in *History Today* (September 2006)

While it would be wrong to deny the contribution of Fighter Command, I agree largely with the perspective that it was the navy that held the Germans from invading. As the German general Jodl put it, so long as the British navy existed, an invasion would be to send “my troops into the mincing machine”. They first had to get past the Royal Navy. They simply hadn’t the warships to do so. Then they’d need to think of the threat from our own air power. When Churchill talked of “the Few”, he meant all the RAF. It was not just Fighter Command but other elements, the bombers and especially Coastal Command. They monitored the German build-up in France, they tracked German capital ships, and they sunk 366 German merchant ships. So I take a holistic approach—it was all of the RAF, not just the fighter pilots, involved in that huge effort.

SOURCE C from a radio election broadcast by Winston Churchill, June 4th 1945

There can be no doubt that socialism is inseparably interwoven with totalitarianism and the abject worship of the state. Socialism is in its essence an attack not only upon British enterprise, but upon the right of the ordinary man or woman to breathe freely without having a harsh, clumsy tyrannical hand clasped across their mouth and nostrils.

I must tell you that a socialist policy is abhorrent to British ideas on freedom. There is to be one State, to which all are to be obedient in every act of their lives. A socialist state could not afford to suffer opposition—no socialist system can be established without a political police. They (the Labour government) would have to fall back on some form of Gestapo . . . no doubt very humanely directed in the first instance. And this would nip opinion in the bud: it would stop criticism as it reared its head, and it would gather all the power to the supreme Party and party leaders, rising like stately pinnacles about their vast bureaucracies of Civil Servants, no longer servants and no longer civil . . .

SOURCE D from Margaret Thatcher's *Downing Street Years* (1993)

Already large and unwieldy after its expansion in two world wars, the British Government (1945–1951) very soon jammed a finger in every pie. It levied high rates of tax on work, enterprise, consumption and wealth transfer. It planned development at every level—urban, rural, industrial and scientific. It managed the economy, it nationalised industries, it made available various forms of welfare for a wider range of contingencies—poverty, unemployment, large families, old age, misfortune, ill-health, family quarrels—generally on a universal basis. And when some people preferred to rely on their own resources or on the assistance of family and friends, the Government would run advertising campaigns to persuade people of the virtues of dependence . . . such a philosophy was explicitly advocated by the Labour Party. It glorified in planning, regulation, controls and subsidies.

Marks

1. How much do **Sources A** and **B** reveal about the differing views on the importance of RAF Fighter Command in preventing an invasion of Britain in 1940? **16**
 2. How useful is **Source C** as evidence of why the Conservative Party lost the 1945 election? **12**
 3. How fully does **Source D** describe the impact of the Labour government's domestic policies between 1945–1951? **12**
- (40)**

[END OF QUESTION PAPER]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Part 2 Field of Study (1) Source D—Three photographs, Scale and weights (ID 000-180-001-316-C), Sculptured stone (ID 000-000-099-710-C), and Sword (ID 000-000-099-678-C) are reproduced by permission of Scran © National Museums Scotland. Licensor **www.scran.ac.uk**.