

# **A level History online event 2022 summer series feedback**

**9HI0–2203**

## **Delegate Booklet**

### **Contents**

AO1 generic mark scheme	2
Exemplar from Paper 2F qu.5	3–5
Exemplar from Paper 39 qu.9	6–12
AO2 generic mark scheme	13
Source and exemplar from Paper 36 qu.1	14–17
Source and exemplar from Paper 2G qu.2	18–26
AO3 generic mark scheme	27
Extracts and exemplar from Paper 1E qu.5	28–34

**AO1** – Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance (55%)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li> <li>Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

Option 2F.2 South Africa, 1948–94 (9HI0 2F)  
AO1 – Section B Question 5

- 5 How accurate is it to say that the Treason Trial (1956–61) was the most significant challenge faced by the anti-apartheid movement in the years 1948–61?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)

When analysing the challenges faced by the anti-apartheid movements in the years 1948–1961, it is clear to suggest that the Treason Trial was significant, but was not the only factor that enforced challenge. Anti-apartheid movements also faced challenges such as the Unlawful Organisations Act, resulting from the Sharpeville Massacre, as well as the movements into homelands.

The Treason Trial 1956–1961, occurred from the creation of the Freedom Charter where all groups came together to create a document ~~and~~ of what they believed they desire. The Treason Trial was ~~a~~ significant as all key leaders of organisations were arrested and trialled for plotting against the government. This was significant as each party was left without a leader potentially causing disenfranchisement of groups leading to less pressure being applied on the National Party to prevent apartheid. However, what made the Treason Trial less significant than other factors was that all leaders were found not guilty therefore, allowing groups to continue making their situation being less challenging. Although the duration of the trial was long it allowed groups to use the Freedom Charter as their main demonstration especially the ANC. As groups continued to progress throughout the trial it led the Treason Trial to being a less significant

factor to challenging the anti-apartheid movement as it helped ~~for~~ to raise more awareness to apartheid.

~~Howe~~ Another factor considered to be significant to challenging the anti-apartheid movement was the Unlawful Organisations Act which was implemented by the government after the Sharpeville Massacre in 1960. This would be significant when challenging the movement as it caused organisations such as the ANC and PAC to be banned causing them to work underground. This applied challenge as many groups were unable to display any form of action against the apartheid government meaning they required time to make new tactics and strategies in order to raise awareness of anti-apartheid. It was also challenging as it made any movements created by organisations punishable by law meaning potential numbers and influence would decrease if they were not careful. However, the act led to splits within groups such as the ANC making the beliefs and desires of the groups less unified meaning being anti-apartheid was being represented and demonstrated differently throughout. The Unlawful Organisations Act devalues the significance of the Treason Trial as this could be considered to be more significant.

Overall, when analysing both factors presented it is clear to see that as the years progress, the significance of the Treason Trial when challenging anti-apartheid movement

decreased due to the increasing number of implementations made by the apartheid government in order to reduce the impact of anti-apartheid movements. This is also due to no mass consequences faced from the Treason Trial when comparing to the implementation of the Unlawful Organisations Act therefore, the accuracy of the statement can only be agreed to a certain extent to the significance of the Treason Trial.

## Option 39.2 Mass media and social change in Britain, 1882–2004

### AO1 – Section C Question 9

- 9 How accurate is it to say that attitudes towards women's roles during the Second World War were the most important feature of the changing lives of British women in the years 1882–2004?

(Total for Question 9 = 20 marks)

There were some pivotal changes 1882–2004 that were important features of the changing lives of British women. ~~The~~ The mass increase and conscription of women working in 1941 was important as it proved again that they could take on different roles and be valuable assets to society. It also led to structural changes that made their lives easier. Marie Stopes' clinics provided ~~her~~ crucial health advice and help that had been inadequate before. However, neither of these developments alone ~~had~~ had a major important impact and more changes were needed to finish what they started. They did not lead to major changes <sup>long-term</sup> ~~immediately~~. Equal rights legislation in the 70s accelerated the increasing numbers of women going to university and taking up careers significantly as they removed ~~the~~ <sup>many</sup> pre-existing barriers. Therefore, these made up the most important features of the changing lives of British women 1882–2004.

Firstly, during the second world war, women took up new jobs in the millions and their proportion

in certain industries increased significantly. This was due to encouragement for volunteers originally then joined conscription in 1941. In the chemical industries, the proportion of women increased from around 14% to 33% and millions of men worked in munitions, as nurses and in factories, compared with significantly lower numbers before. This highlights a key change in attitudes because they were suddenly needed and attaining certain roles was no longer an uphill struggle for them.

Moreover, more part-time work was allowed to compensate for their role as a mother too and around 15,000 nurseries - for around one quarter of children - were established by 1945 for this reason too.

This shows that attitudes began to allow for women to take on more than one role so being a mother was no longer their sole purpose or <sup>in</sup> ~~light~~ in some cases. As a result, arguably attitudes in the war towards women led to some significant changes in their lives because now ~~what~~ was expected of them and ~~not~~ major needs had been compensated for, that had ~~not~~ restricted them before. However, these changes would have been short-lasting had it not been for other changes too. After <sup>World War One</sup> ~~that~~ for example, the 'Restoration of Services' Act undid all the similar changes that had engendered for women, so a major change in attitudes caused by the war was not enough this time. The Labour shortages afterwards maintained some of

these effects but in most cases women were displaced ~~and~~ by the returning men and had to be stay-at-home mothers throughout the 1950s and 1960s. <sup>Drabble would report in the 1960s about their</sup> ~~for the most part.~~ This shows that the war <sup>was not enough</sup> alone was not enough and did not lead to any ~~per~~ major permanent changes to women, unlike in the case of equal rights legislation in the 1970s.

Secondly, equal rights legislation in the 1970s such as the Equal Pay Act (1970), Sex Discrimination Act (1975) and some other acts to complement these in that decade cemented the progression towards equal rights with regard to work ultimately. ~~First~~ <sup>The</sup> The Equal Pay Act (1970) meant that women were no longer ~~discouraged~~ <sup>discouraged</sup> ~~prevented~~ from ~~as~~ work as much due to unfairness. ~~There is~~ Since the 1970s, female university attendance increased notably to ~~at~~ from about 15-30% in the 70s to 45% in 2004, showing the notable psychological effect of it. Also, the Sex Discrimination Act effectively removed the marriage bar. ~~So~~ <sup>to</sup> One woman who had been a welder in the Second World War but had lost her job afterwards could now apply successfully after nearly 30 years of disappointment.

More minor acts to fill loopholes in these and allow maternity leave complemented them in their two main effects to encourage more women to actively pursue careers and to provide to be less barriers in their way. The effects of this legislation were seen with a notable increase in the presence of women in full-time jobs as well such as Solicitors and Doctors. The 70s marks a notable point in these trends. However, equal rights legislation had some flaws. ~~Around~~ Employers had 5 years to prepare for checks concerning the Equal Pay Act so could effectively prevent it from working. Around 80% of complaints were upheld concerning it and a major strike at the Dagenham Ford factory occurred due to unequal pay. Consequently, it is clear that the Acts did not ~~offer~~ comprehensively allow equal rights in terms of jobs, but they clearly set a major trend. By 2004, around 30%-40% of doctors and solicitors were female, a clear increase. This made women more independent and provided them with more options in life, so pioneered their lives significantly. The effects were long-lasting and permeated many aspects of their lives, such as self-perception<sup>(reception)</sup> and education.

Finally, Marie Stopes' clinics from 1921 onwards

were also significant in changing women's lives 1882-2004. Firstly, there were only a few such clinics in the world at the time and beforehand, obscuring laws that would remain in force until around 1959 prevented mass distribution of information concerning contraception. This is important because large families confined women to the home most of the time to look after children (the average family size was around 5 in the 1910s) and it encouraged the idea that sex should be mutually fulfilling and for enjoyment - leading to the rise of companionate marriage. The first clinic was in Holloway, then more emerged across the country throughout the 1920s and 1930s such as in Leeds, Cardiff, Swansea and Sheffield. Around 10,000 women sought advice in the 1920s which increased to about 45,000 by 1945. This shows that masses of people were directly affected across a range of areas - Stokes pointed out that only around 31 in a sample of about 5000 patients here became pregnant. This shows the clinics introduced sweeping changes to many women's lives, effectively bucking previous trends. However some surveys suggested that under half of women consulted actually used contraceptive methods, such as the cervical cap afterwards. Also the women

consulted anyway were not a significant portion of the population. They numbered in the tens of thousands, not millions, and were usually middle-class whereas most women were working-class. These facts compound to show that the actual impact of the clinics, though positive and pioneering for women's (we), was limited in its extent, for only minimal numbers of women. Overall then, Marie Stopes' were not the most important feature of women's (we) 1882 to 2004 because their impact was limited and not for society as a whole, unlike with regard to equal pay legislation in the 1970s, which led to major, long-lasting changes.

Overall, three major changes occurred for women 1882-2004. Though changing attitudes towards their roles in society during the Second World War led to major changes, these were short-term and mainly reversed by later developments. Marie Stopes' clinics only affected low numbers of women in society from a certain section so were limited in their impact. Both these changes were positive and pioneering, but short-ranging in their impact.

Equal rights legislation in the 1970s can be marked as the beginning of major trends in society for masses of women so the effects of this was more ~~power~~<sup>significant</sup>, and it was also positive and pioneering.

**AO2** – Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context (20%)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

**Option 36.1 Protest, agitation and Parliamentary reform in Britain, c1780–1928**  
**AO2 – Section A Question 1 and Source 1**

- 1** Assess the value of the source for revealing the beliefs of the London Corresponding Society and the response of the government to radical reformers in 1794.

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

**(Total for Question 1 = 20 marks)**

**Source 1:** From the London Corresponding Society's account of the arrest of Thomas Hardy, published 1794. Hardy was one of the founding members of the London Corresponding Society. This account appeared in a pamphlet that was distributed free of charge.

The house of Citizen Hardy was attacked at about 6.30 on Monday morning, 12 May 1794, by a government representative who was accompanied by four or five runners\*. After arresting Hardy, they proceeded to the bedroom. On finding a considerable quantity of letters, one of the runners observed to Mrs Hardy, 'There is enough to transport him abroad, if not to hang him.'

These are the most cruel, unjust and illegal events with which Britain has been disgraced in many years. We knew that there were no circumstances that could justify any such proceedings. We were led to conclude that these outrages were only meant to provoke the public in order to give government ministers the opportunity of seizing from the people some of their remaining rights. The loss of rights that we chiefly expected was a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. It was our intention to warn our countrymen against such an attack on our rights. We trusted that the people's united efforts would have been able to rescue their country by constitutional means from the coming danger. The speed of government action has, however, prevented this.

We now see the personal freedom of every individual Briton subjected to the wickedness of the king's ministers. It has long been known by the London Corresponding Society that letters addressed to Citizen Hardy and every other active member were often opened at the post office.

It is true that we intended to call a convention. But it is a groundless lie that the purpose of this convention was to overthrow the government. The sole intent was to devise the means of achieving a complete representative body based on the principles of universal suffrage, equal representation and annual elections.

Since the arrest of Citizen Hardy, other citizens have been put in jail by the same unconstitutional means. The obvious intention of these arrests is to restrict the liberty of the press. Our enemies in government well know that they owe their power to the ignorance of the people. We can, therefore, clearly see why the government takes such outrageous steps to stop the progress of knowledge.

Our only anxiety arises from the fear that the just resentment of the treatment experienced by our imprisoned friends may incite some to move away from that peaceful conduct, which has, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, characterised the corresponding societies.

\*runners – members of the Bow Street Runners, an organisation that operated as a police force in London

## Plan

From LCS, 1794, Distributed Free

"Enough to transport him... to hang him."

"Suspension of Habeas Corpus"

"Universal suffrage, equal representation and annual elections."

"Peaceful conduct."

## Essay

~~While~~ <sup>the</sup> source is fairly useful in investigating, revealing the response of the government to radical reformers, ~~it is not~~ as well as ~~very useful~~ for investigating the beliefs of the London Corresponding Society. This can be seen from its comprehensiveness and accuracy.

One of the most useful parts of the source is ~~a~~ where it says that "On finding a ~~considerable~~ considerable quantity of letters, one of the runners observed... 'There is enough to transport him abroad, if not to hang him.' This not only shows that the

government was ready to punish those who wrote against them, but reflects the fact that they were willing to go to extreme measures to do so. This idea is further supported by the "suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act", which allowed the government to hold prisoners ~~wh~~ without a trial. However, the government rarely transported leaders of the LCS, and didn't hang them either. They were usually held without any charge for a few months and then released. Due to the provenance of the source, there is a possibility that the idea of Thomas Hardy being hung for his writings was simply an ~~ore~~ overexaggeration used to stir up sympathy for the LCS. Nevertheless, though the language used in the source is clearly used to garner support, the source ~~generally~~ is accurate when discussing the 'gagging' acts used by the government. Therefore, it is fairly useful.

The source is also quite useful in investigating the beliefs of the LCS.

~~For~~ Firstly, it outlines a number of important beliefs held by the LCS, listing "the principles of universal suffrage, equal representation and annual elections!" This clearly lists a number of the aims of the LCS, meaning that ~~those without backgra~~ there is no ~~idea~~ need for background to learn of their main goals. Furthermore, the language used further shows their beliefs such as when it says that "It was our intention to warn our countrymen against such an attack on our rights." This reflects that the London Corresponding Society believed that the government infringed on the rights of its citizens, further supporting the ideas of parliamentary reform.

In conclusion, the source is very useful for revealing the beliefs of the LCS as well as the government responses. However, when discussing government responses, it ~~shows app~~ is not fully comprehensive, potentially due to some bias, which weakens it as a source.

**Option 2G.2 Spain, 1930–78**

**AO2 – Section A Question 2 and Sources 3 & 4**

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the significance of the results of the election of February 1936 in Spain?

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

**(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)**

**Source 3:** From an article, *After the Victory. A Single Demand: The Power to Govern*, published in the Socialist Party newspaper, 18 February 1936. This article was published two days after the 1936 elections. Here the writer gives the response of the left-wing to the election result.

Victory was obtained on Sunday and, as a result, the Popular Front has successfully established its claim to be the government. No one and nothing can now stand in the way of the conclusive and overpowering consent of the people. No one – and of this we are sure – will stand in the way.

At this time, it is necessary to show great calm. We must not allow anyone to provoke those who are against us. Nothing would be more damaging to all our purposes. Our victory will make our struggle easier and will result in the absolute defeat of our enemies. 5

It is urgent that the powers of government be handed over to the Popular Front. The whole country is demanding that our most fundamental objectives be fulfilled. We demand one thing: the handing over of the powers of government. The people must now ask for a single thing: the powers of government. Power belongs to the people. No one can oppose power falling into their hands. Once the powers of government are in their hands, the people will no longer have to ask for anything. 10 15

**Source 4:** From Luis Bolin, *Spain: The Vital Years*, published 1967. Bolin was a right-wing journalist. He was responsible for arranging Franco's air flight to Morocco in July 1936. He became a member of Franco's government after the civil war. Here he is commenting on the outcome of the 1936 election in Spain.

There was no democratic justification for the triumphant excesses of the Left. Even after a good deal of manipulation, the elections of 16 February had not shown conclusive results – 4,570,000 votes for the Right, 4,356,000 for the Left, and 340,000 for the Centre. These results showed that Spain was splitting into two extremes. However, the results were enough for the Left to seize power and to appoint a Popular Front Government. 20

The Left introduced a programme that included the removal of President Zamora. This programme also placed restrictions on army officers and called for the confiscation of property and the nationalisation of banks and private industries. It included the destruction of all churches and convents and the destruction of the bourgeois class and of bourgeois newspapers. It included the creation of armed militias. This programme was a first step towards the dictatorship of the proletariat. 25

Azaña was elected as President. He was a most suitable candidate for the Presidency of such a Republic. Positions in the cabinet were allotted to the Republican Left, Republican Union and Catalan Left, all willing puppets of the Red extremists. 30

Revolt broke out in a dozen towns, and outrages were committed daily in big cities. In Madrid, a riot was caused by a ridiculous rumour that the ladies who worked for social welfare had distributed poisoned sweets to children. As a reprisal, several churches were burnt and three nuns and two other women were assaulted by an infuriated mob. 35

Given that source 3 emanates from a Socialist Party newspaper, it is therefore from the ~~likely~~ broad perspective of the Popular Front government, which is seemingly well considering their victory in the 1936 elections. Whereas, source 4 emanates ~~from~~ broadly from the right-wing's perspective given that it is from Bolin, a known right-wing associate and therefore is also well as both sources have contrasting origins, demonstrating a broad view of the significance of the election when used together. Arguably, both sources are of <sup>comparable</sup> ~~quality~~, however, a closer inspection is required.

Source 3 suggests that rightist elements and their demands were repressed and ignored ~~by~~ as a result of the election, and leftist demands and needs were championed. The source states that the election "will result in the absolute defeat of our enemies", and during the Popular Front's Government, agricultural reform was introduced which saw the nationalisation of land 'grabbed' by ~~the~~ 30,000 Extremadura peasants, who took over 3,000 farms, destroying the elite/rightist

agricultural interests and objectives, and this is one of many examples which the source alludes to, all leftist/rightist interests were <sup>many</sup> "destroyed", which included banning the rightist party the Falange in 1936. Moreover, the source ~~also~~ mentions as to how they were going to fulfil leftist interests, "The whole country is demanding that our most fundamental objectives be fulfilled". This can be seen with the <sup>many</sup> leftist reforms which were introduced as a result of the election, for example, Catalanian autonomy was restored, a known anarchist area, and therefore championing leftist interests which would not have occurred if the election results differed, proving its significance. Contextually, the source is undoubtedly partisan, originating from a left-wing newspaper, and therefore does present some issues in determining the significance of the results as it chiefly only sheds light on the positive elements of the Popular Front government, ~~and is therefore~~ ~~biased~~, as it is clearly aligned with the government politically. Moreover, it is dated only 2 days after the election, and therefore cannot demonstrate the full extent of significance regarding the elections as it is so early on and many of the events which occur that

demonstrate the significance of the election are in the latter years of the Republic. However, the source is arguably representative of leftist objections which were to come into fruition after the publication date of the source and therefore is arguably representative. However, once again its emotive tone is indicative of how the source aimed to invigorate the left following the Popular Front's victory in the election, and therefore may be too overly positive and thus misleading, especially considering that the repression of all rightist interests were not as thorough as the source suggests, for example leading Rightist Military generals like Franco championing the Right's interests was relocated to the Canaries instead of imprisoned. Therefore, in light of the source's context, the source is useful in revealing the significance of rightist demands being ignored and leftist demands being championed, however is more representative of what the left aimed to gain, not in fact what they achieved, considering the source's dating.

Source 42 ~~suggests~~ places weight on the ~~fact~~ significance of the further polarisation of Spain post-election and how the country progressed from

moderate to extreme views politically as a result of the election. Source 4 highlights how "Spain was splitting into two extremes", the results being 48% to the Popular Front and 46% to the right, demonstrating how Spain was becoming more polarised politically. This can be seen with how the source also implies a communist / far-left state, "This programme was ~~the~~ a first step towards the dictatorship of the proletariat", and considering that it was in fact Stalin who was championing the Popular Front government model, the significance of them being elected demonstrated how the left had moved further left and thus Spain had become more polarised, as they were <sup>now</sup> politically influenced by the USSR, also demonstrating how as a result of the election, Spain was drawn further in to the ideological battle between communism and fascism. Moreover, the source states how "The left introduced a programme that included the removal of President Zamora", demonstrating the significance of the election as the moderate-right Zamora was replaced by leftist Azana as President and Casares Quiroga, also a leftist, became Prime Minister.

and now both the head of state and government were further left politically, increasing Spain's moderation to going further left. Contextually, the source is useful in that it is published in 1967 and is therefore after the election majority and can therefore be more inclusive of the events post-election, however, there may be recollection issues considering it is more than 30 years after the election, and therefore may not be entirely accurate. Additionally, the source is from Spain and is therefore also partisan, ~~therefore~~ <sup>therefore</sup> an emotive and bitter tone is evoked, like "all willing puppets of the Red extremists" and therefore likely has a tendency to exaggerate. Therefore, in light of context, the source is useful in revealing as to how Spain became further polarised, however, is limited in that it ~~pre~~ post-dates the election significantly which arguably greatly affects its accuracy.

Both sources agree that growing naivety of the Spanish populace occurred as a result of the election, proving its significance. Source 3 states "power belongs to the people", and many Socialists began openly overt fighting,

particularly the Socialist vote against the Falangist JAP, which was also a result of growing polarisation, as aforementioned. Source 1 demonstrates how the significance of the leftist government returned years of renewed government anti-clericalism, as seen with "Several churches were burnt and three nuns... were assaulted by an infuriated mob". This was in fact worsened by the elected government releasing the 1934 political detainees, some without government authority, which led to LCC attacks on public buildings, demonstrating increasing violence and 250 of these attacks were on churches. Source 3 is less candid in its nature, alluding implicitly to growing political violence as a significant product of the election, as it is a Socialist newspaper and therefore will protect the Government's reputation more carefully, unlike Source 1 where Bolin is greatly opposed to the Government and is a member of the right and therefore has less to lose and more to gain in revealing the growing violence of the Spanish populace, and therefore in light of this context, both sources are

Still useful, however source 4 proves to be of more use.

To conclude, whilst both sources are useful in revealing the significance of the 1936 election results, arguably source 4 is more useful. Despite its emotive tone and dating greatly after the incident it is the most candid and is more representative as it is not 2 days after unlike source 3. Unier does not give a biased view and does not originate from a source of lesser origin, who won the election, and therefore is more critically willing to cover up the extent of the significance of the election results in February 1936.

**AO3** – Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted (25%)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li> <li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li> <li>• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li> <li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li> <li>• Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li> </ul>

**Option 1E Russia, 1917–91**

**AO3 – Section C Question 5 and Extracts 1 & 2**

- 5** In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because 'reform produced crisis' [Extract 1, line 1]?

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

(20)

**Extract 1:** From Archie Brown, *The Rise and Fall of Communism*, published 2010.

In the Soviet Union, reform produced crisis more than crisis forced reform. In 1985 neither the Soviet system nor the Soviet state were under threat. By 1989 both of them were. Gorbachev and his advisers wanted to dismantle the communist system but were strongly opposed to the breakup of the Soviet state. However, they were not prepared to sacrifice the liberalised and democratising political system in favour of the violent suppression of national separatism. 5

Perestroika achieved a great deal. Fear of the state authorities was removed, liberty was introduced, competitive elections took place, and democratic accountability emerged in the USSR. It was no coincidence that these things happened shortly before the Soviet state itself ceased to exist. The task of holding together a democratised multinational state, in which each nation could point to a long list of grievances, was far harder than preserving the Soviet Union as a highly authoritarian state. Until the mid-1980s, it had been taken for granted that every demonstration of nationalism would be stamped out ruthlessly. It was when that ceased to be the case that expectations were raised and the Soviet state was called into question. 10 15

**Extract 2:** From Lee Edwards, *The Collapse of Communism*, published 2013.

Resolving Soviet economic stagnation could only have been accomplished by tampering with the system, which carried obvious risks. It was common knowledge in the 1980s that the Soviet economy was in deep trouble. The US Central Intelligence Agency forecast virtually zero growth for the USSR. Even within the Soviet Union voices were heard calling for major changes in the way the economy was run. A heavy and unanticipated blow was the sudden drop in the price of oil, the country's leading export and main currency earner. The decline in earnings from oil forced Moscow to resort to heavy borrowing from abroad. 20 25

In addition, the Soviet government preferred to ignore the nationalist tensions within the USSR. Consequently, the Soviet leadership did nothing and things soon got out of hand. The moment the politicians of the non-Russian republics sensed that Soviet authority was wobbling, they began to clamour for national rights and independence. Gorbachev made a desperate attempt to preserve the Soviet Union by drafting a new constitutional charter granting concessions to the republics, but he was overtaken by events. 30

5. In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the USSR collapsed in 1991 because 'reform produced crisis' [Extract 1, line 1]?

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

(20)

~~Both Extract 1 and Extract 2 acknowledge that Soviet leadership was wrong in its initiating of reform. Have~~

Both Extract 1 and Extract 2 acknowledge that the counterproductive reforms initiated by Soviet leadership caused the collapse of the USSR. However, Extract 2 has a conflicting view to Extract 1 in this that Extract 2 argued that the stagnation of Brezhnev's era could only have been recovered by initiating reforms that pose risk. Extract 1, however, holds a contrasting view by claiming that 'the Soviet Union did not need reform as neither the Soviet system, nor the Soviet state was in crisis and that reforms should have never happened as they "reforms produced crisis".'

Extract 1 is correctly pointing out that in 1985, the Soviet system was not in danger. Indeed, the economy stagnated, but the

(Section C continued)

late Brezhnev era did not cause social unrest and living standards, although slowly, were improving. This was part of Brezhnev's social contract. The Communist Party exerted total control over all republics and nationalism really was not an issue. However, Extract 1 is limited to the belief that reform was unneeded. The <sup>implication</sup> of Russians in Politburo under Brezhnev, and in the army were really a problem that if not outbreak in 1985 could have ~~gone~~ to become at a later stage. In this Extract 2, ~~it~~ <sup>is</sup> incorrectly implies that reform was needed, but carried risks.

The economic stagnation and the failure of the economy to be boosted were major reasons to the ~~break~~ willingness of Gorbachev to initiate reforms, first with *Uskorenie* and thereafter with *Perestroika*.

Extract 2 therefore, blames the external factors that made Gorbachev's reforms to fail. Extract 1 holds a different interpretation by emphasizing the weaknesses of Gorbachev's reforms to as a reason for the collapse. Extract 2 concludes rightly that the

(Section C continued)

drop in oil prices was a reason for the failure of Gorbachev's reforms. By getting into more debt, the Soviet government could not fund the desired technological modernisation which was the heart of Utkovskis. On the other hand, Extract 1 correctly argues that Gorbachev's reforms were disastrous as Perestroika and Demokratsatsiya were reforms that were not influenced by external factors, it was Gorbachev's failure to foresee the disastrous consequences of his reforms. The May election of 1989 indeed resulted in more nationalist leaders gaining seats in the Parliament such as Yeltsin and Yakovlev who opposed Gorbachev's reforms and favoured independence of the republics. That was essentially within Gorbachev's control to foresee that however he was incompetent and when Extract 1 is right in saying that Gorbachev wanted to dismantle the Communist system as he introduced Glasnost and reforms to democratize the system. However he did not want to see the breakup of the Soviet state and suppressed

(Section C continued)

growing nationalism. The Tbilisi Massacre of 1989 is a good example for that. Soviet troops killed 30 people who were protesting and seeking Georgian independence. Another military intervention happened in January 1991 when Soviet troops entered Lithuania to restore order and retain Lithuania in the Union by not accepting the declaration of independence. In this sense, Extract 1 correctly identifies that some of the reforms of Gorbachev were disastrous. However, Extract 2 is also right by concluding that some of Gorbachev's reforms were due to external factors such as the global drop in oil prices which was crucial source of finance for the Soviet Union. Extract 2 also points out to some of the failures of Gorbachev such as allowing competitive election. Yeltsin was elected President of the Russian Republic in June 1991, and pursued a policy of Russian nationalism and favoured free-market economy. That did not happen earlier, but as nationalist leaders saw the erosion

(Section C continued)

of the Soviet political system they began to claim their own authority by raising the issue of nationalism. This is exactly what Extract 2 points to and the another unsuccessful reform was the establishment of the CIS in 1991, but it was evident that his reforms backfired and led to the destruction of the Soviet system. Here is where the ~~two~~ extracts intersect - the failure of Gorbachev to deal with nationalism.

In conclusion, that the USSR collapse in 1991 was due to "reform produced crisis" is well supported as both Extract 1 and Extract 2 acknowledge the disastrous handling of <sup>rising</sup> nationalism as central to the breakup of the Soviet Union. While Extract 1 believes that there was the reforms of Gorbachev and his inability of him and his colleagues to produce adequate reforms, Extract 2 <sup>argues</sup> believes that there were also external factors that were unpredictable and were the main cause for the failure of the USSR. Most importantly, Extract 2 claims that Gorbachev's reforms were necessary

(Section C continued) and but he was overtaken by events. However, both Extract 1 and Extract 2 are united in their understanding that reform produced crisis. Extract 1 puts the blame on Gorbachev's political reforms such as Glasnost and Perestroika which allowed greater freedoms in a system destined to collapse. Therefore the view is convincing that reform