

Spring term A level History online network event

Sources and interpretations: resources and exemplar answers

AO2 Generic Mark Scheme

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.
----------	--------------	--

Summer 2018 Paper 2E.2 question 2 and Sources 3 and 4

Option 2E.2: The German Democratic Republic, 1949-90

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the control of young people in the GDR through the Free German Youth (FDJ)?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

Source 3: From the *Statute of the Free German Youth*, May 1959. The *Statute* was an official document produced by the Free German Youth (FDJ). The following points outline the intended role of the FDJ in the development of young people.

1. The Free German Youth is the Socialist mass organisation of the youth.

It unites in its ranks, on a voluntary basis, the working-class and rural youth, the young intelligentsia, pupils and students, and the youth of the middle class.

The Free German Youth represents the political, economic, and cultural interests of all young people in the German Democratic Republic. 5

As the friendship league of all boys and girls, it wages the battle for peace and Socialism.

2. The Free German Youth helps all young people to become young patriots who have an all-round education; full of life, cultured, and healthy.

Through cultivation of the body and sports, it aims to educate the youth to become healthy persons, to develop in them qualities such as courage, strength, and endurance, and to promote agility and grace. 10

The Free German Youth is a community of young people who come together at work, study and sport, in music, song, and dance to develop a joyous life. German youth has its true fatherland in the German Democratic Republic. That is why the members of the Free German Youth employ all their powers to further strengthen their workers' and farmers' state, and through their example win over the entire youth for participation in this work of peace. 15

Source 4: From an article by the Reverend Andreas Tasche in a church newsletter, published October 2014. The Reverend Tasche was a Protestant church minister in Germany. Here he is describing his experiences of growing up as a Christian in the GDR.

As a young person I was never a member of the Free German Youth. Nor had I participated in the Jugendweihe 'Youth ceremony', a cunning measure introduced by the State as an alternative to Christian Confirmation. I also refused to learn and sing certain propaganda poems and songs which angrily denounced the Christian faith and the Church. I would not salute the flag of the State-run Youth Organisation which was raised at certain times in school. 20

And so I belonged to a minority which in the 1960s and 70s, depending on region, numbered between two and eight per cent of the population. I could not apply for higher education and so could not study journalism as I had planned. Even vocational training as a maintenance engineer or as a mechanical technician was denied to me. 25

None of the requests of my parents to the school board, the local and then regional authorities, right up to the Ministry of Education in Berlin were successful. No school, university or firm wanted 'an ideologically unreliable young person'. Not even my very high exam grades could change anything. 30

The other 92-98 per cent of children and young people who, with their parents, had turned their backs on the church, could pursue careers in the GDR. There were very few ardent Communists among them but the State was content with comfortable yes-men seeking a quiet life. 35

Summer 2018 Paper 2E.2 question 2 exemplar answer

Chosen question number: **Question 1** ☒ **Question 2** ☒

Source 3 describes the role of the Free German Youth (FDJ) from an official point of view, and Source 4 describes the life of a Christian who ~~did not~~ was not a member of the FDJ. Both sources can be used to investigate the control of the young in the GDR, as both sources describe ~~opposing~~ opposing viewpoints around how the FDJ was used.

Source 3 comes from an official Statute document outlining the role of the FDJ. Therefore, due to the origin being an official document, the source has an agenda to promote the FDJ, showing it in a positive ~~eff~~ light. Moreover, the agenda of the document will be to explain the impact that the FDJ organisation will have on the young people and will ensure what is written can not be viewed as negative towards youth, only helping them throughout their youth years separate from schooling institutions.

The source begins by describing member-

ship to the FDJ as "voluntary". Indeed, this ~~is~~ was true, however those not part of the FDJ were limited to their career options and often failed to gain university places. Source 3 continues to explain the role of the FDJ in terms of representing "political, economic and cultural" interests. The aim of the FDJ was very much to train ~~the youth~~ the youths to become the next generation of loyal Communists, therefore the ~~was~~ political and cultural aspects of the FDJ were geared towards building socialism in the GDR. The source describes the aims of educating the youth "to become healthy persons", however, it was more to create a loyal socialist generation. ~~The~~ The FDJ is described as a group who come together "in music, song and dance". Indeed, the FDJ was popular with the majority of youth being members, and in the 1960s 1.8 million attended camps organised by the group. However, by the 1980s, most of the youth would prefer to ~~be with their~~ ~~hang out~~ go out with their friends and listen to Western music over ~~others~~

Singing socialism songs. The source ends describing how the role of the FDJ ~~was~~ is to "win over the entire youth". The SED used members of the FDJ to spy on people around their community, for example, if a person's satellite for their television was facing towards the West, the FDJ were supposed to report them. Instead of winning over the youth, the FDJ were used ~~for~~ as a tool of the government to promote a socialist life by providing activities that the youth would ~~can~~ participate in, whilst training them to be the best members of society.

Source 4 comes from an article published in a church newsletter in 2014 by a Reverend who ~~was previously~~ grew up as a Christian in the GDR. This source therefore comes from a person's perspective of what it was like growing up, rather than an official censored document.

Reverend Tasche describes ~~the~~ how he was "never a member" of the FDJ, and

did not participate in the "Jugendweihe" ceremony, which he describes as a "cunning measure". This ceremony was introduced by the FDJ as an alternative confirmation from that of the Church. A "cunning" move it was as it separated those who were ~~on the~~ following the socialism path and choosing 'man over God', and those who still followed the Church. ~~However~~ Ulbricht believed that the Church and Communism were not compatible, using the FDJ as an alternative group that the youth could follow rather than the Church. Moreover, Reverend Tasche describes how he "could not apply for higher education" and could not study what he wished, even through "requests" ~~of~~ from his parents. This highlights the way that the SED used the FDJ to boost its membership by denying those who were not part of it further education and job prospects. He describes himself as the "minority", with the majority of "92-98 percent of

children" being able to pursue ~~their~~ careers. This demonstrates the control that the FDJ had over young people as they "turned their backs on Church" in order to "pursue careers". The source finishes by describing how in the majority very few were "ardent Communists" but this did not bother the GDR as they were content with "yes-men" who did not oppose the system.

Overall Source 3 is useful to some extent as it describes the role of the FDJ from an official view, moving away from the "controlling aspects" and towards how it acted as a peaceful group for all the youth to enjoy. Source 4 is more useful as it shows how not being a member of the FDJ effects your future life chances and that the majority simply gave up the Church and conformed to what the SED in order to obtain

a career without intervention. Together both sources are useful to some extent to investigate the control of young people through the FDTJ as on one hand source 3 describes the intended role and on the other hand source 4 describes the actual role of the FDTJ and how it was used as a tool for people to conform to socialism by giving up the Church and following new socialist rule. Therefore sources 3 and 4 are useful to some extent as source 4 is more useful in describing the control that the FDTJ had over the young people.

Level 3

Notes on exemplar answer to Paper 2E.2 qu.2:

Summer 2018 Paper 2E.1 question 1 and Sources 1 and 2

Option 2E.1: Mao's China, 1949-76

Study Sources 1 and 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 How far could the historian make use of Sources 1 and 2 together to investigate the impact of the Cultural Revolution on education in China?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

Source 1: From *'New China's First Quarter Century'*, an English-language propaganda booklet, published in China, 1975. The booklet outlines the achievements of Mao's China in a variety of different economic and social areas, including education.

The revolution in education, started during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, is still going on throughout this country. What has been undertaken is the transformation of the old educational system in the light of Chairman Mao's teachings: education must serve proletarian politics and be combined with productive labour. 5

Before, students were shut up in their classrooms. They had little idea how workers and peasants worked. They had no practice in working with their hands, their heads being crammed with formulae and equations. Such students failed to meet the requirements of socialist revolution.

Now students, in the course of receiving education, make a useful contribution to society and state. More importantly, while working together with workers and peasants, the students begin to understand and draw near to the labouring people and learn how to work in their service. 10

The university enrolment system has been changed. Universities take students from among outstanding workers, peasants and soldiers with some years of practical work behind them, on recommendation by the masses and approval by local leaders. This removes the 'book-knowledge first' criterion, which has unfairly barred the labouring people and their sons and daughters from entering the universities. 15

The educational revolution has achieved notable success. The first worker-peasant-soldier students have graduated. Highly conscious politically, they have a vocational experience far above that of old university graduates. They have co-operated with factories and mines, undertaking projects before graduation. 20

Source 2: From an interview given by Xu Xinhua in 1996. Xu had been a high school student in Shanghai when the Cultural Revolution began in 1966. He was working in China as a head teacher when he was interviewed by researchers from an American university.

To me and to the rest of my generation the Cultural Revolution meant not only ten years of turmoil and personal hardship. 25

I went from school to the countryside in 1968. I wasn't given much choice. My two elder brothers had jobs in Shanghai, so that meant I would have to be a peasant. I travelled north believing that hardship is the best way to build character. 30

We students did bring some change to the countryside. You can't say we didn't contribute. I went all out in my work so that I could become a 'Model Education Youth'.

I come from a working-class family. In school I had been an average student. In 1972, universities and colleges started recruiting worker-peasant-soldier students. I thought that my best bet was to work hard so that I could get a recommendation for university. 35

I was nominated to study at university; my parents were very happy because I was the first from our family to go. I'd earned this place for myself.

I studied physics. Education then didn't stress academic excellence. But our training wasn't completely worthless. We were expected to solve many practical problems. One-third of our study time was spent in factories, working with production teams. I thought it was a good way to learn. I only wish I'd had more years of study. 40

Summer 2018 Paper 2E.1 question 1 exemplar answer

Chosen question number: **Question 1** ☒ **Question 2** ☒

These sources, when used together, are useful in revealing the impact the Cultural Revolution had on education after its most chaotic period (1966-1968) had ended. However, while there is some allusion in ~~the~~ source 2 to the impact of the Cultural Revolution on education at the height of the movement, the weight of this impact is not conveyed by either source.

These sources are useful due to the areas in each which overlap, thereby giving more validity to what they are stating. For example, both sources have a focus on the recruitment of workers, soldiers and peasants into higher education in the 1970s. Source 2 details how Xu worked hard to be nominated for one of these places and source 1 describes ~~the~~ how this new system of enrolment removed the 'barring' of the children of the 'labouring people' from

entering a higher education. This new system of enrolment displayed communist values in that it allowed education to be open to all. These sources however don't reveal why this form of enrolment was necessary. While it did indeed represent communist values it was also caused by the severe drop in the education of the population due to The Cultural Revolution. As many members of the Red Guard were secondary school age it makes sense that by 1975 (the publication year of source 1) ~~there~~ enrolment into university had to be made easier with less 'stress on academic excellence' because the majority of those enrolling missed out on education from 1966-68 when the schools were forced to shut. Therefore while these sources do reveal the impact of the Cultural Revolution on education, in particular, the necessary changes to university enrolment, ~~as~~ they do not explain why this change was necessary which in itself was the bigger impact of the Cultural Revolution on education.

This lack of detail on the negative impact of the Cultural Revolution on education can be expected from source 1 due to its nature of being propaganda. The nature of the source as propaganda implies that the negative impacts of an event will be glossed over while the more positive consequences, like the idea that 'the educational revolution has had notable success' and that the recent graduates are 'far above that of old university graduates', are likely to be emphasised or possibly exaggerated. The source's nature however does offer insight into how the government wanted its enrolment reforms to be viewed and it does display the links between the reforms and Mao's socialist agenda when it says that the changes were made 'in the light of Chairman Mao's teachings'. Therefore while this source cannot be fully trusted due to its nature as propaganda it is nonetheless useful in viewing the impacts of the Cultural Revolution because it shows

how the government sought to promote it, reforms that followed the chaotic years of said Revolution.

While these sources are limited in their expression of the more immediate impacts of the Cultural Revolution on education, Source 2 does open with an allusion to them through the phrase 'ten years of turmoil and personal hardship'.

This phrase along with Xu's subsequent development about how he 'wasn't given much choice' over his move to the countryside reveals the conditions of the Cultural Revolution and its immediate impacts. The Cultural Revolution was driven by Mao's hold on the younger generation who were unaware of his failures during the Great Leap Forward (1958-62). His instructions led to violent attacks against authority figures such as teachers and eventually ~~the~~ schools across the country shut. This impact of the Cultural Revolution meant that as many as 130 million children lost their opportunity to be educated. When the

situation was calmed by the PLA in 1958 as many as 18 million of the Red Guards were sent to the countryside in the 'Up to the Mountains and down to the villages' campaign. In these rural areas, they ~~so~~ weren't allowed access to education and their miserable lives often led to disillusionment. While these impacts to the education of millions are alluded to by Xu in his interview, the weight ~~and~~ of the impact isn't conveyed as he seems to have been one of the few that made the best of their lousy situation.

To conclude, these sources are useful in revealing the longer term impact of the Cultural Revolution on education as they both have a focus on the reformed university enrolment system. However, other than a subtle allusion in source 2, neither source reveals much on the immediate impacts of the cultural revolution which actually held more weight because they caused the disillusionment of almost an entire generation.

with MAO's regime. Therefore, these sources are only partially useful as they focus on the less immediate and less significant impacts of the Cultural Revolution on education.

Level 5

Notes on exemplar answer to Paper 2E.1 qu.1:

Paper 3: AO2 exemplars

Summer 2018 Paper 3 option 35.2 question 2 and Source 2

Option 35.2: The British experience of warfare, c1790–1918

Study Source 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2 Assess the value of the source for revealing the tactics used by the Boers and the deficiencies of the British forces in Black Week, December 1899.

Explain your answer, using the source, the information given about its origin and your own knowledge about the historical context.

Source 2: From *The Times* newspaper, 21 December 1899. The report was sent from the Chieveley military camp in Natal. It refers to the Battle of Colenso, one of the British setbacks during Black Week. *The Times* had established a reputation for the quality of its reporting of war and had sent a team of journalists to South Africa.

On 12th December at dawn, General Barton's brigade marched forward and occupied a position three miles from Colenso. There was a gentle slope down to the Tugela river and the landscape was absolutely open. The river had steep banks and there were several small hills at the top of the slopes on the far side of the river.

5

At 7.15am the British supporting artillery began their bombardment using very powerful explosives. The Boers did not respond and the British officers concluded that the Boers had realised that they could not hold the position and had retreated.

A few minutes later a single gun was fired from one of the small hills. This was a signal for the Boers to commence firing. A tremendous hail of fire began which must have come from concealed entrenchments along the line of the river. Some of our men reached the river but where they had been told they would find a crossing point, the river was seven feet deep. After the battle it was discovered that the Boers had dammed the river a little way upstream so that they could control the flow.

10

15

One of our brigades was moving some heavy naval guns forward when the firing started and our native drivers immediately ran away. The fire was intensive and our casualties were heavy.

The supply train did not arrive and our ammunition was exhausted. The order was given to pull back. The heavy guns were abandoned with no attempt to disable them.

20

In the centre, the Connaught Rangers led the attack. From the manner of their advance they might have been taking part in a training day in Britain. The country over which they advanced provided no cover. There was a long line of very thin smoke which made it impossible to pinpoint where the enemy were concealed. Our artillery were unable to target the enemy because the Boers were in a hollow.

25

At midday, General Buller ordered a general retreat. Our losses were 1,114 killed, wounded or missing.

30

The strength of the Boer position is impossible to exaggerate. They had planned an exceedingly effective defence. To hold their fire in the initial stages required great discipline. We had to attack an invisible enemy whose position could not even be fixed by the smoke from his rifle.

Summer 2018 Paper 3 option 35.2 question 2 exemplar answer

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Source two holds significant weight for revealing tactics used by the Boers in Black Week, December 1899. Source two accurately represents the effective defence, planning and reconnaissance the Boers held, giving them the ultimate upperhand. 'A single gun was fired from one of the small hills' suggests that the Boers had concealed their position from the British. 'This was a signal for the Boers to commence firing', which also suggests the Boers had accurately planned out their attack. For example, the Boers elected commandos, who knew the land very well and would aid them in reconnaissance and planning. Therefore, ^{as source 2 reveals,} the tactics used by the Boers were efficient, as they were able to conceal their position 'from one of the small hills', and ^{they} used commandos to gain knowledge of the land for battles against the enemy. ^{this suggests source two holds significant weight.} Furthermore, source two also holds ^{weight} ~~value~~ for revealing ~~the tactics used~~ how successful the tactics were that had been used at the Battle of Colenso. For instance, 'there was a long line of very thin smoke... made it impossible to

pinpoint where the enemy were concealed' suggests the Boers had further tactical success from concealing and defending their position ^{by using} 'smoke.' At the Battle of Colenso, the Boers had used smoke to aid their concealment and to draw the British into the firing line. ~~as~~ As a result, when the smoke lifted the British were ~~sur~~ surrounded by Boer guns, thus being cornered. Therefore, Boer tactics focused on concealing their position ^(using smoke or hills) to draw out the enemy in hope that they would believe the Boers had retreated. ^{due to their successful fighting} Some two yet again holds further weight for revealing Boer tactics, as it is effective in suggesting how the Boers aided their success at Colenso through brilliant concealment ^{by using smoke} and reconnaissance. On the other hand, some two holds lesser weight due to its time period of the account. For example, it only refers to the 'Battle of Colenso' which shows that the source can not account for the Boers successful tactics in ^{other battles, such as} ~~magas fontein~~ ^{where they used} ~~(such as using in cons to~~ ~~over~~ ~~the~~ alert themselves to the British arrival.) Additionally, Boer tactics

~~used by the Boers~~ began to slack at the end of black week, and some two does not account for this as it only depicts the Boers' successes. Therefore, some two holds lesser weight for revealing the tactics used by the Boers in the black week, 1999, as it is limited to the Battle of Colenso and is unable to further its expansion into the outcome of the other battles in black week (such as Ladysmith and Magesfontein.)

Some two also holds significant weight for revealing deficiencies of the British forces in Black Week 1899, some two accurately depicts the poor reconnaissance the British army had and the inadequate leadership they received. 'Some of our men reached the river but where they had been told they would find a crossing point, the river was seven feet deep.' Suggests the error in knowing the land well by British command. For example, when the men reached this river they become trapped by Boer fire as they were unable to cross ^{the river to get away} due to it being 'seven

feet deep. Therefore, a deficiency of the British force is their poor reconnaissance. They were unable to cross the river and follow their plan effectively as they did not know the land well enough to do so. This suggests Saxe has holds significant weight as it gives an insight into why British tactics were so poor at the Battle of Cocheno, highlighting their ultimate deficiency, which was reconnaissance. Similarly, Saxe has also holds further weight as it reveals the deficiencies of the British forces through ~~Baker's~~ poor leadership. ~~For example~~ 'one of our brigades were moving some heavy guns forward when the firing started and our native drivers immediately ran away' suggests that due to confusion and the poor tactic of moving 'heavy guns forward', members of the British force 'ran away'. For example, Butler (the commander) had ordered his force to move the guns down the valley, this left his troops open to fire and as a result they lost 9 of their guns to the Boers. This suggests that due to his poor leadership, ^{which was} ~~not~~ planning his

troops move ^{more} effectively. Buller left his force exposed and confused, which can also account for why they 'ran away.' Therefore, Source two holds weight for revealing deficiencies in the British force as it acknowledges the poor leadership at the Battle of Colenso, which effectively left the British vulnerable to enemy fire ~~most~~ ~~the time~~ and confused. Furthermore, Source two holds weight as it is from the 'Times Newspaper'. ~~This is~~ 'The Times' often sent out war correspondants to ~~the~~ South Africa, and they were widely accepted by commanders (such as Kitchener and Roberts) thus not being censored. Therefore, the war correspondants would be able to freely detail the war and British deficiencies to highlight the problems to the government at home, which means source two holds weight as it is likely to be accurate in its account. However, this may lead to the source being subjective, which will lessen its weight. If the reporter has an 'agenda' such as the need to portray to the British government just how bad the deficiencies were, the source could be

exaggerated and therefore not wholly accurate. ~~Also~~ Therefore, *Some two* holds lesser weight due to its subjective stance and the possible chance of omissions.

In conclusion, the value of *Some two* is very high for revealing the tactics used by the Boers and the deficiencies of the British force in Black Week 1899.

Some two shows how the Boers tactics allow them to excel and how the British force came susceptible to poor leadership.

However, I feel that *Some two* holds the most weight for revealing the Boers tactics. This is because, not only in the Battle of Colenso did their reconnaissance and planning excel, whereas British deficiencies began to change later on in Black Week when talks of new commanders (such as Kitchener and Roberts) emerged. Therefore, *Some two* is able to depict a full picture of Black Week for the Boers tactics, whereas it lacks contextual accuracy for British deficiencies improvements at the end.

Some two does only consider one Battle, ^{in Black Week} being Colenso, which needs to be taken into consideration when evaluating the events of the whole week.

Level 4

Notes on exemplar answer to Paper 35.2 qu.2:

Summer 2018 Paper 3 option 34.1 question 1 and Source 1

Option 34.1: Industrialisation and social change in Britain, 1759–1928: forging a new society

Study Source 1 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the benefits of the apprentice system for the apprentices themselves and the organisation of the system at Quarry Bank Mill.

Explain your answer, using the source, the information given about its origin and your own knowledge about the historical context.

Source 1: From Andrew Ure, *The Philosophy of Manufactures*, published 1835. Andrew Ure was one of the chief defenders of the factory system. He visited a number of factories when writing his book. Here he is describing his visit to Quarry Bank Mill.

Situated at Quarry Bank Mill is the oldest of the five establishments belonging to the great firm of Mr Greg and Sons, of Manchester, who work on one-hundredth part of all the cotton used in Great Britain. At a little distance from the factory, on a sunny slope, stands a handsome house, two stories high, built for the accommodation of the female apprentices. The female apprentices at the Quarry Bank Mill come partly from its own parish, partly from London, but mainly from the Liverpool poor-house.

5

The proprietors have engaged a man and a woman, who take care of the apprentices in every way; also a schoolmaster and a schoolmistress; and a medical practitioner. Mr Greg is in the habit of looking after the education of the boys, and Miss Greg supervises that of the girls, who are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, sewing and other domestic skills. The health of these apprentices is unequalled by that of any other class of work-people in any occupation. The medical certificate laid before the Factory Commissioners proves that deaths are only one in 150, being no more than a third of the average in Lancashire. Their ages vary from 10 to 21 years. When the girls grow up they almost always marry some of the men belonging to the factory. They often continue to work, and receive better wages than workers at other mills.

10

15

Only one or two instances have occurred in the course of 40 years, since the system was begun by Mr Greg, of any of them receiving support from the parish. The apprentices have milk-porridge for breakfast, potatoes and bacon for dinner and butcher meat on Sundays. They have bacon every day. About 550 young people of this description have passed through the mill in the course of 40 years. Mr Greg Senior says that the general state of education among the apprentices is remarkably superior to those who work on the farms. The apprentices are a good deal more fatigued and less willing to go to school after a holiday, than after the business of an ordinary day. They all attend school with regularity.

20

25

Summer 2018 Paper 3 option 34.1 question 1 exemplar answer

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Source 1 addresses both the benefits of the apprentice system for the apprentices at Quarry Bank Mill, namely their accommodation, education and general wellbeing, and also the organisation of the system at the mill. The source is therefore of great value in addressing both the benefits for apprentices and the organisation at the mill. However, the ^{author} ~~engineer~~ of the source, a historian and ~~staff~~ 'chief defender' of the factory system, is likely to portray the information in a biased fashion due to his viewpoint, and this will therefore limit the value of the source.

The source is hugely valuable for revealing the benefits of the apprentice system for apprentices ^{as it} ~~and~~ outlines how all of the basic needs of the apprentices are catered for through the paternalism of the Greg family. For example, the source states that near the factory is a two story house which serves as 'accommodation of the female apprentices'. The source then emphasises that the workers come 'partly from its own parish, partly from London, but mainly from the Liverpool poor-house'. This particular point is of significance - as a supporter of the factory system,

Andrew We wants to portray Greg's factory in the most positive light possible, therefore trying in every way to make the conditions of accommodation ^{and rest of many of his apprentices} seem suitable ~~for the apprentices~~. whilst this point made by the source may be seen to be biased due to the origins of the source, Greg's care for his apprentices are undoubted. For example, he ensured that every apprentice received an education between eight and nine o'clock at night, and as the source states, from with 'Mr Greg' for the boys and 'Miss Greg' supervising 'that of the girls'. Education wasn't merely reading, writing and arithmetic, but also included 'sewing and other domestic skills'. The source then goes on to state that health is 'inequalled by that of any other class of work-people', and whilst this is quite likely true, it could be seen to be a slightly biased argument to make, given the author of the source.

However, it is interesting to note that ~~what~~ although We mentions the brilliant health of workers at the mill, the ^{'handsome'} ~~brilliant~~ accommodation and 'superior education', the source does not ~~address~~ address in large detail the health problems that were endured by a number of apprentices. ~~but~~ It mentions that the medical certificate showed ~~less than~~ 'deaths are only one in 150', but conditions in the mill caused ~~other~~ health

problems that were unseen. ~~For example~~ This limits the source's value to some extent, as it does not address the problems faced by apprentices also. For example, there ^{other} were numerous eye, leg and hand injuries caused by dangerous moving parts, and young apprentices frequently had to climb under moving machines. In addition, fibres in the air from spinning clogged the lungs. ~~And whilst~~ there were dangerous health issues and nasty injuries, they were not deaths, and hence not reported in the medical certificate, nor the form written by J.A. Ure. As previously mentioned, this is for the reason that Ure is trying to seek further support for the factory system, and so any major dangers or drawbacks to the system are glossed over or not made a point of, so as to gain more support for his viewpoint. This consequently limits the source's value in showing how certain elements of the system didn't benefit apprentices.

The source is also valuable in revealing the organisation of the system at Quarry Bank Mill, but to a lesser extent than the benefits to apprentices. It describes how 'a man and a woman' have been given the ^{task} ~~task~~ of to 'take care of the ~~master~~ apprentices' - this suggests that the system is organised so that apprentices are consistently well looked after and loyal to their employers for that reason. Perhaps a testament

to the success of the system's organisation is the figures that Ure mentions to add further credibility to his ~~an~~ argument; the fact that the mill produces 'one-hundredth part of all the cotton used in Great Britain'. This demonstrates that the mill was experiencing great success through the organisation of the system, and especially the capitalisation on young, malleable apprentices taken from the 'Liverpool poor-house'.

The source also doesn't make much of the fact that the system of organisation was designed to achieve maximum productivity from its workers. The schemes that Clegg introduced for the supposed benefit of his workers and efficiency of the system were cleverly calculated by him - ~~providing~~ keeping all apprentices on site ensured that the system worked effectively and all of his workers were loyal to him - this being the reason that 'girls... almost always marry some of the men belonging to the factory', and 'continue to work'. The system essentially provided employees who enjoyed their work, but ensured the ongoing productivity and success of the mill. This is something again that the source is less likely to dwell on as it draws away the reason for the author's central argument. Whilst Ure ~~maintains that~~ demonstrates a system of care and personal interference through education, the system

of organisation in the mill was a calculated effort on Greg's part to increase loyalty. As the source does not credit this for being one of the reasons for the organisation of ~~the~~ the factory system at Quarry Bank Mill, the value of the source is limited by this.

It is clear that the source is incredibly valuable into revealing both the benefits & apprentices of the system and also its organisation, but it is ~~clear that~~ obvious that the source is intended to only credit the mill at Quarry Bank rather than also point up any problems within the system for apprentices. As Ure visited the mill himself, the information given is likely to be highly reliable, which undoubtedly increases the source's value, but the biased nature due to Ure's standpoint as a chief defender of the system mean that the arguments presented are largely one-sided. However, the information provided is hugely valuable and gives a brilliant insight into how apprentices were cared for, and through the personal teaching by the Clegg family, the gap between employer and employee grew narrower. It is for this reason that the source is more valuable in revealing the benefits to apprentices of the apprentice system than the organisation of the system itself.

Level 5

Notes on exemplar answer to Paper 34.1 qu.1:

Section C

Target: AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. • Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Summer 2018 Paper 3 question 5 and extracts 1 and 2

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

Question 5: In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Reagan administration's policies were an attack on the poor which increased social division?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extract 1: From Anthony S. Campagna, *The Economy in the Reagan Years: The Economic Consequences of the Reagan Administrations*, published 1994.

Inevitably, the cuts made by Reagan administrations pitted the haves against the have-nots. In their tax and spending policies, they favoured those who needed no help, and turned aside from those who did. In effect, they polarised society and began the policy of social division. Their opposition to public housing and welfare (benefiting mostly inner city blacks) was seen as racist and fuelled the black versus white chasm. Their ideas of federalism pitted states against localities, urban dwellers against suburban. Their opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment and their disregard for the needs of women, such as day-care centres that accompanied women's changing family roles, subordinated women in society. In general, their continuous criticism of welfare recipients created an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion about the non-working population from those who were employed, especially the working poor.

It is possible to overstate the case here, but there is little doubt that deep divisions were either created or made worse in the Reagan years. After all, the Reagan men were out to challenge the prevailing sentiment about the role of government in society, and it should, therefore, come as no surprise that they upset traditional habits of thinking and alienated the affected groups.

Extract 2: From George Rising, *Stuck in the Sixties: Conservatives and the Legacies of the 1960s*, published 2001.

In a presidential diary entry, Reagan denied 'trying to undo the New Deal'. What he wanted was to 'undo the Great Society*'. It was LBJ's war on poverty,' he claimed, that 'led us to our present mess.' Treasury Secretary Donald T. Regan also wanted to reduce the cost of government, stating that these programmes were 'expanding every year, and in recent years they have become swollen.' Ronald Reagan superbly capitalised on anti-welfare sentiment. Reagan maintained that he wanted to retain the New Deal's 'safety net' for the deserving poor. But he fiercely condemned those people who manipulated the welfare system. For example, he frequently retold a story about a 'welfare queen from Chicago' with '80 names, 30 addresses, and 12 Social Security cards,' whose 'tax-free income alone is over \$150,000.' Similarly, he often claimed that food stamps allowed 'some fellow ahead of you to buy T-bone steak,' while 'you were standing in the checkout line with your package of hamburger.' Reagan's blistering attacks on 'welfare queens' and government handouts skilfully exploited the politics of resentment. Such attacks inspired millions of working class white males, many of them southerners, to vote Republican, a lot of them for the first time.

*Great Society – the domestic policies of Lyndon Baines Johnson, which aimed to eradicate poverty and social injustice

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Reagan administration's policies were an attack on the disadvantaged which increased social division?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

Both sources support that the Reagan administration's policies were an attack on the disadvantaged. ~~which there~~ Reagan introduced his own economic strategy in his presidency, called 'Reaganomics'. This approach by Reagan attempted to lower taxes, increase the defence budget ~~and~~ and destroy 'Big Government'. As a result, to achieve these goals, Reagan cut the ~~rest~~ number of staff in the White House and also cut federal aid as he believed help from the government was only acceptable if at least one parent in the family was working. Therefore, it is convincing that the Reagan administration's policies were an attack on the disadvantaged which increased social division due to Reagan's presidency resulting in the gap between rich and poor widening.

Extract 1 supports that Reagan did not account for the poor as Campaigna comments



how 'in their tax and spending policies, they favoured those who needed no help, and turned aside those who did'. While Reagan did lower tax, this benefitted the rich more than the poor. This was a result of the poor people who relied on help from the government having their benefits cut due to a lack of funds to help them - it is clear how homelessness increased during Reagan's presidency.

Extract 2, from George Rising, comments how 'Reagan denied the ~~New Deal~~ but 'trying to undo the New Deal'. What he wanted was to 'undo the Great Society'. Therefore, it is evident Reagan appreciated FDR's legacy but wanted change.

Level 2

Notes on exemplar answer to Paper 1F qu.5:

Summer 2018 Paper 1G question 5 and extracts 1 and 2

Question 5: In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939 because he thought the western powers would not intervene?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

Extracts for use with Section C.

Extract 1: From Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dictatorship*, published 1971.

Poland was the last country where Hitler could claim to have legitimate grounds to revise the terms set out in the Treaty of Versailles. After the destruction of Czechoslovakia Hitler announced that the Danzig question had to be solved. Hitler did not believe that the guarantee Chamberlain had given to Poland in March 1939 had changed the European situation.

5

Hitler thought the guarantee to Poland was pure bluff. On April 28 he ended the German-Polish Non-Aggression Pact and the Anglo-German naval agreement; he now demanded a passageway through the Polish Corridor. His moves followed the same pattern as 1938, and he ordered the plans for the attack on Poland on September 1, 1939. Hitler had told his top military leaders in May that Danzig was only an excuse for further expansion. He claimed that *Lebensraum* and achieving a guaranteed food supply for Germany were his real motives.

10

Hitler had good reason to be optimistic. Even though the Western powers had begun to produce armaments on a greater scale, they still wanted appeasement.

15

Extract 2: From Gordon Craig, *Germany 1866–1945*, published 1978.

With the conclusion of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, which struck the Western capitals with the force of a thunderbolt, Hitler's preparations for the next phase of his eastern plan were complete. Had Hitler wanted to achieve his objectives by negotiation he could have done so. The Poles were now clear on the reality of their position and were eager for an arrangement. But Hitler did not want another Munich. He declined the advice of other European leaders, including that of Mussolini.

20

Ciano, the Italian Foreign Minister, asked Ribbentrop, Hitler's Foreign Minister, what Germany wanted from Poland. He was informed: 'We want war'. Ribbentrop was of course merely reflecting the thoughts of Hitler. At this point in his career no triumph seemed satisfactory to Hitler unless it involved devastating military force.

25

Hitler calculated that, if Western states intervened, it would give him the opportunity to destroy them and clear the way for the greater war against Russia that would fulfil Germany's destiny. Hitler was not surprised when the British and French governments responded to the invasion of Poland by declaring war on Germany.

30

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939 because he thought that the Western powers would not intervene?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

The main argument of extract 1 is that Hitler had invaded Poland because he did not expect that the Western powers would stand by their guarantee of Polish sovereignty. Whereas the main argument of extract 2 is that Hitler was not concerned with the Western powers' response to the invasion of Poland in 1939.

The argument of extract 1 can be found quite convincing because Britain and France "still wanted appeasement" as the public opinion in Britain at the time was to maintain peace at all costs, and this was reflected by Chamberlain who believed that peace was secured at the Munich agreement of 1938. This makes the ~~first~~ ^{view} ~~extract~~ convincing because Chamberlain's attitude made Hitler believe that he could safely invade Poland without Britain and France getting involved in the conflict. Therefore, according to extract 1, Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 because he



"did not believe that the guarantee Chamberlain had given to Poland" would be maintained by Britain and France.

This interpretation is contradicted against in extract 2, which argues that Hitler had known that Britain and France would get involved in the conflict. This interpretation can be found convincing because Germany had signed the Rome-Berlin Axis pact and the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact in 1939 in order to threaten the Western powers as he had known that they would get involved with the invasion of Poland.

Extract 1 contrasts extract 2 because Bracher argues that Hitler was confident and "optimistic" in "appeasement" whereas Craig argues that "Hitler was not surprised", which implies that Hitler was ready for war with the West. However both extracts agree that Hitler would have planned for an invasion of Poland in 1939 as "he ordered the plans for the attack on Poland" (extract 1) and that the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact meant that "Hitler's preparations for the next phase of his eastern plan were complete" (extract 2). Therefore, both extracts can be found convincing.



P 5 1 8 8 4 A 0 2 1 2 8

21

Turn over ►

However, as a counter-argument to both extracts, one could say that Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 because of domestic issues such as a stagnating economy, and the depletion of key resources. This means that Hitler invaded Poland because he had no other option at the time as Soviet Union was a threat to Germany. Therefore Hitler needed the war with Poland because it would "clear the way for the greater war with against Russia", which would have allowed Germany to replenish their resources.

To evaluate, the general view is that Hitler invaded Poland in September, 1939 because he believed that Western powers would not interfere. This is supported by Bracher who argued that Western powers wanted appeasement instead of war, and is contradicted by Craig who argued that a war with Poland was a step towards a war with the West, and to a war with Russia. Despite this, both ~~or~~ extracts are convincing to an extent, and both agree that a ~~war~~ war with Poland was planned as a stage towards greater domination over Europe. In conclusion, this discussion will argue that Hitler had



gone to war with Poland in 1939 mainly because he believed that Western powers were too weak to intervene ~~with~~ in the war, and also because Germany needed a war to obtain resources.

Level 4

Notes on exemplar answer to Paper 1G qu.5:

Level	Mark	Descriptor		
	0	No rewardable material.		
Level 1	1–8	Selects material <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited range of material has been identified for use in the enquiry and appropriately cited. Information taken from reading is mainly used illustratively and understanding of the issue in question is limited. Judgement on the question is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence, and contextual knowledge is not linked to it. Demonstrates only limited comprehension and analysis of the views in the three chosen works, selecting some material relevant to the question. Surface differences are noted as matters of information. Evaluation of the chosen works relates to their information rather than their argument, or is based on questionable assumptions. Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the enquiry. There are only limited attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision, but the work is concise. 		
		Low level 1: 1–2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.	Mid level 1: 3–5 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.	High level 1: 6–8 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.
Level 2	9–16	Attempts analysis and explanation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified and appropriately cited. Information taken from reading shows limited attempts at selection and is used mainly illustratively, but shows some understanding of the overall issue in question. A judgement on the question is given but with limited support and is related to information, rather than specific issues of interpretation. Contextual knowledge is used only to expand on matters of detail in a work or to note some aspects that are not included. Attempts analysis of views in three chosen works by comparison and description of some points within them that are relevant to the debate, but limited understanding of the reasons for differences is shown. The evaluation recognises an element of argument in the chosen works but the criteria for judgement are routine or left implicit and substantiation is limited. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the conceptual focus of the enquiry. The answer is concise and shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision. 		
		Low level 2: 9–10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.	Mid level 2: 11–13 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.	High level 2: 14–16 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.

Level	Mark	Descriptor		
Level 3	17–24	Explains analysis and attempts evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified from reading and appropriately cited. Information has been appropriately selected and deployed to show understanding of the overall issue in question. A judgement on the question is related to some key points of view encountered in reading and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation. Contextual knowledge of some issues related to the debate is shown and linked to some of the points discussed. Analyses some of the views in three chosen works by selecting and explaining some key points and indicating differences. Explanation demonstrates some understanding of the reasons for differences. Attempts are made to establish valid criteria for evaluation of some arguments in the chosen works and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry, but material lacks range or depth. The answer is concise and shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision. 		
		Low level 3: 17–18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.	Mid level 3: 19–21 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.	High level 3: 22–24 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.
Level 4	25–32	Analyses, explains and evaluates interpretations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified from reading, appropriately cited and selected and deployed with precision to demonstrate understanding of the issues under debate. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Evidence from reading is used with discrimination to sustain a judgment on the question although selection may lack balance in places. Contextual knowledge of some of the issues is integrated in the discussion of aspects of the debate. Analyses the views in the chosen works and the differences between them, explaining the issues of interpretation raised. Explanation of points of view in three chosen works demonstrates some understanding of the basis of the arguments of the authors. Valid criteria are established by which the arguments in the three chosen works can be judged and they are applied in the process of making judgements, although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated. Knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry and to meet most of its demands. The answer is concise and generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision. 		
		Low level 4: 25–26 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.	Mid level 4: 27–29 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.	High level 4: 30–32 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.

Level	Mark	Descriptor		
Level 5	33–40	Sustained analysis, explanation and evaluation of arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified from reading, appropriately cited and selected and deployed with precision to demonstrate understanding of the issues under debate. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed in a sustained evaluative argument. Material from reading is used with discrimination to sustain a considered overall judgement on the question. Contextual knowledge of the issues is fully integrated into the discussion of the debate. Analyses the views in the chosen works and the differences between them, explaining the issues of interpretation raised. Explanation of points of view and differences between them demonstrates understanding of the basis of the arguments of the authors and the nature of historical debate. Valid criteria are established by which the arguments in the three chosen works can be judged and they are applied and fully justified in the process of making judgements. Knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry, and to respond fully to its demands. The answer is concise and well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision. 		
		Low level 5: 33–34 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.	Mid level 5: 35–37 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.	High level 5: 38–40 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.

Historians have disagreed about the extent to which Adolf Hitler can be considered to have been a strong dictator in the years 1933 – 1939.

What is your view about the extent to which Adolf Hitler can be considered to have been a strong dictator in the years 1933 – 1939?

- Analyse the ways in which interpretations of the question, problem or issue differ.
- Explain the differences you have identified.
- Evaluate the arguments, indicating which you found most persuasive and explain your judgements.

Whether Adolf Hitler was a strong dictator as ruler of Nazi Germany has been a hotly debated topic between historians and political scientists for decades, starting even before 1945 when the man was still alive. Throughout the second half of the 20th century, two main schools of thought developed. The Intentionalist view, represented here by Klaus P. Fischer, places Hitler in the foreground of all aspects of governance of the Third Reich and claims he intentionally fostered conflict and confusion between other important Nazi official in order to secure his rule. In contrast, the structuralist view, represented by Martin Broszat puts forward the argument that various institutions of the Third Reich developed without Hitler's control and the power of the individuals in charge was left unchecked. Additionally, he claims that Hitler was largely secluded from affairs of state and as a result many parts of the government essentially ran as independent power bases. The historian Ian Kershaw does not fit into either of these two categories, instead he proposes an alternative view taking elements of both internationalism and structuralism to create what has come to be known as 'working towards the Fuhrer'. This states that Hitler was indeed removed from affairs of the state, he instead spoke in terms of grand designs and ambitious dreams, which his followers fanatically carried out in their attempts to interpret the Fuhrers will. In order to measure the accuracy of these interpretations, we must first define what it means to be a strong or weak dictator. We can do this by considering certain questions; was Hitler able to achieve his political aims? Was his authority ever Questioned? Were his directives ever watered down and was he unable to implement desired policy? Naturally the answers are contested by these three Historians, yet so are the interpretations of the questions themselves.

3 differing views identified. Awareness of areas of the debate demonstrated.

One element crucial to this debate are the ways Hitler's leadership style is perceived, and the level of competence assigned by the Historian in question. All three agree that Hitler's routine and work style was unusual and irregular, yet the effect this had on the Fuhrer's ability to govern is contested by the three Historians. According to Klaus Fischer, Hitler was diligent and determined despite the fact he would 'Work eccentrically, paying little attention to time and routine', he was still able to 'work with surprising discipline and tenacity'.¹ This implies that, whilst admittedly not the typical working schedule, these tendencies don't necessarily mean that Hitler was unproductive or idle, instead it is a mere personalised schedule which better fit his preferences, and may well have increased the work output of the Fuhrer. Fisher also takes the view that Hitler was able to push forward

Fischer

analysis of views

his directives, and did so in an aggressive fashion when he claims 'Hitler practised broad and sweeping leadership, unencumbered by administrative policy or precedent'² suggesting that he was someone who was able to cut through red tape and circumvent procedural normality, in an almost royal fashion. This is perhaps an apt comparison to make, as Fischer goes on to claim that Hitler preferred 'to communicate his orders in oral form, but the fact is that these orders had the force of law'.³ Broszat firmly disagrees with this interpretation, instead he claims Hitler was in fact idle and work averse, making him ineffective as a leader. Broszat states Hitler had a 'habit of rising at noon and during the day, entering his offices only for important receptions... dropping a word here and there and settling important matters in the most casual fashion'.⁴ This implies that Hitler's idleness meant he had far less control over the running of the state, a man who is being portrayed as unfit for and seemingly disinterested in the office he holds. Broszat also admits that while the Fuhrer may have personally preferred to issue spoken orders, the established machinery of government still acted on written decrees, yet these 'were often obscure in their meaning and effects and arrived through different and often unreliable middle men'⁵ suggesting that Hitler was in fact very poor at asserting his authority, since he was unable to meaningfully convert his bold words into actionable directives. Whilst Kershaw agrees that Hitler's routine had a negative impact on his effectiveness as a leader given he talks of his 'non - bureaucratic and idiosyncratic style of rule. His eccentric 'working' hours, his lengthy absences from Berlin, his impatience with the complexities of intricate problems'.⁶ Again, in Kershaw's opinion, Hitler's style of work is evidence of someone who is restless and uninterested in the affairs of his own government and is either incapable of, or unwilling to tackle complex issues. Although Kershaw does add another point, that Hitler purposefully removed himself from the workings of government so as to cultivate an 'image of a Fuhrer who seemed to stand aloof from political infighting'.⁷ This means that whilst detrimental, it wasn't disinterest like Broszat suggests, but instead a strategy to build a very particular impression of a man who laid out the grand vision and let his subordinates grapple with the details.

Contextually, a great deal of support can be found for Fischer's argument, as in some areas of governance at least, Hitler seemingly has firm control over policy. A prime example of this comes when looking at the unsigned memorandum of August 1936 laying out his vision for the four-year plan. This document, uncharacteristic of Hitler in the sense that it is a detailed, written instruction which methodically lays out the economic objectives designed to rearm Germany. Substantial expansion of domestic industrial capacity, the cutting back of imports with a view of achieving Autarky, development of substitute commodities such as artificial rubber and massive agricultural expansion are all listed as priorities. This backs up Fischer's claims that Hitler was in fact able to work with extreme tenacity when it came down to key issues which mattered the most to him. This document has very clearly defined goals and demands, it is an in depth policy directive with an absolute clear intention - to make Germany ready for war within four years. This of course goes against the views of Broszat, as Hitler can hardly be described as idle nor work shy, at least when it comes down to policies which relate to militarisation. Additionally, this matter was hardly handled in a 'most casual fashion'⁸ as Broszat stated before, but in a deadly serious manner. This was clearly not a decision made spontaneously, but instead demanded a great deal of preparation and

Context used effectively to evaluate views of Fischer + Broszat.

Supporting historian used to evaluate

evaluation. The Historian Richard Evans also casts doubt on Broszat's claims that the Fuhrer's directives were skewed by subordinates when he states 'Hitler's underlings did not have to imagine what he would want in any given situation: the principles that guided their conduct were there for all to grasp'⁹. Meaning that there had always been a clear path set out by Hitler, right from the publication of Mein Kampf to his coming to power in 1933. Evans even describes these ideas as having been 'drummed into the hearts and minds of Nazi activists'¹⁰ suggesting Hitler can't have struggled to implement his directives since they were already imbedded in every nook and cranny of the Nazi regime. The unsigned memorandum also calls into question Kershaw's view in that Hitler was impatient and struggled 'with the complexities of intricate problems'¹¹. For this is evidence showing that the Fuhrer must have taken a great deal of time and energy to formulate this document. It doesn't lay out 'broad strokes' or symbolism, it is filled with specific policy directives, many with exact target figures for production. I believe the rearmament of an industrial power is a fairly complex and intricate endeavour, and hence this memorandum makes Kershaw's view less convincing.

valid criteria used here to reach evaluative judgement

Broszat has put much more emphasis on Hitler's lifestyle, and given that his main source on this subject is Otto Dietrich who consistently paints a scathing picture of Hitler's personality

gives explanation of reasons for differences

we can now start to see why Broszat forms the view of Hitler as consistently work averse and lazy, as this is the description put forward by Dietrich in a truly scathing fashion. Yet, given Dietrich's past as a senior SS functionary and having written his accounts from prison, after being sentenced at the Nuremburg trials, it is probable that he has given an account of Hitler which attacks his character and downplays his strengths as a leader so as to denounce his own personal ties to Nazism. It is for this reason, coupled with the fact that little contextual support can be found, that I don't find Broszat's view convincing in this matter.

criteria for judgement explained

Fischer on the other hand has taken a more balanced approach and is willing to admit Hitler's eccentricity whilst still maintaining a view that he managed to work diligently and that he was certainly able to action his policies. This is of course supported significantly contextually and is again more convincing than Kershaw's arguments that Hitler wasn't capable of tackling complex issues nor wanted to in order to stay aloof of internal squabbles. Instead we have firm examples of detailed policy being laid out, hence why Fischer's view is the most convincing on this issue.

clear appreciation of conflict in views

Another factor in determining whether Hitler can be considered a strong dictator is the structure of the government. Whilst all three Historians agree that the system was fairly chaotic in nature, there are disagreements as to whether this was Hitler's intention or merely arose largely by accident. In Broszat's view, the disorder arose quite by accident. He describes government agencies as 'tending repeatedly to generate new positions having a 'direct' relationship with the Fuhrer and to encourage these in turn to strive for a separate existence, like some permanent process of cell division'¹². This suggests an environment in which new government bodies seem to appear constantly, and that this is in turn fracturing the central government into smaller and smaller pieces. To carry on the metaphor, this 'institutional mitosis' of sorts, where departments, according to Broszat seem to disintegrate, suggest an environment where trying to conduct affairs of state would be immensely difficult, and 'increasingly undermined the unity of the entire state'.¹³ Yet, a

as
understanding
the
structure
of the
debate

further implication being made, is that these new bodies actively vied with one another for control, and that internal power struggles weren't so much between individuals, as they were between institutions leading to the supposed 'disintegration of the government into a polyocracy of separate departments'¹⁴. Fischer, although admitting there were many new agencies and offices being created, believes this doesn't automatically mean that the system was a chaotic, impotent mess, instead he claims it 'was a highly bureaucratised and technologically sophisticated system and its ultimate aim was the total control of a citizen's life'.¹⁵ This rejects the idea of Broszat's model of polyocracy, and instead puts forth the argument, that whilst it may be been difficult to draw an organisation chart of the Third Reich, the government and state apparatus as whole still functioned along some core principles and had shared objectives in bringing about a totalitarian society. Fischer argues that Hitler purposefully maintained the confusing structure so as to tighten his grip over all aspects of the government; 'What Hitler clearly didn't want was a system in which complete control was lodged in any particular organisation or person except his own'.¹⁶ This suggests that Hitler feared other party members or government officials may have tried to challenge him if left to build up too great a power base. So the separating of departments and the creation of overlapping spheres of authority kept them all in check and importantly, more dependent on Hitler personally for clarification. As far as Kershaw is concerned, he acknowledges elements of both arguments when he states 'Though the chaotic structure of government was for the most part not a deliberate creation...If Hitler had wanted a different governmental structure but had been prevented from doing so...no evidence but rather every indication Hitler was content and indeed wanted to keep out of wrangles among his subordinates'.¹⁷ This suggests that, although the system wasn't of Hitler's design, he was perfectly happy with this chaos and sought to take advantage of it. He also builds upon his 'Working Towards the Fuhrer' approach by suggesting that Hitler aimed to appear above the chaos of government rather than embroiled in it.

long
quotation

about
the
text

In terms of intentions, there is evidence to support Fischer's stance, for there are indications that Hitler attempted to apply Social Darwinist principles to government. If shown to be true, it would validate Fischer's argument, as having subordinates vie with one another and then selecting the strongest means they cannot challenge Hitler, instead they rely on him to grant them their elevated status once they prove themselves victorious. When looking at the conflict between Hjalmar Schacht and Herman Goering, we see evidence such a dynamic playing out. Despite the fact spending on rearmament more than tripling from 1933 to 1936, Hitler was seemingly frustrated with the lack of progress being made by his Economics Minister. Pressure was mounting to increase munitions production, yet Schacht was hesitant, he didn't want to damage other sectors of the economy and feared dangerous levels of inflation might arise. After showing his reluctance, it's Hitler's response which provides evidence for this view, as rather than simply dismiss Schacht and replace him with Goering, the man who had promised he could build a war economy, he instead created a new office of 'Plenipotentiary of the Four Year Plan' and assigned Goering there. So, Hitler's idea to promote Goering to separate organisation, rather than just use the already established framework of the economics ministry and merely let its focus change to the Four-Year Plan first demonstrates that Hitler is clearly adding to the complexity of the

Context fully integrated in the debate.

government structure which backs up Fischer's view that it was an intentionally created system. A further implication is that Hitler wanted to test both men. Despite being displeased with Schacht and incredibly trusting of Goering he gives the former a chance to fight for his post and the latter he demands must prove himself. It could have been possible that if Schacht, not wanting to be side-lined had changed his mind, and then worked on rearming Germany and had managed to trump Goering, that Hitler's favour would change accordingly. It does seem that Hitler, although clearly more enthused with Goering's ideas still wanted resolution of conflict to determine who was the better man for the job, not just promises. This strongly supports the idea that Social Darwinism was being applied to government and hence makes Fischer's argument more convincing. This also supports Kershaw's interpretation however, as it seems to demonstrate a Machiavellian approach is being used by Hitler, in which by playing both men against each other, he not only distracts them from trying to usurp power from Hitler, but simultaneously makes them more dependent on him. They are forced to work towards the Fuhrer's will, and do so as accurately as possible, not only to please Hitler but to also outdo their opponent. Edward Peterson's work is useful here, as it provides a wider perspective when he states 'the man who does not decide - would help explain the eternal confusion of the men working for him, a literal anthill of aspiring and fearing people trying to please the 'great one'¹⁸ This quite clearly adds weight to Kershaw's interpretation, as it describes the effects of having a chaotic government structure leading to the officials climbing over each other much like ants in his analogy to please Hitler and fulfil his vision. Yet, Peterson also provides support to Broszat's interpretation which, up till now has been shown to be inaccurate when he writes 'The result was the division of domination into thousands of little empires of ambitious men, domains that were largely unchecked'¹⁹ before going on to describe the Fuhrer's will as 'largely a mirage'²⁰ This makes Broszat somewhat more convincing, as there are indeed elements of random chaos, not a strategically thought out plan of sewing confusion. Additionally, there was a degree of polyocracy as these subordinates pursued their own ambitions as well as Hitler's and the will of the Fuhrer wasn't as ironclad as Fischer makes out, instead its plausible that there was in fact some difficulty in central governance like Broszat claims.

Developing valid argument

Given that Broszat is a structuralist, his entire focus on this topic is centred around institutions and the way in which they interacted with each other and therefore we can see why he'd take the view that the Nazi government was chaotic and as a result impotent. It is an analysis of systems and the structure of institutions, not a study on the individuals and the interpersonal relationships between Hitler and his subordinates, which is what Fischer has done. Hence why we see an emphasis on Hitler's personal power and the links he has with the various individuals who head up the agencies. Both differ from Kershaw likely due to his research on this topic being based on the Marxist Historian Timothy Mason, who refutes the traditional strict intentionalist arguments and instead focuses on Hitler being the figurehead of a political and economic ideology.

in Kershaw's refs?

Overall, I find Kershaw to be the most convincing when it comes to considering the structure of the government in relation to Hitler's dictatorship. It seems the chaotic nature of the government wasn't a complete accident like Broszat claims, nor was it carefully constructed.

like Fischer claims, instead it seems it is largely the result of a sudden and uneasy fusion of Nazism into an old-school bureaucratic liberal democracy. But there are times when Hitler does strategically intervene as seen in the case of Hjalmar Schacht and Herman Goering when it would be the most beneficial to him. This opportunistic behaviour to try and gain as much power as possible through covert and indirect means is clearly Machiavellian behaviour, and it always places Hitler in the position of being the arbiter and mediator, supposedly above the petty squabbles of his underlings which he in fact engineered. Hence why Kershaw is the most convincing, it resembles the Working towards the Fuhrer hypothesis more than strict intentionalism or pure chaos.

*Criteria for judgement
level of
+ explained*

Another factor to be considered in this debate is Hitler's relationship with the Party, Government and State. Fischer claims that 'It is indisputable that the will of Hitler was never seriously challenged'²¹, which implies that there was very little bureaucratic resistance to any of the Fuhrer decrees which left the Reich chancellery (since this was the body which actually distributed the Fuhrer's will to the various departments) with the ability to clearly put across the Fuhrer's wishes and have them carried out without disturbance. Broszat on the other hand directly disagrees with this interpretation; 'since the Fuhrer failed to exercise a timely, ordered and scrupulous control and direction of Ministerial legislation and decree making, the discrepancy between theory and practice became more marked as time passed. There was no guarantee at all that what the Fuhrer allowed to go on unopposed was in fact legally the administration of the Fuhrer's will'.²² This implies that the various departments started to drift further out of step with the executive in Germany, and that rather than go on unopposed, the Fuhrer's will was in fact so vague at times that it was merely interpreted to mean whatever the department chief's felt it meant. Kershaw contributes to the argument with the view that whilst Hitler issued broad statements of intent, his involvement in actual policy decisions were few and far between, 'The conditions in which Hitler's 'will' could be implemented as government 'policy' were only in small measure fashioned by Hitler himself'²³ This is essentially, the 'working towards the Fuhrer' hypothesis, in which Hitler's words were converted into actionable and practical policy by his subordinates largely without Hitler's direct involvement.

*Fischer's
argument*

24/01

Support can be found for Broszat's argument that various government departments pursued their own agenda, regardless of the Fuhrer's orders when considering the T4 Euthanasia program, headed by the Chief of the Chancellery of the Fuhrer Philip Bouhler. It started as a father writing to Hitler in 1938 asking for his ill son to be put down, one of hundreds of requests the Fuhrer received weekly, that correspondence being handled by Bouhler who seized the opportunity to try and gain more power. He quickly got Hitler's verbal permission and quickly organised the voluntary euthanasia of 60,000 patients in cooperation with Hitler's personal physician Dr Karl Brandt. Doctor's needed authorisation before going through with this program however, authorisation which was provided by a hand written note by Hitler to Bouhler. Given that this is the only 'document' which Hitler penned, rather than an official decree and therefore the subsequent program was illegal, this gives weight to Broszat's view as it can be seen as one of Hitler's subordinates taking an initial verbal authorisation which may well have been to authorise the death of one man's son and take it upon themselves to majorly expand this initiative. However, when taking

*view
tested
with
context*

evaluation

into account the fact that the program was expanded even further and over 100,00 people were killed over the space of three years, it suggests that once again Hitler seemed at least content with the program running, otherwise it stands to reason he would have shut it down. This then also makes Kershaw's interpretation more convincing, as Bouhler's actions can be interpreted as him merely carrying out the will of the Fuhrer and Hitler once again staying out of the specific details of the policy. Contextually, Fischer's argument is the weakest in this case, although not completely inaccurate. We don't directly see anyone challenging Hitler's directives nor blatantly ignoring them, although we do find instances such as this where what constitutes the Will of the Fuhrer is unclear and is therefore moulded more by the interpretations of Hitler's subordinates rather than the man himself.

Overall, when it comes to Hitler's relationship with the party and state, I find Kershaw's view the most convincing on the matter, largely due to the fact that there is stronger contextual evidence. Hitler could have stopped the program at any time yet chose not to, hence we can infer that Bouhler was indeed Working Towards the Fuhrer and that his interpretation of Hitler's vision when it came to the euthanasia program was satisfactory. Although there is some limited contextual support for Broszat, this isn't an instance of a government official having nothing to work with and doing what they think best. Bouhler given his position, was not an isolated minister of a minor department who never saw his Fuhrer. As for Fischer, whilst it is true there aren't any clear violations of Hitler's directives, there isn't a clear top-down flow of orders from the Reich Chancellery either hence his argument holds less weight than Kershaw's.

Criteria developed to reach judgement

In conclusion, when reviewing the accuracy and backgrounds of the various historian's interpretations of whether Adolf Hitler can be considered to be a strong dictator, I find Ian Kershaw's interpretation the most convincing. This is due to the fact that he has approached the subject with a fresh, revisionist perspective and has been able to take elements of intentionalist and structuralist ideas in order to craft a more balanced picture of the realities of the Third Reich and Hitler's place within it. Whilst Fischer is very strictly intentionalist and Broszat's work is largely a reactionary piece to an outpouring of hard-line intentionalist books which preceded him and he aimed to firmly put forth another viewpoint that the Nazi State wasn't a Behemoth or well-oiled machine. Yet in doing so, both men miss aspects which Kershaw, being more flexible and with the ability to look back over all the pre-existing interpretations does not. Additionally, there is a large amount of contextual support for Kershaw's views both when it comes to the structure of the government and the relationship between Hitler, the party and state. Although Fischer arguably wins out over the leadership style of Hitler, there isn't enough contextual evidence to support his views throughout the exploration of the question and the same can be said for Broszat. In returning to the questions posed at the beginning of the piece, the means by which we must gauge these Historian's interpretations, Kershaw is undoubtedly the most convincing. He outlines how Hitler went about achieving his political aims, by inspiring others with bold visions and allowing them to fill in the details. His authority wasn't direct, but indirect, and by taking advantage of confusion he fostered and maintained his power.

*Judgement arises from previous evaluation
Sustained*

Word Count: 4095

- ¹Klaus Fischer, *Nazi Germany a New History*, London, 1996, p.298
²Ibid., p.297
³Ibid., p.296
⁴Martin Broszat, *The Hitler State*, New York, 1981, p.282
⁵Ibid., p.286
⁶Sir Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship*, London, 2015, p.99
⁷Ibid., p.100
⁸Broszat, *op. cit.*, p.282
⁹Richard J. Evans, *The Third Reich in Power*, London, 2005, p.614
¹⁰Ibid., p.614
¹¹Kershaw, *op. cit.*, p.99
¹²Broszat, *op.cit.*, p.276
¹³Ibid., p.276
¹⁴Ibid., p.286
¹⁵Fischer, *op. cit.*, p.311
¹⁶Ibid, p.320
¹⁷Kershaw, *op. cit.*, p.101
¹⁸Edward Peterson, *The limits of Hitler's power*, Princeton University Press, 1969, p.432
¹⁹Ibid., p.446
²⁰Ibid., p.446
²¹Fischer, *op. cit.*, p.296
²²Broszat, *op. cit.*, p.284
²³Kershaw, *op. cit.*, p.107

Appropriate
Citation

BP1 LS The criteria has been fully met. There is explicit evidence of a good range of material which has been effectively selected and deployed. Clear understanding of the issues in this debate. The response is evaluative throughout with a sustained focus on issues.

BP2 LS The criteria have been fully met. There is very evident contextual understanding. Context has been deployed to develop the evaluation and to reach judgements based on the testing of views + the extent to which they stand up to close scrutiny.

BP3 LS This is fully evaluative and the criteria for LS have been met. There is detail discussion and explanation of the different interpretations and an exploration of the reasons for differences. There is a very clear understanding of the nature of the debate.

BP4 L5 The criteria for judgement are developed throughout this answer. There is detailed reasoning and criteria is fully justified throughout. All the criteria are met.

BP5 L5 Knowledge is used very effectively to test the historian's views and demonstrates a real appreciation of the conceptual focus. The answer is well organised with a clear and logical structure and the argument is clear and coherent.

38/40
39

Bibliography

Broszat, Martin, *The Hitler State*, New York, 1981.

Evans, Richard J, *The Third Reich in Power*, London, 2005.

Fischer, Klaus, *Nazi Germany a New History*, London, 1996.

Kershaw, Ian, *The Nazi Dictatorship*, London, 2015.

Peterson, Edward, *The Limits of Hitler's Power*, Princeton University Press, 1969.

Historians have disagreed about the extent to which Elizabeth I actions was the main reason for the launching of the Spanish armada in the year 1588.

What is your view about the extent to which Elizabeth I actions was the reason for the launching of the Spanish armada in the year 1588?

- Analyse the ways in which interpretations of the question, problem or issues differ.
- Explain the differences you have identified.
- Evaluate the argument, indicating which you found most persuasive and explain your judgements.

The extent to which Elizabeth I's actions were the reasons for the launching of the Spanish armada in 1588 has long been disputed among many historians due to a variety of different problems and conflicts that arose between Elizabeth and Phillip and the source material the historians gained through their research. Therefore historians may put more weight on what factor compared to another. John Guy's interpretation¹ claims that it was in fact Elizabeth's actions, driven by her Privy Council pressuring her. However, Robert Hutchinson's² view puts the overall blame on Phillip II, claiming that he had always had an interest in England and with each event pushed him closer until he eventually launched the armada. G.R. Elton's interpretation³ doesn't put blame on an individual monarch but he puts the blame on religious differences between the Catholic Spain and the Protestant England.

3 different views identified

Historians disagree as to whether Elizabeth's actions caused the decline in Anglo Spanish relations. According to John Guy, due to Elizabeth's characteristic it was in fact her privy council pressuring her into decisions that culminated in war. Both Burghley and Walsingham 'urged Elizabeth to prepare for war rather than waste precious time on diplomacy'⁴. Implying that Elizabeth wanted to solve the differences through diplomatic means, however the members of her privy council were more interested in going to war with Spain. John Guy further develops his claim that the privy council was in fact the driving force behind Elizabeth's actions. He states Leicester 'confronted Elizabeth face to face and urged her to prepare for a military confrontation with Spain'⁵. Guy is suggesting

¹ Guy, J. (2003). Elizabeth, the forgotten years. Viking. Penguin books.

² Hutchinson, R. (2014). The Spanish Armada. London. phoenix

³ Elton, G.R. (1991) England under the Tudors. London. Routledge.

⁴ Guy, op. cit., p.96

⁵ Guy, op. cit., p.97

Appropriate citation

that Elizabeth didn't want war with Spain yet her privy council was urging her and pushing more of an offensive approach forward. Leicester 'begged her to unshackle Drake and let him build up a strong reserve ships'⁶. it seems that Guy's claims are suggesting that it was often a case of Elizabeth conflicting with her privy council. But despite these differences she still takes and follows the privy council's advice that consequently put England and Spain at war resulting in the launching of the armada. This interpretation is challenged by G.R. Elton. Elton believes that the launching was not the fault of Elizabeth, he in fact suggest that Elizabeth is 'constitutionally incapable of conducting war'⁷ as she continually 'displayed qualities of indecision, procrastination, variability of mind'⁸. Thus, Elizabeth doesn't have the traits needed for war, she really doesn't know much about war and therefore she has no desire to start one. Elton states that Elizabeth 'hated war and usually ready to seek her end by any other means'⁹. even when she made decisions that would imply that she desired war she would often retreat on those decisions. Elton states 'the queen managed to postpone its outbreak'¹⁰ and therefore he is suggesting that Elizabeth was not the aggressor in the armada as throughout the last 18 years of her reign she did everything she could to stop England being at war, perhaps this was down to her constant procrastination or when she was at war 'the drain on men and money went on inexorably'¹¹ and therefore why would Elizabeth want to go to war when it weakens her country both finically and militarily. Robert Hutchison interpretation adds another point to this suggesting that Elizabeth was never the aggressor; she was almost a victim of Phillip with the Spanish plan to 'capture Elizabeth alive and send her as a prisoner to the Vatican'¹² this meant Phillip saw Elizabeth as a heretic queen derived from his believes and therefore she had no rights to the throne. John Guy's claim can be supported contextually because the privy council was united in its opposition to Spain but still divided as to the measures that should be implemented. During Elizabeth's reign the so-called neutralist, led by William Cecil, Lord Burghley believed that England should build up the English defence in the preparation of a possible attack from the Spanish. But she should not take any offence actions that may provoke Phillip II to attack. These views often aligned with the views of Elizabeth and therefore often prevailed. However, in 1585, the interventionist, led by Walsingham and Leicester, gained the supremacy in the parliamentary debates. They were certain that if Parma, the governor of the Spanish Netherlands, gained absolute control over the Netherlands, the further step for Spain would be the attack England and thus meaning it was significantly important that England should intervene on behalf of the Protestant rebels pushing Elizabeth into action and thus intervening. Once Elizabeth did intervene in the Netherlands Phillip II started building the ships to the armada, thus Guy's claims seem to be very persuasive and reasonable. G.D. Ramsay work adds weight to Guy's, as

⁶ Guy, op. cit., p.97

⁷ Elton, op. cit, p.358

⁸ Elton, op. cit., p.358

⁹ Elton, op. cit., p.358

¹⁰ Elton, op. cit., p.357

¹¹ Elton, op, cit., p. 357

¹² Hutchinson, op. cit., p.40

he writes 'no doubt the first seed of trouble had been sown when Elizabeth soon after her accession, refused the hand of Phillip, reformed the English church in a moderately Protestant direction and lent help to the cause of heresy in Scotland and France.'¹³ This shows that Guy's claim that Elizabeth actions and her provoking of Phillip was the reason for the armada. Elton's view can be supported by the 'singeing of the king of Spain's beard' or Drake's pre-emptive strike on the port of Cadiz. Once Elizabeth granted Francis Drake permission to launch such an attack, she then withdrew her consent and attempted to send a message telling him such order. However, Drake received the message too late and the attack took place. Thus, this gives weight to Elton's interpretation as it supports the claim that Elizabeth was indecisive and lacked the ability to make decisions to attack this does however contradict Hutchison's view as he sees Elizabeth as a victim where this shows her as indecisive and because of this an assault took place. Elton's view gain further creditability due to the expedition of the Netherlands when Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, was appointed as the commander of the English forces and he arrived in the Netherlands in September. However, this was not successful as Elizabeth was not enthusiastic and soon got cold feet. After only six weeks she rejected the argument of the interventionists and opted once more for a realpolitik. She gave orders to Leicester to only defend the Dutch, not to attack the Spanish and she then wanted to bring Spain back to the negotiating table. Elton and Guy's view on Elizabeth may differ as Elton is an older historian that was in fact John Guy university lecturer and therefore Guy may have a much more modern view as it furthers Elton's claim that Elizabeth's characteristics led to her privy council taking control and pushing their ideas through Elizabeth. Hutchison's view can gain some substance from the Throckmorton plot. This was another attempt by Mary Queen of Scots to assert her claim to the English throne. However, she now had continental friends who were prepared to plot on her behalf. In 1583 Walsingham uncovered such plot. The Catholic duke of Guise and the Spanish ambassador Mendoza conspired to reassert Catholic control of Scotland and use it as a base for an invasion on England. This therefore supports the idea that Spain was the aggressors. This can also be used to support Elton's view as Mary queen of Scots demonstrates Elizabeth's inabilities. Mary continuously makes claims to the throne and her constant involvement in rebellion, but Elizabeth still didn't make a decision on how to handle Mary. It wasn't until the Babington plot where Mary was punished and thus executed and even then, Elizabeth didn't fully commit to her decision.

Context-
Used
to
test
views

Attempts
interior -
o each
wasn't effective

Overall the argument is fairly limited that Elizabeth actions was totally responsible for the launching of the armada as Guy argues that Elizabeth and her council almost wanted war. Both Elton and Hutchinson argue that Elizabeth actions had trivial effect on the launching of the armada. Elton claims that Elizabeth was not capable of war, she didn't want to go to war. She lacked the traits to conduct strong war effort, therefore why

differs

¹³ Ramsay, G.D. (1986). The foreign policy of Elizabeth edited by Christopher Haigh in the reign of Elizabeth I. London

would she then begin one with Spain. Though it could be argued that these traits such as procrastination and indecisiveness for further reason for the outbreak Whereas Hutchinson places more emphasis on Elizabeth being a victim of Phillip.

Attempts judgement but decision is not clear

Another factor that could be regarded as responsible for the conflict is Phillip II actions. All historians agree to some extent that Phillip had a part to play in the launching of the armada, and his aggressive tactics did nothing to allow the matter to be solved peacefully. Although, they disagree to the extent on how much Phillip can be blamed and his motives behind the attack. Hutchinson states that Phillip was a man motivated by power as he argues that the reasons behind the armada was Phillip and his 'countries burgeoning colonial interests around the globe'¹⁴. This suggests that Phillip wanted England as Spanish territory, he therefore launched the armada to overthrow Elizabeth and assert his control over England making Phillip the aggressor. This is clearly clarified by 'Parma, in his twenty-eight-page plan'¹⁵ to attack England. This gives the impression that Elizabeth could do nothing to dissuade the war diplomatically as she in fact intended; by refusing any sort of act that would antagonise Phillip and give the impression of war. This because Hutchinson suggested that Phillip and his council were already drafting plans to invade England while at the same time 'further isolating Elizabeth's realm'¹⁶, giving further confirmation that Phillip was the aggressor. Elton's interpretation agrees that Phillip was the main but the sole aggressor, though he sees the reasons behind the armada to be religion, he suggests this is because 'as the king of Spain grew older he changed from a Politician to a fanatic: the cause of the church began to dominate all his plans.'¹⁷ This meant that Phillip was driven by his religious view, thus he would become bewildered whenever he faced a situation with Elizabeth due to her Protestant beliefs, making it impossible for the conflict to be solved peacefully, unlike Hutchinson's believe that suggests that Phillip was driven by colonial interests. Both views are challenged by Guy's who that Phillip did have somewhat an aggressive nature, believes that Phillip was an opportunist and he was merely retaliating to Elizabeth. This was because many of Elizabeth's actions either demanded a retaliation or it opened doors for Phillip, 'with Mary dead, Phillip was quick to claim kingdom of England for Spain'¹⁸. This implies that the execution of Mary, gave Phillip the claim to the English. This meant that Elizabeth herself gave Phillip the legitimacy and fuel to launch the armada as with Mary death she leaves her claim to Phillip, thus it was Elizabeth supplying Phillip with the opportunity. Guy's also claims even when Elizabeth did attempt reconcile it was a poor effort as shown when 'she suggested that king Fredrick II of Denmark and Norway to mediate between her and king Phillip'¹⁹, which Phillip was obviously going to reject as 'Fredrick was a Lutheran' and therefore would be bias. Guy's

Subtle difference

difference

Context

¹⁴ Hutchinson, op. cit., p.28

¹⁵ Hutchinson, op. cit., p. 30

¹⁶ Hutchinson, op. cit., p. 28

¹⁷ Elton, op. cit., p.367

¹⁸ Guy, op. cit., p. 93

¹⁹ Guy, op. cit., p.97

Context
to
evaluate

view here could be seen to be inaccurate, as contextual evidence contradict many of his *evaluation* claims. This is because evidence suggest that Phillip began to seriously plan for an armada from a much early point even from 1583 and by December 1585 he had begun compiling plans and intelligence reports. He only couldn't turn his full attention to England until later because he was preoccupied with the Ottoman Turks, after the battle of Lepanto and his win, thus preventing ottomans from dominating the Mediterranean Sea he was free to turn his full weight on Elizabeth and concerns in the north. The reasons are therefore more complex than Phillip retaliating to Elizabeth or waiting for opportunities to arise, namely taking revenge for Mary and merely launching an attack because he now has a claim. This does support Hutchinson's view however, by validating his point that Phillip had an interest in England from a very early stage without other factors pushing him to launch the armada. Hutchinson's view can also be supported by the acquisition of Portugal in 1580. Phillips power was significantly enhanced when he added Portugal to his empire, showing he had an interest in colonial expansion. This latest addition gave Phillip control over the Portuguese navy, which now meant he had command of a sea force comparable to those of England alarming Elizabeth greatly. This was because Phillip had a powerful enough navy to compete with England. Elton's view gains weight from Philips support from the pope. In late 1586 pope Sixtus V gave his blessing to the enterprise and promised a million ducats to be paid when Spanish troops landed in England. Missionary priest William Allen also gave his wholehearted backing to the venture, calling all Catholics to rise against Elizabeth. The intervention of the pope and calling of Catholics all point to Phillip being driven by his religious faith.

Overall, when judging whether Phillip II's actions may have been responsible for the outbreak of the Spanish armada, the claim that Phillip is the main aggressor and was driven by his religious faith is convincing from Elton's perspective. This is because he believed Phillip became more of a Catholic fanatic over time, and unlike Hutchinson's view who believes Phillip was motivated by political and colonial advancements, Elton believes Phillip less of a Politician as he aged. His view can be evidenced and supported by other historians. Guy's claim that Phillip was an opportunist is somewhat believable when reviewing the event took place, but his believe that Phillip was merely retaliating to Elizabeth is highly questionable when considering the context. Hutchinson's view is fair less convincing than Elton's as it places ~~too much believe~~ that Phillip was driven by colonial expansion and Guy's view is ~~fair~~ to sympathetic of Phillip. Thus, this is implying that Philips actions played a key role in the launching of the armada and he was motivated mainly by his religious interests

Attempts
to use
evidence for
judgement

A third area to consider for the reasons for the outbreak of the armada is how much influence religion had on the launching of the armada. Some historians state that both parties were to blame and thus they were both the aggressors, however some, such as Elton place more emphasis on the point that Phillip was the main aggressor based on his Catholic belief and some believe that it was Elizabeth and her privy council couldn't help themselves intervening when the topic was to do with Protestantism, like the intervention in the Netherlands such as Guy. Elton's interpretation suggests that religious differences between Elizabeth and Phillip couldn't be ignored. Most likely

Phillip wanted to grow Catholicism and thus 'he offered himself to Pope Sixtus V as the sword of the church'²⁰, which suggests that Phillip armada was one of a holy enterprise offering himself to take on Protestant and thus Elizabeth as the defender of Catholic's. Therefore, showing Phillip motivated and offering himself to the pope which suggests religious motivations. Elton also claims that the Phillip became almost obsessed with Catholicism, he believed himself to be a defender as the faith changing from a 'Politician to a fanatic.'²¹ This implies that Phillip hatred for Protestantism grew and thus so did his for Elizabeth. Elton also claims that as he became more of a fanatic so did the threat to Elizabeth until the point where 'if Spain were to be held at bay and Protestantism was to be saved, England would have to take an open part in war'²². Suggesting that Phillip Catholic threat grew to the point where Elizabeth could no longer ignore it if she wanted Protestant belief to remain. This may be down to Elton's belief on anti-organised religion and therefore was more likely to blame the armada on religious reasons. Susan Duran work on Elizabeth I and her foreign policy is useful here as she asserts that 'Catholics could never be trusted'²³ thus gives more weight to Elton's interpretation, as it not only supports the fact of Phillip becoming a fanatic but also confirms Elton's argument of religion being the main cause. This argument is challenged by John Guy which states that Elizabeth was responsible for the outbreaks, her privy council was pressuring her in the belief of spreading Protestantism and thus challenging Phillip and Catholicism. Guy claim stated Elizabeth and her privy council were often driven by the spread of Protestants, he claims that the Protestant faith and the continuing of the religion was she was prepared to offer 'James VI, the king of Scotland something she refused to concede: the possibility of a future claim by dynastic right to the English throne'²⁴ however, this was providing 'he stayed Protestant and behaved himself'²⁵. This suggests that Elizabeth believe religion was one of up most importance to her and she was prepared to do something that at one point she previously refused to do just so James did not side with the Spanish during Elizabeth's aggressive move to launch an expedition in the Netherlands. This demonstrates that Elizabeth's and her privy councils action were always in the ideology of protecting Protestantism. Guy's view also states 'the remaining months of 1587 were wasted in fruitless haggling'²⁶ this was because Elizabeth poor effort to reconcile, as the mediator was Lutheran. This was therefore driven by religion even when Elizabeth attempted to try and solve to matter diplomatically there was still an underlining problem for both sides and therefore Elizabeth chose a mediator that was obviously going to side with her. Hutchinson believes that although Phillip was the main aggressor and he was driven by colonial explanation, religion often played a role and therefore Phillip used religion both to dampen Elizabeth's strength and to gain support from other Catholic nations which often worked for Phillip as such in the 'Treaty of

criteria for difference

unclear

An argument here but English went

repetition

²⁰ Elton, op. cit., p. 370

²¹ Elton, op. cit., p.367

²² Elton, op. cit., p. 364-365

²³ Doran, Susan (2000). Elizabeth the first and her foreign policy. London. P.32

²⁴ Guy, op. cit., p.93

²⁵ Guy, op. cit., p. 93

²⁶ Guy, op. cit., p. 97

Joinville²⁷, promising of 'support for the Catholic causes in France'²⁸. Within the treaty Phillip pledged to assist the Guise family in its plans to disinherit Navarre. The religious wars were thus revived in Spain much to Philips satisfaction since it limited the chances of French help in the Netherlands, and to Elizabeth's dismay since it meant that she could no longer rely on French intervention. However more significantly this treaty carried a Franco-Spanish alliance which created the fear of an attack from the continent. Thus, showing Phillip using the power of religion to hinder Elizabeth and gather more support and strength to launch the armada, which Hutchinson argued led to Phillip gaining enough strength to comfortably launch an attack. Elton's view can be supported contextually as Phillip was continuously sought to manipulate her own subjects against her. Consequently, diplomatic events had real impacts on Elizabeth and her realm. This is shown clearly in the arrival of Catholic priests and Jesuits with their mission to reinstall Catholicism in England. Acting upon the order of the council of Trent to reconvert the Protestant of Europe. In 1568 William Allen had set up a college in Douai, in the Netherlands. The college enjoyed the patronage and protection of Phillip II. Seminary priests arrived in England in 1574. These were particularly dangerous to Elizabeth because they were trained in the scripture so could rise to the challenge posed by Protestants. Hutchinson's can also gain credibility from this as it could be seen that Phillip was not driven by religion but he in fact used the Jesuits and the missionary priests to gain an advantage. his view can also be supported by the papal bull of excommunication. The full consequences of the bull did not become clear to Phillip of Spain as he was not fully convinced of the wisdom of issuing the excommunication showing he was not fully committed to the pope, however, the threat became very clear with Spanish involvement in the Ridolfi plot, however the credibility of how much Spain was motivated by this is limited as either Phillip or the duke of alba backed down at the very last moment for the six thousand troops didn't materialise. Guy's claims can be supported by the pacification of Ghent. The estates general of the Netherlands demanded that all foreign should be expelled from the Netherlands and their traditional liberties should be restored. Elizabeth supported these demands went as far as threatening Henry III of France if he intervened thus supporting the Netherlands more than she ever has. She interceded with the Spanish and persuaded them to accept the treaty. Thus, showing Elizabeth was prepared to even threaten France in the events the treaty of Ghent and the independents of a Protestant nation should be threatened.

Overall, it's clear that religion played a big part in the quarrel between Spain and England, with Phillip seeming to be the main aggressor. This is because, although Guy claim that Elizabeth and her privy council was the main driving force with religious motivations often surfacing, apart from the Netherlands, even then her motivations could differ from religion, contextual evidence support Hutchinson claim that Phillip used religion to gain an upper hand and Elton's claim that Phillip was driven by Catholicism. Hutchinson's interpretation can be questioned as there Phillip was a Catholic fanatic, he followed the pope enormously. Therefore, although Elton is anti-organised religion his argument seems the most convincing

²⁷ Hutchinson, op. cit., p.28

²⁸ Hutchinson op. cit., p. 28

due to his expertise of, and long experiences with primary contemporary source concerning the Tudors. This background adds more reliability to Elton's interpretation, his expertise in Tudors allows him to see how religion has been a major problem since Henry VIII.

In conclusion when reviewing the accuracy and motivations of all the historian's interpretations of the reason for the launching of the armada in the year 1588, I find Elton's view the most convincing, this is because Elton is the most universally known historian, so he has proficient knowledge of the events that took place at the time of the armada.

Although Guy research is more recent, he has chosen to underplay the religious motivations of the privy council. They were radically Protestant and therefore most decisions they made was for the Protestant course such as the intervention in Netherland, which was Similarly, to Guy, Hutchinson who, worked previously in media and therefore has a lot less expertise and research, focuses on less of the period. Hutchinson looks solely the Spanish armada and Guy looks at Elizabeth's reign, concentrating more on the end of the period, and therefore both their content may explain the differ in views and the writes are less extensively compared to Elton who looks at the whole Tudor period giving him and his book more understanding of the Tudors and Elizabeth's reign. Although Guy's and Hutchinson's have evidenced claims, not all of them can be supported, as Guy claims that Elizabeth was often persuaded by her privy council is questionable due to Elizabeth's actions in sometimes standing her ground and her stubbornness to follow anyone and Hutchinson's claim that Elizabeth was somewhat a victim of Phillip II is inaccurate as Elizabeth wasn't completely innocent throughout the quarrel, she did worsen the situation at points. Elton's claim is also more convincing than that of Guy's and Hutchinson's because Guy seems to lean on Elizabeth heavily in his work and Hutchinson leads on Phillip heavily in his, whereas Elton finds Phillip as the main aggressor, however he sees both parties responsible at points.

Words 4057

BP1 L4 - Good range of material selected and used - mostly with precision but occasional lapses. Most views discussed but lack of real depth as views regarding the Netherlands.

BP2 L4 Contextual knowledge is integrated and used to develop the analysis and to develop judgements.

BP3 L4 The views are analysed and the differences are explained. Clear that there are interpretations that can be questioned and criticised - The arguments are understood.

Bibliography

Doran, S (2000) crisis management 1568-85: Elizabeth I and foreign policy, 1558-1603. London

elton, G.R. (1991) war 1585-1603: England under the Tudors. London. Routledge

Guy, J (2003) no warrior Queen: Elizabeth and the forgotten years. Viking. Penguin books

Hutchinson, R (2014) rumours of war: the Spanish Armada. London. phoenix

Ramsey, G.D. (1981) the foreign policy of Elizabeth: reign of Elizabeth edited by Christopher Haigh. London

BP 4 L4 valid criteria are established and used to try to reach judgements - though the body of the answer as well as in the conclusion. The deployment of the criteria and judgements are partially substantiated - L4 not L5.

BP 5 L4 Knowledge is deployed to discuss the arguments. However it lacks clarity on the role of excommunication and the plots involving Mary Queen of Scots and understanding of the importance of the Netherlands is not entirely convincing. The argument is undermined in places by poor use of English.

29/40 Secure in 3 BPs, L4 entry in 2 BPs.
Best fit is mid L4 - at the upper end.