



**History (Advanced Higher):
question paper**

Candidate script exemplars

Exemplar 1: Candidate script

Evaluate the usefulness of Source A as an explanation of the reasons for the February Revolution. (12 marks)

Source A is useful to a considerable extent as an explanation of the reasons for the February Revolution. It was written as a personal record of the events of the Russian Revolution and is useful as it provides quite a unique eyewitness account of the social political and economic conditions that provoked unrest in February 1917, especially in industrialised cities, providing evidence of the influence of supply shortages and dissatisfaction with the bourgeoisie and political classes. The fact it was a personal diary ensures that the opinion of the writer was his own, giving greater insight into the views of a key revolutionary still considered today to be the diarist of the revolution. It was written as revolutionary events unfolded in 1917 and published in 1922. This makes the source useful as it contains primary evidence of first-hand experiences which relate to the development of popular discontent by late February 1917, including interactions at Socialist gatherings- with the Bolshevik leaders- which highlighted the key concern with regard to the Duma and intentions of the educated classes. Source A was written by NN Sukhanov, a Russian who aligned with those on the left wing. He was a Menshevik who aimed to record the events of the revolutionary period as they unfolded. This makes the source insightful as it provides evidence of the motives that drove discontent among those further to the left of the political spectrum leading to demonstrations that unfolded to include revolutionary attitudes.

Source A mentions '*moderate socialist held that the women's street demonstrations under the slogans of "Bread!" and "Down with autocracy" were linked to the convening of the State Duma*'. This reveals both the political motives behind the revolutionary movement and collective protest of those on the left in opposition to the attitudes and plans of the Duma, and it also usefully provides insight into the socio-economic hardships that industrial workers faced, with insufficient supplies of food products and

rising costs of the living. This is supported by the fact that between 1914 and 1916 the prices of food and fuel experienced a quadruple increase whilst real wages failed to keep up, making it part of a wage price inflationary spiral which would have deeply impacted the livelihoods of the majority.

This perspective is similarly referred to by Mark Harrison when he discusses the role of government infrastructure and relative supply deficits, arguing that *“when the full extent of consumer shortages was revealed the ensuing crisis toppled the old regime”*. This implies that food shortages and social economic problems which arose as a consequence were key factors provoking a shift in political attitudes towards those against the autocratic rule of the Tsar, including a move towards support for beliefs on the left of the political spectrum, leading to worker demonstrations and revolutionary motives by February 1917. Source A additionally states, *‘Elements further to the left, including myself, spoke out at various party meetings against tying the workers’ activities with the Duma because the Bourgeois circles there had given proof enough not only of their inability to join the proletariat even against Rasputin but also of their mortal fear of utilising the strength of the proletariat in the struggle for a constitutional regime or for carrying on the war to total victory’*. This is useful as an account for leftists’ motives not only against the autocratic regime, but also against the middle social classes. This demonstrates a clear class divide in Russian society regardless of mutual dissent with Tsarist rule. The fact that the view that the working proletariat and the bourgeoisie are so far withdrawn from one another indicates the growth in the support for a belief such as Marxism - provides context about the ideological schools of thought which influenced the outbreak of revolution.

This spontaneous nature is also referred to within Source A, *‘Not one party was preparing for the great upheaval. Everyone was dreaming, ruminating, full of foreboding, feeling his way...’*. This is useful as it provides a primary source of evidence that the revolution itself was leaderless and largely

unprecedented, hinting towards the influence of social conditions and mutual hardship. Historian Chamberlin makes reference to the February Revolution's lack of premeditation and overall spontaneous nature, perhaps enabling the unforeseen success of the demonstrations.

Source A can be considered less useful in respect of Sukhanov's ideological alignment with the left, although a Menshevik. This opens the source to criticism, and perhaps bias, as it fails to acknowledge the action taken by the liberals and the Octobrists against the Tsar, forming the Provisional Committee of the State Duma as the demonstrations unfolded and advising and pressurising the Tsar into his abdication leading to the collapse of the monarchy and autocracy by 3rd March 1917.

Furthermore, Source A fails to mention a key factor leading to the February Revolution's outbreak- the military. This makes the source less useful as it fails to acknowledge the influence of the conditions endured by soldiers on the front line. By 26th February 1917, the Volinsky Regiment - following their commands to shoot armed protesters - became mutinous aligning with the workers in their demands. Without the loyalty of troops which protected the Tsar during the 1905 Revolution, his administrative power was completely vulnerable to challenge- in part leading to the mounted pressure which drove Nicholas II to resort to abdication.

Overall, this is a key source, useful and relevant for its reporting of the events within a left wing context.

907 words

Exemplar 2: Candidate script

Question 87: Evaluate the usefulness of Source B as evidence of the impact the Blitz had on Britain. (12 marks)

Source B is quite useful as evidence of the impact of the Blitz on Britain.

Source B was written by Winston Churchill who was British Prime Minister for most of the war which would make it useful about the impact of the Blitz on Britain because he was an eyewitness to the bombing of the cities in 1940-41, whose account is therefore more likely to be accurate. However, the authorship may actually make the source less useful about the impact of the Blitz as he was a politician who presided over this period who may therefore have an agenda to present the period of 1940-41 in a positive manner for self-gain, so it may contain a certain degree of bias.

Source A mentions "*these were times when... the Londoners were seen at their best*" which makes it useful about the impact of the Blitz because it suggests that the British morale was maintained and actually strengthened under the heavy bombing. AJP Taylor believes this was the case with the universal experience of being bombed bringing about a sense of social solidarity across classes. This view is supported by a primary source - a report in Portsmouth which found that people lived largely as normal and did not resent the war "there is no anti-war feeling - - - morale is high".

The source also mentions that '*the shelters and defences grew continually*' but that '*6 or 7 million people*' faced the '*very great danger*' of '*the smashing of their sewers*' which makes it useful about the impact of the Blitz because in spite of the government shelter provision the smashing of the sewer system for the large London population did indeed pose great danger. Ziegler has heavily criticised the state's civil defence measures in this regard as they failed to

adequately protect the working classes who are 10 x more likely to be killed than the upper classes. This was seen from the storming of the Dorchester hotel in London by workers who wanted access to its deep shelters (which were much safer).

However, Source A fails to mention the view of the revisionist historian Angus Calder who argues that the notion of a 'People's War' in which social solidarity was achieved is a myth contradicting Churchill's view in the source. Calder cites such evidence as the doubling of instances of rape and an increase of looting cases from 500 in September to 1600 in October 1940 to suggest that British society was divided and unsafe as a result of the Blitz which gave the perfect conditions for such crimes during raids and blackouts.

430 words

Exemplar 3: Candidate script

Question 30: Evaluate the usefulness of Source A as evidence of the reasons why some Scots supported the 1715 rebellion. (12 marks)

Source A is fairly useful as evidence of the reasons why some Scots supported the 1715 rebellion. Source A is useful as it was written in 1714. As a primary source and written during the time of frustrations arising, the information given likely reflects the social views of the time. Furthermore, Source A was written by the Privy Council. This is somewhat useful because in one way it is written by officials who have a duty to overview what is happening in Scotland. However, it is also biased as it is written by those who do not agree with the Jacobite cause. Lastly this is useful as it is a proclamation meaning that it is an official report. Source A says that those who have supported the Jacobite because they have “*complained of alleged injustices*”. This reveals that some Scots felt misrepresented and that they had to make things right. Furthermore, Source A also says that “... *One objective is to secure his unjust claim to the British throne*” and that Catholics support the cause. Indeed, at the time one of the main aims of the 1715 rebellion was to reinstate a Stuart onto the throne. As Catholics many felt unsafe and that the Will of God was being ignored by having a Protestant Monarch on the throne. Thirdly Source A says “*the Treaty of union remains entire and complete.*” This alludes to the idea that one of the main reasons some Scots supported the ‘15 was because they wanted to reverse the Treaty of Union, indeed many at the time feared England’s political control over them. However, Source A fails to mention that one of the main reasons union was passed was because England had promised to reverse restrictive acts which were hindering the growth of the Scottish economy such as the Navigation Acts. Around the time of the 1715 rebellion, the benefits of this were yet to be clear and people felt betrayed taking matters into their own hands. Indeed, Lynch says that after the union the economic impacts were little and people felt almost instant regret.

349 words

Exemplar 4: Candidate script

Question 55: How much do Sources B and C reveal about differing interpretations of the nature of the Nazi Party consolidation of power between 1933 and 1934? (16 marks)

Sources B and C reveal differing interpretations of the reasons for the Nazi consolidation of power.

Source B says *“within one brief paragraph, the personal liberties enshrined in the Weimar Constitution were suspended indefinitely”* contends that the Reichstag Fire Decree allowed the Nazis to consolidate power by halting the Communists personal liberties and by locking them up. Source B also considers important the view that *“the autonomy of the Lander was overridden by the right of the Reich government to intervene to restore order”*. This shows that the government was able to suspend the input of the German states and almost govern as a dictatorship which Hitler wanted - allowed Hitler and in NSDAP to consolidate power

Source C states *“Although the killings of 30 June were clearly illegal on any reading of the law, approval of Hitler’s actions was almost universal”* this shows that Hitler and the NSDAP managed to consolidate power by killing the leaders of the SA to make sure there was no one to oppose them - showed Nazi’s brutality as a reason for consolidation of power . Historian Dick Geary believes The Night of the Long Knives helped the NSDAP consolidate power as it showed the Nazi State *“would brook no opposition”*.

Source C has the view that *“Hitler protected the law from the gravest abuse by acting in times of danger and as Führer making law directly”*, this shows Source C believes the Nazis consolidated power through the Enabling Act as it allowed Hitler to make laws without using the Reichstag, acting as a dictator. Historian Evans believes the Enabling Act

helped the Nazis and Hitler consolidate power when he says “together with the Reichstag Fire Decree it provided the legal pretext for the creation of a dictatorship”, showing that Hitler consolidated power by making Germany a dictatorship.

However, the sources fail to mention that the Nazis consolidated power by is a process of Gleichaltung which was for the coordination of the government taking over all aspects of life. The source fails to mention the Nazis consolidated their power by signing a concordat with the Vatican which made sure the Catholic Church didn't interfere with politics - decreasing opposition. The source also fails to see that the Nazis consolidated their power by making it illegal to form or support political parties, this helped as it made Germany a one-party state with no legal opposition. Another thing the source omits is that the Nazis consolidated power by taking control of all forms of media in Germany, this made Germany a totalitarian state meaning the NSDAP controlled what the public saw. The source omits the fact that the Nazis consolidated power in 1933-34 by the use of propaganda, this helped as it was used to target people patriotism and convince them that Nazis were the saviours of Germany. However, Historian Noakes believes that propaganda is overstressed as a reason for Nazi success believing it wasn't actually that successful.

The source also fails to mention that the Nazis consolidated power through terror and violence by striking fear into possible opposition. The source also fails to mention that the NSDAP consolidated power by the Gestapo, these were the secret police - struck fear into people as they didn't know who they were caused people to go with the Nazi flow. The source also omits the fact that the SA helped Nazis consolidate power as they were the bully boys who violently beat opposition and forced people to support Nazis. The source also fails to mention some trade union leaders helped the NSDAP to consolidate power as they would

Advanced Higher History question paper exemplar 4: candidate script

report to the Nazis if anyone opposed Hitler or his party - caused people not to oppose the government.

614 words

Exemplar 5: Candidate script

Question 62: How much do Sources A and B reveal about differing interpretations of the reasons for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism prior to 1939? (16 marks)

Source A reveals that one reason for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism prior to 1939 was that Dutch leaders set up Afrikaner schools to “*revive Afrikaner morale and teach the tenets of Calvinism*”. The church setting up Afrikaner schools resulted in the growth of Afrikaner nationalism because from a young age children were inculcated with nationalist beliefs. Source A also believes that a reason for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism before 1939 was the influence of the Dutch reformed Church in increasing nationalism as shown by the source saying *that “the DRC again began its intensive agitation for Christian national education”* showing the influence of the church in promoting these views. Source A also shows another reason for the rise of Afrikaner nationalism being the “*language issue*” where Afrikaner nationalism increased in order to promote Afrikaans over Dutch and English. For instance, there was significant Afrikaner backlash after the Constitution of 1910 made Dutch and English the national languages instead of Afrikaans.

Source B reveals other important reasons for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism. Source B reveals that one of the reasons for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism was the growth of the Broederbond in 1918. The Broederbond was a cultural organisation which was designed to increase the presence of Afrikaner nationalism in public life and had a wide scope in creating organisations to promote Afrikaner nationalism. For instance, the Broederbond created the Voortrekkers to encourage Afrikaner nationalism within the children. In fact, historian Serfontein argues the Broederbond with their nationalism had a conspiracy to take over the state. The source reveals that another reason for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism was the Broederbond creation of the FAK which brought the Afrikaner nationalism and the Broederbond to a “*much wider audience*” through its creation of events and organisations. For instance, the FAK

created the Institute for Christian national education which resulted in 1/3 of teachers being Broederbond members. The source also mentions that another reason for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism was the Broederbond creation of Ekonomiese Volkskongress in 1939 which shifted the Broederbond to use nationalism to influence economics. The economics institute created by the Broederbond would garner support for nationalists due to support for the economic organisations that would improve standards of living.

However collectively both sources A and B failed to mention some other contributing factors to the growth of Afrikaner and nationalism. One reason for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism was the creation of the Ossewa Brandweg in 1938 which was a cultural organisation to promote Afrikaner nationalism. Furthermore, another omission was the creation of the first Afrikaner Bible in 1933 emphasising strong Christianity and the importance of Afrikaner language. Giliomee argues that cultural organisations and churches were essentially building a nation out of words. The sources failed to mention that another cause for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism before 1939 was the decision of South Africa to fight in World War I which resulted in an Afrikaner rebellion. It resulted in a growth of nationalism and backlash after the SAP killed 190 Afrikaner rebels. The source fails to mention that another reason for the growth of Afrikaner nationalism was the acceptance of the Balfour Declaration in 1926 by Hertzog. Another factor both sources failed to mention as a factor causing the growth of Afrikaner nationalism before 1939 was the creation of the Purified National Party in 1933 by DF Malan as it further emphasised hard-line Afrikaner views.

571 words

Exemplar 6: Candidate script

Advanced Higher History: essay structure – introduction

To what extent was Stalin's rise to power due to his opponents' weaknesses?

Following the death of V.I. Lenin in January 1924, a major question over Communist Party leadership arose. His final Testament, intended for the Party Congress, failed to deliver a clear message regarding who should succeed him. He scrutinised a number of contenders, yet, as Isaac Deutscher contends, the entire document “*breathed uncertainty*”.¹ Following competition for power across the party spectrum, the unforeseen result was Stalin's rise to leadership over his competitors who failed to recognise the power of his role as General Secretary and his membership of the Orgburo and Secretariat. The reasons underpinning Stalin's rise to power are subject to historical debate. Historians including Chris Ward argue that his authority was due to the flexibility of his policy which won him broader support in the long run.² By contrast, Michael Lynch attributes Stalin's rise to power to Trotsky's own weaknesses and his reluctance to compete.³ This essay will explore the weaknesses of the opposition, Stalin's own strengths, policy and the party's nature were contributory factors to Stalin's eventual leadership. Although his opponents' weaknesses made a considerable contribution, this essay will argue that the Communist Party's organisation played the most pivotal role in Stalin's rise to power.

Exemplar 7: Candidate script

Advanced Higher History: essay structure – introduction and conclusion

To what extent was Stalin's rise to power due to his opponents' weaknesses?

Lenin's death in 1924 created a void in the Bolshevik party which could only possibly be filled by a select few men, all of whom had their own individual strengths and weaknesses. The emergence of Stalin as sole leader of the USSR is often attributed to these weaknesses of his opponents, with Historians such as Robert Service arguing that Stalin rose to power as a result of, "*Trotsky's failure to attack*". However, this argument disregards key factors in the leadership struggle such as Stalin's central role in the 'party machine', as well as the structure at the time of the party itself, as this gave Stalin the ability to promote his supporters into positions of power and demote anyone who opposed him. Furthermore, luck played a significant role in Stalin's rise to power as had Lenin, Sverdlov and Dzerzhinsky not died when they did, Stalin may not have had the opportunity to progress the ranks of the party in the way that he did. It can also be argued that it was Stalin's personality and opportunistic nature which aided his rise to power as this allowed him to fully take advantage of the unique situation, he was in. However, historian Ian Thatcher believes that Stalin rose to power as he was the true heir of Lenin, stating that Stalin's victory was, "*not so much of a mystery, as a natural outcome*" as parallels can be clearly drawn between the policies and ideologies of both Stalin and Lenin. This essay will argue that while personalities were important it was in fact the Party machine which allowed Stalin to emerge as leader.

Conclusion

To conclude, the weaknesses of Stalin's opponents, especially Trotsky, were extremely important in assisting Stalin's rise to power as although they were perhaps technically superior politicians, they lacked then mediatory skills needed

to be successful. Stalin's friendly and agreeable personality was also key in allowing him to blend into the background and avoid being seen as a threat by his opponents. However, it was Stalin's role within the party machine which crucially allowed him to gain power as it allowed Stalin control of the Lenin Enrolment. This, as historian Carr states, allowed the party to grow, "*from the elite party of Lenin to the mass party of Stalin*", demonstrating that Stalin's influence over the party, in particular enrolment, was the most important factor contributing to his rise to power.