

X259/13/01

NATIONAL
QUALIFICATIONS
2013

TUESDAY, 14 MAY
9.00 AM – 12 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.

Field of Study

	Part 1	Part 2
	<i>Page</i>	<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”: The 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 Russia (1917–1953)	10	30
(10) The Spanish Civil War: Causes, Conflict and Consequences (1923–1945)	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. To what extent did agriculture underpin all other elements of Iron Age society?
2. “Governor Agricola is no longer to be credited with the Flavian conquest of Northern Britain.” How valid is this view of Agricola’s role in the Flavian conquest?
3. How significant an impact did conversion to Christianity have on Northern Britons in the post-Roman period?
4. How important a part did the demand for land play in attracting the Vikings to Northern Britain?
5. “Britain received a third tribe, namely the Irish (the Scotii).” How valid is this view of the origin of the Scots?

(2) Scottish Independence (1286–1329)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. “King John’s poor reputation is more a result of the work of English or ‘pro-Bruce’ chroniclers than of a study of the events of his reign.” How justified is this view?
2. “William Wallace’s actions between 1296 and 1305 did more harm than good to the cause of Scottish independence.” How far do you agree with this statement?
3. How far does the support of the Scottish Church explain Robert the Bruce’s victory in the civil war between 1306 and 1310?
4. How successfully did King Robert consolidate royal authority within Scotland between 1314 and 1328?
5. To what extent was the Treaty of Edinburgh of 1328 the product of war-weariness on both sides?

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

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. To what extent is it possible to argue that humanism in the Italian Renaissance was simply a revival of antiquity?
2. What factors best explain why Venetian art of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries was so different from that of other Renaissance states?
3. To what extent were the Medici “princes of Florence” in all but name between 1434 and 1494?
4. How valid is the view that Giorgio Vasari’s “Lives of the Great Artists” presents a distorted view of the development of art during the Italian Renaissance?
5. Was the concept of the “Renaissance Man” more of an ideal than a reality?

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

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. What factors best explain why the Jacobite rebellion of 1715 achieved no more than “stalemate, retreat and ultimate fiasco”?
2. How important a factor were the methods of the tobacco lords in establishing Glasgow as the “tobacco metropolis of Western Europe”?
3. “Urban areas had become the dominant presence in the society and economy of Scotland by 1800.” How valid is this description of the growth of Scottish towns and cities during the eighteenth century?
4. How important a factor was the French Revolution in explaining political unrest in Scotland in the 1790s?
5. To what extent does John Cockburn of Ormiston deserve to be considered the most significant contributor to Scotland’s agricultural revolution?

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

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. To what extent was the Kansas-Nebraska Act the most significant reason for the emergence of the Republican Party by 1856?
2. How justified is the view that military operations in the Western theatre were at least as important as those in the Eastern theatre in the course of the Civil War?
3. To what extent have criticisms of Jefferson Davis as a wartime leader been exaggerated?
4. “It seems exceedingly probable that this administration will not be re-elected.” How valid is Lincoln’s assessment of the difficulties he faced during the 1864 Presidential campaign?
5. How far can it be argued that the Civil War changed social and economic conditions in both North and South?

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

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. “The upheaval of 1868–1869 had not merely eliminated the Shogun, but marked a decisive step towards achieving a centralised state.” To what extent did political reform achieve this aim after 1868?
2. How successful were the educational reforms of the Meiji era?
3. Recent historians have drawn attention to “the indispensable part played by women in Japan’s economic advance”. How valid is this view?
4. What factors best explain why Japan had successfully destabilised and dominated China by 1895?
5. To what extent has the importance of Korea as a contributing factor to the Russo-Japanese War 1904–1905 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. To what extent is it fair to say that in Germany in 1918–1919 “there was a revolutionary situation but not a revolution”?
2. “The Treaty of Versailles lay at the root of the instability faced by the German government between 1919 and 1923.” How valid is this assessment of the impact of the Treaty of Versailles on the Weimar Republic?
3. How far can it be argued that Stresemann’s foreign policy showed that he was a German nationalist rather than a “Good European”?
4. To what extent did industrialists and the military gain more from Nazi economic policies than other sections of German society, 1933–1939?
5. What factors best explain the ineffectiveness of opposition to the Nazi regime, 1933–1939?

(8) South Africa (1910–1984)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. How important were the demands of the diamond and gold mining industries in determining South African government policy, 1910–1939?
2. To what extent was disunity amongst resistance groups the main factor in undermining the effectiveness of opposition to segregation before 1939?
3. How far can it be argued that the unique sense of Afrikaner identity was the main reason for the rise of Afrikaner Nationalism before 1948?
4. How valid is the view that the policy of Separate Development after 1959 was apartheid by another name?
5. How significant was the United Nations in influencing the foreign policy of the South African government, 1960–1984?

(9) Soviet Russia (1917–1953)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. What factors best explain why a one-party dictatorship emerged in Russia between October 1917 and March 1921?
2. To what extent has the role of Trotsky in bringing about Red victory in the Civil War been exaggerated?
3. “Stalin was very much in the right place at the right time, lucky—but the luck had to be used.” How valid is this assessment of the reasons for Stalin’s rise to power?
4. “The entire country transformed. Millions died and millions more changed their way of life irrevocably.” How valid is this assessment of the impact of collectivisation?
5. What factors best explain the development of Soviet foreign policy between the end of the Great Patriotic War and 1953?

(10) The Spanish Civil War: Causes, Conflict and Consequences (1923–1945)

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. What factors best explain Miguel Primo de Rivera's attempts at social and economic reform in the 1920s?
2. To what extent was a lack of finance the main reason for the failure of Azaña's agrarian reforms?
3. How far can the Asturias Rising of 1934 be described as the "first battle of the Civil War"?
4. To what extent was the British Government pro-Nationalist during the Spanish Civil War?
5. To what extent did Soviet aid make a positive contribution to the defence of the Spanish Republic between 1936 and 1939?

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

Part 1

Answer TWO questions.

Each question is worth 25 marks.

1. To what extent was Chamberlain's resignation due to his inability to gear the economy effectively for "total war"?
2. How successful was the evacuation scheme during the Second World War?
3. How far can the Allied bombing campaign against Germany between 1939 and 1945 be judged a success?
4. How effective was the contribution of the British Empire and its Dominions to the Allied war effort during the Second World War?
5. To what extent did the Labour Government of 1945–1951 deliver a "New Jerusalem" to the British people?

[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 from *British Archaeology*, Issue 54, Simon Denison (Ed) (August 2000)

New discoveries at Vindolanda fort on Hadrian's Wall have reinforced the idea that the fort may have been used as a Roman POW (Prisoner of War) Camp in the 3rd century. Back-to-back rows of native-style circular stone huts have been found in the south-western corner of the fort . . . about 300 huts could have existed, housing up to 2,000 prisoners. According to the Director of the Vindolanda Trust the huts probably date to the reign of Emperor Septimius Severus, who brought an imperial force to quell a native uprising in northern Britain. Severus pushed well into Scotland during the campaign and subsequently died at York in 211. Many hostages were sent as exhibits to Rome but it is suspected that others were kept at Vindolanda. The hut rows are unparalleled at any fort elsewhere in the Empire. Many contain hearths, but they are otherwise devoid of finds as they were regularly swept clean in antiquity.

SOURCE B from *The Wall, Rome's Greatest Frontier* by Alistair Moffat (2009)

The imperial expedition into Scotland and the heartlands of the insurgent was to be primarily focused on the east coast. The fort at South Shields, at the mouth of the Tyne was converted into a massive supply dump with no less than twenty-three granaries built to store food . . . there was enough for an army of 40,000 men for three months in the field . . . The intended target was Tayside, the territory of the Maeatae . . . in any event no pitched battles or decisive victories were recorded for the great army . . . it seems that the Maeatae and Caledonii would not be drawn into a set piece and they probably scorched their earth. Instead of glory in battle, the emphasis [for Severus and Caracalla] may have to have been on great engineering projects—like a bridge across the Tay—how the Roman army could tame the landscape, and its inhabitants with technology.

SOURCE C from *Orkneyinga Saga* (c 1230)

One summer King Harald Finehair sailed west on a punitive expedition against the Vikings who were raiding the coasts of Norway from their winter-bases in Shetland or the Orkneys; for he had grown tired of their depredations. He subdued Shetland and the Orkneys and the Hebrides, and sailed all the way down to the Isle of Man and destroyed all the settlements there. He fought many battles there, and extended his dominion further west than any king of Norway has done since then. One of those killed in battle was Ívarr, the son of Earl Rögnvaldr of Möer; so when King Harald set sail for Norway, he gave Earl Rögnvaldr the Orkneys and Shetland as compensation for his son. Earl Rögnvaldr in turn transferred both countries to his brother Sigurðr, who was King Harald's prow-man. When the king sailed back to Norway he bestowed on Sigurðr the title of Jarl and Sigurðr stayed behind on the islands.

SOURCE D from *Picts, Gaels and Scots* by Sally Foster (2004)

. . . in Pictland we find evidence that kings were placing increasing emphasis on organising themselves for war. There was a shift from plundering, pillaging and extortion to pitched battles, which required far greater military organisation and resources. For example, enormous effort went into the breeding and stabling of horses, and the groom seen accompanying the female figure on the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab must have been an important member of the royal household . . . Further resources must also have been required to free warriors for either permanent or temporary duty. Military aggression can be seen as a continual undercurrent throughout the period. It could be—indeed frequently was—used to decide which particular person inherited or acquired authority over any given area; kings had to be strong. This was presumably how Bridei son of Beli consolidated Pictish kingship and we must assume that this was how Cinead mac Ailpin rose to power . . . So military might was used to obtain and assert power. Such instances of internecine strife and apparent political instability are recurrent themes throughout this period.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How much do Sources A and B reveal about differing interpretations of Severus' methods of control of Northern Britain? | 16 |
| 2. How useful is Source C as evidence of the extent of Viking control of the Northern and Western Isles? | 12 |
| 3. How fully does Source D explain the warlike nature of Pictish society? | 12 |
| | (40) |

(2) Scottish Independence (1286–1329)

Part 2

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

SOURCE A from *The Wars of Scotland 1214–1271* by Michael Brown (2004)

In late September 1286, the Guardian James Stewart met with Robert Bruce and his son, the Earl of Carrick, at the latter's castle at Turnberry . . . The gathering of the Bruces with Stewart and his uncle, Walter, Earl of Menteith, the Earl of Dunbar and Angus of Islay was a roll call of families, largely from the west, most of whom would later support the Bruce claim to the throne . . . While the Guardians could maintain the routine of royal administration, raising rents, paying fees and auditing sheriff's accounts, they lacked the stature of a king in the vital job of managing flashpoints and rivalries within the nobility. Instead, they were often drawn into these incidents . . . The way out of these internal tensions lay outside the kingdom. It is likely that the Guardians actively sought Edward's support. Like his father in the 1250s, Edward was approached as a means of guaranteeing political stability in a Scottish realm which lacked a royal head.

SOURCE B from *A Great and Terrible King: Edward I* by Marc Morris (2008)

It was Robert Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow and Guardian who recovered himself sufficiently from the shock of Edward's demand of overlordship to respond on behalf of the startled Scots. He said it did not matter what they, as temporary custodians, might or might not concede: only a king of Scotland could answer such a momentous demand. The bishop took Edward to task over his reasoning: *they* were not obliged to prove him *wrong*; rather *he* should prove himself *right*. Wishart reminded the English king that he was supposed to be a crusader and observed that to threaten to unleash war on a defenceless people did him no credit. At this Edward was predictably enraged . . . In deciding on his strategy, it is likely that Edward acted in collusion with Robert the Bruce. Bruce was among the first to acknowledge Edward's superiority, allowing him to take possession of the vacant kingdom and award it to whichever candidate he judged to have the strongest claim.

SOURCE C from King Edward I's Ordinance of Scotland, 1305

In the matter of setting a Guardian over that country, it was agreed that John of Brittany should be the King's lieutenant in Scotland and Guardian of the country. Further, it was agreed that the sheriffs of the country shall be natives of Scotland, or of England, and shall be appointed and dismissed by the King's lieutenant, and by the Chamberlain, at their discretion. The King's lieutenant, and the Chamberlain, and the Chancellor at their discretion, may replace the justiciars, and replace them with others, whether English or Scots by birth, who are in their view satisfactory. As for the laws and customs to be used in the government of the land of Scotland, the King's lieutenant shall cause the good people of the land to assemble and that there shall be read over the laws that King David made, and also the amendments and additions which have been made since by the kings. Any matters that they cannot agree on will be put in writing and taken to the King at Westminster.

SOURCE D from *The Battle of Bannockburn* by Aryeh Nusbacher (2000)

Late in 1310, King Edward II sent an expedition against King Robert, but Robert avoided open combat, merely harassing the English army, especially on their withdrawal at the end of the campaigning season. Bruce proceeded to play a game of bluff and counter-bluff with King Edward, decoying English ships with leaked reports of Scottish naval operations and delaying the English king with offers of truces. When the English king was distracted by his own rebellious barons, Scottish armies poured over the border into England to demand blackmail. The Scottish protection racket extended as far south as the city of Durham, whose palatine bishop had always been the English king's strong arm in the north. The Bruce followed a policy within Scotland of besieging English castles. Apparently on the advice of the Black Douglas, he took the castles not by starvation nor by siege engines but by sneaking in over the walls when possible . . . by the end of 1313 Robert the Bruce had gone from being the fugitive king to being lord of Scotland north of the Tweed.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How much do Sources A and B reveal about differing views of the role of the Guardians in defending Scottish independence between 1286 and 1292? | 16 |
| 2. How useful is Source C as evidence of the policies pursued by King Edward to control Scotland between 1305 and 1307? | 12 |
| 3. How fully does Source D explain King Robert's military tactics in the war with England between 1310 and 1313? | 12 |
| | (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 *On Painting* by Leon Battista Alberti (1435)

I should explain how painting is worthy of all our attention and study. Painting possesses a truly divine power in that not only does it make the absent present, but it also represents the dead to the living many centuries later, so that they are recognised by spectators with pleasure and deep admiration for the artist. Through painting, the faces of the dead go on living for a very long time. We should also consider it a very great gift to men that painting has represented the gods they worship, for painting has contributed considerably to the piety which binds us to the gods, and to filling our minds with sound religious beliefs . . . Painting contributes to the honest pleasures of the mind, and to the beauty of things . . . The virtues of painting, therefore, are that its masters see their works admired and feel themselves almost like the Creator. Is it not true that painting is the mistress of all the arts or their principal ornament?

SOURCE B from *Patronage in Renaissance Italy* by Mary Hollingsworth (1994)

Julius II planned to make Rome a truly impressive centre, one that would clearly demonstrate his vision of the renewed power and prestige of the Pope as supreme head of the Church . . . Julius achieved much in the ten years of his pontificate. In the funeral oration on the death of the Pope, the speaker contrasted Rome as it had been in 1503 with the city in 1513. Julius II had inherited a rebellious, divided Italy and had reasserted control in the Papal States and expanded his temporal authority in Italy. He had found the papal coffers empty and left them full. Above all, the speaker stressed the concept of a Golden Age under Julius II and his impact on the appearance of Rome. He attributed its renewal to the projects of the Pope, and his uncle. 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.

SOURCE C St Peter refuses to allow Pope Julius II into Heaven
from “Julius Exklusus” (“Julius Excluded from Heaven”) (1514) attributed
to Erasmus

St Peter: When I look you over, I see many a sign of ungodliness and none of holiness. You have almost twenty thousand men at your back, yet I cannot find one single individual who has the face of a Christian. I see nothing but a horrifying mob of ruffians, reeking of brothels, booze shops, and gunpowder. The more I look at you the fewer traces I see of any apostolic character. You wear the robes of a priest of God, yet under them you are dressed in the bloody armour of a warrior. What a savage pair of eyes you have, what woeful features, what an arrogant expression! There’s no part of your body not marked with traces of outrageous and abominable lust. I see you threatening me with your lofty expression; but my feelings won’t be suppressed. I suspect you may be that most pestilent pagan of all, Julius Caesar, returned from hell to make a mockery of our system . . . You say you are a great builder: build yourself a new paradise!

SOURCE D from *Did Women Have a Renaissance?* by Joan Kelly-Gadol (1977)

The lady who married a Renaissance prince became a patron. She commissioned works of art and gave gifts for literary works dedicated to her; she drew to her artists and literati (learned men). But the court they came to ornament was her husband’s, and the culture they represented magnified his princely being . . . The sons of the Renaissance nobility still pursued their military and diplomatic training in the service of some great lord, but as youths, they transferred their non-military training from the lady to the humanistic tutor or boarding school. Humanism brought Latin literacy and classical learning to daughters as well as sons of the nobility. But this very development, usually seen as evidence of the equality of Renaissance noblewomen with men, spelled a further decline in the lady’s influence over courtly society. It placed her under male cultural authority. Her male tutors shaped her outlook, and, as humanists, they suppressed romance and chivalry to advance classical culture, with all its male-dominated and anti-female bias.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How useful is Source A as evidence of the role of art in the Italian Renaissance? | 12 |
| 2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing views of the exercise of power by the Popes of the High Renaissance? | 16 |
| 3. How fully does Source D describe the experience of women during the Italian Renaissance? | 12 |
| | (40) |

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

Part 2

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

SOURCE A from *The Scottish Nation 1700–2000* by T.M. Devine (1999)

Even in earlier decades there had been private fee-paying or “adventure” schools outside the statutory system, because parishes were often too large for one master to satisfy demand. The system came under acute pressure after 1750 with the rising population and a significant increase in migration. The veritable explosion in the number of private schools was, however, confirmation that there was a widespread popular demand for basic literacy.

The most dynamic feature of schooling in the large burghs was a response to the new needs of the expanding business and professional classes. As early as 1695 Glasgow appointed a teacher of navigation and book-keeping, and Edinburgh in 1705 hired a former merchant as “Professor of book-keeping to the city”.

The other side of this coin was greater pressure on the living standards of schoolmasters. These very financial problems encouraged some rural schoolmasters to broaden their teaching to include “new” subjects such as Geography, French and book-keeping since they were permitted to charge a higher fee on these.

SOURCE B from *The Forty Five: Jacobite Tactics* by J.M. Hill (1986)

Prestonpans illustrated the Gaels’ tactical superiority over an opponent not sufficiently trained or led and unfamiliar with the Highland way of war. The performance of his troops so impressed Charles that thereafter he “entertained a mighty notion of the Highlanders, and imagined they would beat four times their number of regular troops”. Charles, however, deceived himself in equating Cope’s rabble with the best regular troops in the British army.

Though the clansmen executed a near perfect Highland charge, their victory was not based on tactical acumen. The cheap victory definitely left Charles over-confident, and gave him unrealistic expectations of their capabilities.

Charles’s strategy at Culloden placed the clan regiments on an ill-chosen field that greatly favoured conventional British tactics and weaponry, but the performance of the individual Highlanders might have made up for this disadvantage if they had been effectively commanded during the battle. Charles simply turned loose his seemingly invincible Highlanders to win the day.

SOURCE C from a letter sent by George Murray to Charles Edward Stuart on the 17th of April, 1746, Ruthven Barracks

Sir, you will I hope pardon me if I mention a few truths. It was wrong to have raised your royal standard without having a positive assurance from the French that they would support you with all force. I'm also convinced that Mr O'Sullivan, whom you trusted with most essential things, was exceedingly unfit and committed terrible blunders. I never saw him in time of action, neither at Gladsmuir, Falkirk or at the last and his orders were completely confused.

They (Government forces) with their front fire and flanking us when we went upon the attack destroyed us without any possibility of our breaking them. The lack of provisions also had fatal consequences. You trusted Mr Hay to order provisions, yet he served you very poorly. He told me provisions were ordered, but he neglected his duty. In the three days before battle your army was starved.

SOURCE D from *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* by Samuel Johnson (1773)

We were now to cross the Highlands towards the western coast. The journey was not formidable, for it took only two days. We had gained the favour of our host so that when we left his house in the morning he walked with us a great way and entertained us with conversation on the condition of the Highlands. From him we first heard of the general dissatisfaction amongst the Highlanders.

The clan chiefs have turned their thoughts to the improvements of their finances and expect more rent. However, the tenant does not see why his industry is to be taxed more heavily than before. He refuses to pay the demand, and is ejected. The land is then let to a stranger, not of the clan.

It seems to be the general opinion amongst Highlanders that rents have been raised too much. The willingness to seek another country is clear from the behaviour of the Highlanders. The numbers which have already gone are very great.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the reasons for the changes in Scottish schooling in the eighteenth century? | 12 |
| 2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the Jacobite rising of 1745? | 16 |
| 3. How useful is Source D as evidence of social change in the Highlands in the late eighteenth century? | 12 |
| | (40) |

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

Part 2

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

SOURCE A from a speech by Frederick Douglass reacting to the Supreme Court decision on Dred Scott, May 1857

The prospects of the struggle against slavery seem far from cheering . . . Slavery was never more closely entwined about the hearts and affections of the southern people than now . . . Slaveholders mean to cling to their slaves as long as they can, and to the bitter end. Their motto is “a firmer hold and a tighter grip” for every new effort that is made to break their cruel power. This infamous decision of the slaveholding wing of the Supreme Court maintains . . . that slaves are property . . . that Congress has no right to prohibit slavery anywhere . . . that colored men are not and cannot be citizens of the United States. Step by step we have seen the slave power advancing; poisoning, corrupting, and perverting the institutions of the country; growing more and more arrogant, powerful and demanding . . . All I ask of the American people is that they live up to the Constitution, adopt its principles, absorb its spirit, and enforce its provisions.

SOURCE B from the *South Carolina Declaration of Causes of Secession*, December 24th 1860

For twenty-five years this agitation (against slavery) has been steadily increasing, until it has now secured to its aid the power of the common Government, subverting the Constitution itself. A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the States north of that line have united in the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery. He is to be entrusted with the administration of the common Government, because he has declared that “Government cannot endure permanently half slave, half free”, and that the public mind must rest in the belief that slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction. On the 4th March next this party will take possession of the Government. It has announced that the South shall be excluded from the common territory and that a war must be waged against slavery until it shall cease throughout the United States.

SOURCE C from *The Irrepressible Conflict* by Frank Owsley (1930)

The two sections, North and South, had joined together under the Constitution fully conscious that they united as two divergent economic and social systems. The two sections were evenly balanced in population and in the number of states, so that at the time there was no danger of either section encroaching upon the interests of the other. This balance was clearly understood.

But equilibrium was impossible under expansion and growth. One section would at one time or another become dominant and control the national government. Therein lies the irrepressible conflict; the eternal struggle between the agrarian South and the industrial North to control the government. The irrepressible conflict, then, was not between slavery and freedom, but between the industrial and commercial civilisation of the North and the agrarian civilisation of the South. The economic systems and interests of the sections clashed. Their social systems were hostile. Their political philosophies growing out of their economic and social systems were impossible to reconcile. What was food for one was poison for the other.

SOURCE D from *Abraham Lincoln and the Road to Emancipation 1861–1865* by William K. Klingaman (2001)

The Emancipation Proclamation . . . encouraged slaves in the Confederate states to flee their masters. The heightened possibility of slave insurrection distracted Confederate officials and lowered morale in the rebel armies. Once Lincoln publicly defined the war as a conflict between freedom and slavery, any chance of European aid to the Confederacy vanished.

However, by emancipating the Confederacy’s slaves as a war measure—and not as an act of justice toward the Negro—Lincoln subordinated the ideal of freedom to the preservation of the Union. Emancipation became the means to an end, a by-product of the war. The Proclamation consisted of legalistic language designed to stifle any challenges to the abolition of slavery, the sort of language one expected from a generation that devoted enormous time and energy to debates over the constitutional and legal rights of slave-owners. Lincoln left no noble words about liberty for Negroes, no eloquent phrases that could inspire subsequent generations to work toward equality.

	<i>Marks</i>
1. How useful is Source A as evidence of the impact of the Dred Scott decision, 1857?	12
2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of the causes of the Civil War?	16
3. How fully does Source D explain the consequences of the Emancipation Proclamation?	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 *Meiji Revisited, The Sites of Victorian Japan* by Dallas Finn (1995)

For 250 years during the strict, stable rule of the Tokugawa shoguns there was little change in the outward appearance of Japan. Until the mid-nineteenth century the Japanese continued to live and work in structures as predictable and carefully defined as their social rank: the samurai's mansion, the peasant's farm, the craftsman's workplace, and the merchant's shop. Manufacturing consisted mainly of weaving, pottery and metalwork, performed skilfully but on a modest scale, using simple machinery powered sometimes by oxen or a waterwheel, but mainly by human muscle. People and their freight travelled by small sailing ships between coastal towns, or moved by palanquin, packhorse, or foot along the traditional highways. The best of these, the Tokaido, running between the ancient imperial capital of Kyoto in the west and the populous shogunal capital of Edo in the east, was obstructed by mud or dust in season, mountain passes, broad swift streams and capricious boatmen.

SOURCE B from a memo sent by Iwakura Tomomi to Sanjo Sanetomi, a leading government statesman (1869)

When the Tokugawa opened relations with foreign countries, it was not addressed whether this was good for the country or bad; after all, three of four Great and Senior Councillors concluded the treaties based on their fear of the foreign threat. They gained a day's peace, but among their numerous failings were deceiving the Imperial Court and lying to the people. We must defend our imperial country's independence by revising the unfair trade treaties we recently concluded with Great Britain, France, Holland, America, and other countries. Currently foreign countries' troops have landed in our ports and they show no sign of leaving and these treaties are a mere cover for the use of imperialist force. It can be said that this is our country's greatest shame.

SOURCE C from *Feudalism in Japan* by Peter Duus (1993)

How can one account for the ease with which feudal privileges were eliminated? In part, of course, the new government succeeded in building up an army and a police force that was able to keep political disorder under control. It also made a generous financial settlement with the daimyo and their vassals, whose annual stipends were commuted into cash payments or government bonds. Many members of the former warrior class used their funds as capital to found businesses and participate in the industrialisation of the economy. At the same time, many former warriors were absorbed into the new structure of government as minor officials, army officers, policemen and schoolteachers. Their bureaucratic education had prepared them for such occupations and enabled them to find work useful despite the elimination of their old privileges. Indeed, for many of the lower-ranking members of the warrior class, the abolition of the old social distinctions opened new opportunities in the world. Though the Restoration had robbed them of their special position in society, it had liberated them as well.

SOURCE D from *The Last Samurai* by Mark Ravina (2004)

Saigo Takamori did not explain his sympathy for the rebels, but many historians have argued that he supported their defence of samurai privilege. Yet although this was undoubtedly true, for Saigo the central issue was maintaining a government based on virtue. Saigo was concerned with the dissolution of the samurai estate because they were the class that epitomized honour and selfless valour. Fragmentary records show that Saigo was deeply concerned about the impact of the land tax and the institution of private property. In two anonymous documents he lamented how private property would “contaminate” the traditional system in which farmers tilled commonly held land. In hard times, he observed, the poor would be forced to sell their land to the rich, which would exacerbate their poverty. Saigo was thus eager to reform the system to ensure that all farmers had adequate plots and then maintained the principle of common land.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the traditional nature of Japanese society in 1850? | 12 |
| 2. How useful is Source B as evidence of the role played by foreign forces in the downfall of the Tokugawa? | 12 |
| 3. How much do Sources C and D reveal about differing interpretations regarding reactions to the abolition of the caste structure? | 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 a newspaper article by Berlin journalist Friedrich Kroner (August 1923)

There is not much to add. Inflation pounds daily on the nerves: the insanity of the numbers, the uncertain future. There is an epidemic of fear and of naked need. Lines of shoppers form in front of shops and no disease is as contagious as this one. The lines always send the same signal: the city will be shopped empty yet again. Rice 80,000 marks yesterday costs 160,000 marks today, and tomorrow perhaps twice as much again. Everyone is buying frantically. The piece of paper, the spanking brand-new banknote still moist from the printing presses, paid out today as a weekly wage shrinks in value on the way to the grocer's shop. The zeros, the multiplying zeros . . . The rising prices bring mockery and laughter. Someone shouts, "Cheaper butter!" Instead of 1,600,000 marks just 1,400,000 marks . . .

SOURCE B from Franz von Papen's *Memoirs* (1952)

Historical developments are the product of diverse forces . . . I am entitled to ask that my own actions be judged in the light of this fact . . . I have been represented as naïve and incapable of grasping the true implications of the political situation at the end of 1932 . . . Yet not many people seem to realise the extent to which Hitler arose because of the harsh clauses of Versailles and the economic crisis caused by reparations. Hitler and his movement were in essence a reaction against hopelessness and for that sense of hopelessness the victorious powers must bear their full share of the blame. Hitler became Chancellor with the support of almost 40% of the German electorate. I have been accused of betraying the Weimar Republic and hoisting Hitler into the saddle as a way of taking revenge against Schleicher. But the correct narrative of events shows that this is not true.

SOURCE C from Ian Kershaw's *Hitler* (1991)

The handover of power to Hitler on 30 January 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. Electoral success alone could not bring it about. Under the Weimar constitution, there was no compulsion upon the President to appoint as head of government the leader of the party which had won most seats in a general election . . . Hindenburg had refused Hitler the chancellorship in August 1932 with the Nazis on the crest of a wave. Five months later he changed his mind with the Nazi Party in crisis following the electoral setback of November 1932 . . . Hitler's appointment was technically constitutional. Few among the elite groups had Hitler down as their first choice but by January 1933, with other options apparently exhausted, most were prepared to entertain a Hitler government. Had they opposed it, a Hitler government would have been inconceivable. Hitler needed the elites to attain power.

SOURCE D from *Guidelines for Teaching History in Secondary Schools* (1938) issued by the German Central Institute of Education.

The teaching of History is based on the natural bond of the child with his nation and has the particular task of educating young people to respect the great German past. The teaching of History must bring the past alive for the young German in such a way that it enables him to feel the responsibility of every individual for the nation as a whole . . . A new understanding of the German past has emerged from the faith of the National Socialist Movement in the future of the German people. The teaching of History must come from this vital faith . . . The certainty of a great national existence . . . is for us based . . . at the same time on the clear recognition of the basic racial forces of the German nation, which are always active and indestructibly enduring.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the impact of hyperinflation on the lives of Germans in 1923? | 12 |
| 2. How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of the reasons for Hitler's appointment as Chancellor of Germany? | 16 |
| 3. How useful is Source D in explaining the goal of the Nazis' <i>Volksgemeinschaft</i> ? | 12 |
| | (40) |

(8) South Africa (1910–1984)

Part 2

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

SOURCE A from *South Africa in the Twentieth Century* by James Barber (1999)

The first Union Parliament met in November 1910 and ahead lay the task of establishing a new political order; creating a new administration and shaping relations. Hertzog, intentionally, or unintentionally, came to symbolise those Afrikaners who still carried the scars of war, who wanted to redefine the relationship with Britain, to protect Afrikaner culture and language, to ensure that power was in Afrikaner hands, and who accused Botha and Smuts of becoming Empire men. Hertzog ran into two groups of opponents. The first were English-speaking Unionists, who regarded him as a fanatic. For them there was no clash of loyalty between Empire and the Union, because the interests of one nurtured and fostered the interests of the other. Loyalty to the Empire was loyalty to South Africa; whereas they saw Hertzog's views as implying separate paths, based on different loyalties and interests. Hertzog's other opponents were in the SAP (South African Party) itself.

SOURCE B from *The Afrikaners* by G.H.L. Le May (1995)

The differences which remained seemed to be those on which there was no longer mortal disagreement. Hertzog had already tried to remove the Natives of the Cape Province from the common voters' roll. Above all, it was now a matter of law that South Africa was a sovereign independent state. On this, one may ask whether it was the South African English, the British Government or General Hertzog himself whose attitude had changed. He had returned from the Imperial Conference of 1926 immensely reassured that Great Britain no longer had imperial designs on South Africa, could no longer drag her, willy-nilly, into wars not of her own choosing, and neither could nor would prevent her from seceding from the Empire if ever she should choose to take that final step. That reassurance had been written into the statute book of the United Kingdom by the Statute of Westminster in 1931.

SOURCE C from *Long Walk to Freedom* by Nelson Mandela (1994)

The Nationalists were a party animated by bitterness—bitterness towards the English, who treated them as inferiors for decades, and bitterness towards the African, who the Nationalists believed was threatening the prosperity and purity of Afrikaner culture. Africans had no loyalty to General Smuts, but we had even less for the National Party. Malan's platform was known as apartheid. Apartheid was a new term but an old idea and it represented the codification in one oppressive system of all the laws and regulations that had kept Africans in an inferior position to whites for centuries. The often haphazard segregation of the past three hundred years was to be consolidated into a system that was inescapable in its reach and overwhelming in its power. The premise of apartheid was that whites were superior to Africans, Coloureds and Indians, and the function of it was to entrench white supremacy forever.

SOURCE D from *Sharpeville: An Apartheid Massacre and its Consequences* by Tom Lodge (2011)

For black South African leaders, the massacre and the nationwide tumult it engendered as well as the subsequent suppression of their organisation made violent strategies directed at regime overthrow seem very compelling. It was true that before Sharpeville both within Africanists and among the ANC there were influential people who already believed that a violent confrontation with the authorities was inevitable and that they should prepare for it. But if the PAC's protests had not mobilised such a massive response and if Robert Sobukwe's protest had been confined to the small numbers who had accompanied him to Orlando police station, then guerrilla warfare might have remained a minority view. Sobukwe himself was ambivalent about the necessity for an armed insurgency and within the ANC in 1960 Chief Luthuli's principled objections to violence were still widely shared.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How much do Sources A and B reveal about differing interpretations of the changing relations between Afrikaners and the British between 1910 and 1939? | 16 |
| 2. How useful is Source C in explaining the origins of apartheid before 1959? | 12 |
| 3. How fully does Source D explain the decision to adopt militant tactics by some resistance groups in the 1960s? | 12 |
| | (40) |

(9) Soviet Russia (1917–1953)

Part 2

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

SOURCE A from *The Russian Revolution* by Sheila Fitzpatrick (2008)

There was suspicion of treason in high places, and one of the main targets was Nicholas's wife, Empress Alexandra, who was a German princess by birth. When Nicholas assumed the responsibilities of commander-in-chief of the Russian Army, which took him away from the capital for long periods, Alexandra and Rasputin began to exercise a disastrous influence over ministerial appointments. The personalities of Nicholas and his wife, and the family tragedy of their young son's haemophilia emphasised the inadequacies of the Russian autocracy. Nicholas seemed less like an upholder of the autocratic tradition than an unwitting satirist of it. The "ministerial leapfrog" of incompetent favourites in the Cabinet, the illiterate peasant faith healer at court, the intrigues of the high nobility leading to Rasputin's murder.

The political and bureaucratic structure was fragile and overstrained. The regime was so vulnerable to any kind of jolt or setback that it is hard to imagine that it could have survived for long.

SOURCE B from *The Bolsheviks Must Assume Power* by Lenin, 12th September 1917

The Bolsheviks, having obtained a majority in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies of both capitals, can and *must* take state power into their own hands.

They can because the active majority of revolutionary elements in the two chief cities are large enough to carry the people with it, to overcome our opponent's resistance, to smash him, and gain and retain power. For the Bolsheviks, by immediately proposing a democratic peace, we will form a government which *nobody* will be able to overthrow.

The majority of people are on *our side*. This was proved by the long and painful course of events from May 6 to September 12. The majority gained in the Soviets of the metropolitan cities *resulted* from the people coming over to *our side*. The wavering of the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks prove the same thing.

Why must the Bolsheviks assume power *at this very moment*? The people are tired of the waverings of the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries. It is only our victory in the metropolitan cities that will carry the peasants with us.

SOURCE C from *Stalin's Russia* by Chris Ward (1999)

At four o'clock in the afternoon of 1st December 1934, the young communist Leonid Nikolaev walked into the Smolny building, the local party headquarters, and shot Kirov in the back. The following day a special decree on terrorist offences gave the recently reorganised NKVD wide-ranging powers of trial and execution. Within a few weeks 13 members of a supposed "Leningrad centre" (including Nikolaev) and at least 98 others scattered across the country had been shot for preparing "terrorist attacks against officials of the Soviet regime". When the Central Committee circulated a letter instructing local organisations to hunt down "Trotskyites" and "Zinovievites" thousands more were arrested—including, of course, Kamenev and Zinoviev. "I am guilty of nothing, nothing before the party, before the Central Committee and before you," pleaded Zinoviev to Stalin.

SOURCE D from *Stalin* by Issac Deutscher (1966)

But why did Stalin decide to Purge? It has been suggested that he sent the men of the old guard to their deaths as scapegoats for his economic failures. There is a grain of truth in this but no more. For one thing there was a very marked improvement in the economic conditions of the country in the years of the trials. He certainly had no need for so many scapegoats; and if he had needed them, penal servitude would have been enough—Stalin's real and much wider motive was to destroy the men who represented the potentiality of alternative government. Considerations of domestic policy can hardly explain his timing. Widespread though popular dissatisfaction may have been, it was too amorphous [lacking focus] to constitute any immediate threat to his position. There was also danger from abroad; only a few months before the first of the great trials took place, Hitler's army marched into the Rhineland; the last trial, that of Bukharin and Rykov, ended to the accompaniment of the trumpets that announced the Nazi occupation of Austria.

	<i>Marks</i>
1. How fully does Source A explain why support for Tsarism collapsed in February 1917?	12
2. How useful is Source B as evidence of growing support for the Bolsheviks after July 1917?	12
3. How much do Sources C and D reveal about differing interpretations of the reasons for the Purges?	16
	(40)

(10) The Spanish Civil War: Causes, Conflict and Consequences (1923–1945)

Part 2

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

SOURCE A from a speech made by Alfonso XIII of Spain in 1931

The elections held on Sunday proved to me that I no longer hold the love and affection of my people. My conscience tells me this condition will not be permanent because I have always striven to serve Spain, and my people, with all my devotion. A king may make mistakes. Without doubt I have done so on occasion, but I know our country has always shown herself generous towards the faults of others committed without malice . . . I could find ample means to maintain my royal prerogatives in effective resistance to those who assail them, but I prefer to stand resolutely aside rather than to provoke a conflict which might array my countrymen against one another in civil war and patricidal strife . . . I believe that I am fulfilling the duty which the love of my country dictates. I pray God that all other Spaniards may feel and fulfil their duty as sincerely as I do.

SOURCE B from *The Spanish Civil War, Questions and Analysis in History* by Andrew Forrest (2000)

As a reward for his role in the Asturias, Franco was made Commander-in-Chief of Spanish Armed Forces in Morocco . . . when Gil Robles became Minister for War in May 1935 he became Chief of General Staff. By the time the Popular Front came to power in February 1936, preparations for a military uprising had begun. The new government seemed obsessively biased against the right [as shown when] Prime Minister Azaña pardoned those workers and left-wing soldiers involved in the Asturias and other risings—Franco and Mola were redeployed, with the aim of neutralising their potential as plotters. Right-wing newspapers were promoting an atmosphere of impending doom, encouraging the right-wing of the army in its plots, the conservative classes praying for their success . . . The month of May began with a general strike invoked by the anarchist CNT. Prime Minister Casares Quiroga seemed blind to rumours that such a threat [of an uprising] was imminent.

SOURCE C from *British Volunteers for Liberty* by Bill Alexander (1992)

Early in May 1937 news reached the front of the fighting in the streets of Barcelona between supporters of the POUM aided by some Anarchists, on the one hand, and Government forces on the other. The POUM, who had always been hostile to unity, talked of “beginning the struggle for working-class power”.

The news of the fighting was greeted with incredulity, consternation and then extreme anger by the International Brigaders. No supporters of the Popular Front Government could conceive of raising the slogan of “socialist revolution” when that Government was fighting for its life against international fascism, the power of whose war-machine was a harsh reality a couple of hundred yards across no-man’s-land. The anger in the Brigade against those who fought the Republic in the rear was sharpened by reports of weapons, even tanks, being kept from the front and hidden for treacherous purposes.

SOURCE D from *We, the Anarchists* by Stuart Christie (2008)

The distance between the base and the leadership widened even further [for example] in May 1937 in Barcelona when the CNT and the FAI leadership ordered its own militants to lay down the arms they had taken up in the face of a campaign of provocation sustained by the PSUC and the Catalan Nationalists since early January. This proved the key event that brought down the government of Largo Caballero, the CNT-FAI leadership’s sole ally in a predominantly pro-Communist cabinet. It finally broke the tremendous moral influence of the CNT-FAI on its main stronghold—Catalonia. The way was now open for the pro-Russian government of Juan Negrin to destroy what was perhaps the most positive achievement of the revolution—the anarchist-dominated Council of Aragón. The overt hostility of the new Negrin administration to the FAI led to a major crisis for the anarchist organisation in June 1937.

Marks

1. How useful is **Source A** in explaining the reasons for Alfonso’s “departure”? **12**
 2. How fully does **Source B** illustrate the motives of those who rebelled against the Republic in 1936? **12**
 3. How much do **Sources C** and **D** reveal about differing interpretations of the role of the Barcelona rising in the growing disunity amongst Republican forces after 1937? **16**
- (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 *We Can Take It (Britain and the Memory of the Second World War)* by Mark Connelly (2004)

The myth of the Blitz is vital to British national identity. According to this memory, it provided proof of the distinct qualities of the island race. It is remembered as the moment when “The Few” of Churchill’s island stood shoulder to shoulder, regardless of class or creed, and withstood the full terror and might of the enemy. Instead of buckling, the people laughed and joked their way through it full of wonderful British self-control. King and Queen came to know their people and their people them, as all did their bit without murmur. The visual images of the Blitz imparted messages of defiance, solidarity and togetherness, and improvisation in the face of a powerful enemy. By surviving this experience, Britain bought the freedom of the world. Like most events of 1940, the Blitz is something the British people can look upon with pride and the endurance and fortitude of the nation in the face of it is something the world should thank us for now and for ever more. In this way is the Blitz remembered and conceived.

SOURCE B from a Mass Observation Report (1944)

There is no doubt, however, that a large majority of women factory workers look forward to settling down and making a home after the war. A minority of less than a quarter were ready to continue in their present work. Most of these were women of 35 to 50 [years of age], unmarried or widows, who had either been in factory work before the war, or found that they preferred it to their previous job. Very few of those who want to stay on at work mention the possibility of marriage; most of them seem resigned to a single existence, and to have arranged their lives accordingly. In spite of this, there is no career-urge towards factory work; one gets the impression that those who choose it have given up ambition and want a quiet life.

SOURCE C from John Terraine's *The Smoke and the Fire* (1980)

At the *Arcadia* Conference in Washington in December 1941, during the happy, beaming honeymoon of Anglo-American relations, the two groups of Joint Chiefs were fused into a Combined Chiefs of Staff Committee with a permanent apparatus. This body became the ultimate strategy-making institution for the two Western Allies; Supreme Commanders in their theatres of war received their orders through it and reported back formally to it. National differences [what often looked like the contest between American dogmatism and British pragmatism] inevitably caused disagreements. There were seemingly irresolvable conflicts between the American Navy, chiefly interested in the war against Japan, and the American Army, with its commitment to the European theatre. Above all, there were the personalities of the two great leaders, Roosevelt and Churchill, both of them liable, in the eyes of their military advisors, to take up far-fetched schemes and fly off at tangents. The organisation was sound, perhaps never sounder than at the very beginning when it took the bold decision to treat Germany as the main enemy, although it was Japan that had attacked America.

SOURCE D from *Enigma: The Battle for the Code* by Hugh Sebag-Montefiore (2000)

Until March 1943 Enigma decrypts were primarily used defensively, so that convoys could be diverted away from waiting wolf packs. By the end of March there were so many U-boats in the North Atlantic that, even when Enigma decrypts revealed their whereabouts, there were often other U-boats waiting on any diverted route. Admiral King of the US Navy, tried to convince the British to use Enigma offensively, particularly against German U-tankers, which extended the length of U-boat patrols by refuelling them at sea. King's proposals were strongly opposed by Sir Dudley Pound, the First Sea Lord, on the grounds that aggressive use of Enigma would compromise its source. He cabled back to America saying "If our Enigma information failed us at the present time it would result in our shipping losses going up by anything from 50 to 100%". The reason why Pound was anxious not to compromise the Naval Enigma was that it still had an important tactical role to play in giving information about improvements being made to U-boats and their torpedoes and it revealed their attacking strategies.

- | | <i>Marks</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. How fully does Source A explain the impact of the Blitz? | 12 |
| 2. How useful is Source B in explaining the domestic and social impact of women's work during World War Two? | 12 |
| 3. How much do Sources C and D reveal about differing views on the challenges facing the leaders of Britain's naval and land forces during World War Two? | 16 |
| | (40) |

[END OF QUESTION PAPER]

[BLANK PAGE]