

The 'How Fully...' question

12 marks

The 'How fully does [Source] explain [event]?'

What is it asking?

Asking candidates to contextualise a source and establish a judgement of the overall value of the source.

Candidates should

- ◆ **interpret** the main views of the source
- ◆ identify and explain the immediate and **wider factors** necessary to provide a full explanation of the events the question is focused on.
- ◆ include relevant **historiography**

How fully does [source] explain...?

Judgement (which should be quantitative)

Source B reveals... to some extent/ a lot about/ not very much about

Interpretation (I) 3 marks

- 1
- 2
- 3

Wider contextual development (WCD) 7 marks

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

Historians' Views (H) 2 marks

- 1
- 2

Germany: From Democracy to Dictatorship, 1918-1939

SOURCE A from *Recollections of the German Revolution of 1919* by Arnold Brecht (1970)

A military army of Spartacists would have inevitably led to the establishment of a Communist system in Germany, and it was this that Ebert and Scheidemann wanted to avoid. They were convinced opponents of such a system, in the interests both of the working classes and their own ideals of freedom and justice. By far the largest section of the working classes was behind them in this and certainly had no reason to feel that they were betrayed by them. A moderate revolution is far more difficult to carry through than one which is radical, extremist and determined to use any methods to achieve its ends . . . Ebert and the Social Democrats acted in accordance with their beliefs and the upright desire to put Germany and the German people back on their feet after a dreadful defeat; they did this to the best of their knowledge and belief.

How fully does **Source A** explain the reasons for the **suppression** of the Spartacist Revolt in January 1919?

12

Example of: Judgement/Introductory sentence

Source A explains the reasons for the suppression of the Spartacist revolt to some extent.

Example of: Interpretation (Content)

(1)

The source says that the success of Spartacism would have meant the establishment of a Communist system, which Ebert and Scheidemann wanted to avoid. **This was a key reason for the suppression of the Spartacist Revolt because** Ebert hated Bolshevism and had seen what had happened in Russia and knew that most Germans feared Bolshevism. (I)

Interpretation (Content)

(2)

The source also says that Ebert and the SPD had the largest section of the working classes behind them. **This was a reason for the suppression of the Spartacists because** Ebert was confident that he would have popular support. (I)

Interpretation (Content)

(3)

Furthermore the source says Ebert and the SPD believed that suppressing the Spartacists would help put the German people back on their feet. **This shows that one of the reasons the Spartacists were suppressed was because they were causing unrest and therefore instability.**(I)

Example of: Wider Contextual Development

(1)

The Spartacist Revolt took place in January 1919 and placed the regime under a lot of pressure. Ebert tended to exaggerate the size of the threat, **which was one reason he wanted the Spartacists to be suppressed (because he feared the spread of their influence).** (W)

Wider Contextual Development

(2)

The Spartacists were suppressed by the **Army with assistance from the Freikorps. This explains why the Spartacists were suppressed so brutally.** The Army and the Freikorps were ultra-nationalist and hated Bolshevism.

(W)

Wider Contextual Development

(3)

That Ebert was able to crush Spartacism so easily in Jan 1919 was partly because on 10 November 1918 he had made a pact over the telephone with the Head of the Army, Groener, in which he agreed not to reform the officer corps in return for getting the promise that the army would support the republic. (W)

Wider Contextual Development

(4)

Luxembourg and Liebknecht disagreed about the timing of a Bolshevik revolution but Luxembourg went along the Liebknecht **which meant that the Spartacists were indeed not organised or strong enough to challenge the new regime and so were crushed.** (W)

Wider Contextual Development

(5)

Ebert was keen to secure the support of the old elite and so crushing Spartacism would be a clear demonstration to the old elite that he would not tolerate disruption caused by the extreme left. (W)

Wider Contextual Development

(6)

Furthermore, **Ebert had scheduled democratic elections for January 1919 and he did not want that democratic process to be disrupted** by the Spartacists and so ordered the suppression of their revolt. (W)

Wider Contextual Development

(6)

Ebert was also terrified of the prospect of civil war in Germany. He saw what was happening in Russia where the country had descended into chaos, bloodshed on a massive scale, and did not want this to happen in Germany. (W)

Wider Contextual Development

(7)

Ebert was also terrified of the prospect of civil war in Germany. He saw what was happening in Russia where the country had descended into chaos, bloodshed on a massive scale, and did not want this to happen in Germany. (W)

Example of: Historians' views

(1)

Evans argued that Ebert crushed the Spartacists because he (Ebert) hated Communism and so would not tolerate it.

(H)

Historians' views

(2)

Carr argues that Ebert crushed the Spartacists because they were a clear challenge to the authority of the government and so he thought prompt action needed to be taken. (H)

Russia: From Tsarism to Stalinism, 1914-1945

(2)

SOURCE C from Kamenev's notes of his discussion with Bukharin, 11 July 1928

We feel that Stalin's line is disastrous for the whole revolution. We could be overthrown on account of it. Rykov, Tomsky and I are unanimous in formulating the situation thus: "It would be much better if Zinoviev and Kamenev were in the Politburo instead of Stalin." I spoke with Rykov and Tomsky about this quite frankly. I have not spoken with Stalin in several weeks. He is an intriguer, with no principles. He subordinates everything to the preservation of power. He changes his theory according to whom he needs to get rid of. In our arguments with him (we) reached the point of saying, "false", "you lie". Now he has made concessions, so that he can cut our throats . . . We have no colonies, we can get no loans, and therefore we must rely on the peasants. You must understand that this is just what Preobrazhensky's theory is; the more socialism grows the greater will be the resistance. This is idiotic illiteracy. Self-criticism should not apply to the leadership, but only to those who carry out orders.

2. How fully does Source C explain the **strategies** used by Stalin in his rise to power in the 1920s?

(Adapted from 2012 QP)



Example of: Judgement/Introductory sentence

Source C explains the strategies used by Stalin in his rise to power in the 1920s to an extent.

Example of: Interpretation (Content)

For example, Source C mentions that Stalin “changes his theory according to whom he needs to get rid of” **showing that** Stalin was able to rise to power by changing his views as a strategy to isolate his rivals. (I) This can be seen to be true as Stalin firstly voiced his disagreement with NEP introduced under Lenin in an attempt to side with the left wing Bolsheviks, Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev before swiftly altering his views in order to side with Bukharin in condoning NEP, thus isolating his more left wing political rivals.(WCD)

Example of: Wider Contextual Development

However, Source C doesn't fully explain the strategies used by Stalin in his rise to power in the 1920s. For example, Source C fails to mention anything about the manner in which Stalin failed to publish Lenin's Testament which included views of Stalin that did not feature positively, as Lenin was afraid of the way in which Stalin might use power. The failure to publish Lenin's will proved to be a significant bonus to Stalin as it ensured that the Bolsheviks and the Russian public were not made aware of Lenin's views of Stalin.(WCD)

Example of: Wider Contextual Development and Historians' views

Again Source C fails to mention some of the tactics used by Stalin in the immediate aftermath of Lenin's death and specifically at his funeral, as it doesn't state that Stalin acted as a pallbearer carrying Lenin's coffin and that he gave an emotional and dramatic speech in which he appeared to be taking on the mantle of Leninism and to reduce the threat posed by Trotsky who was the more logical heir to the leadership of the Party. (WCD) This can be backed up, as E.H Carr states that Stalin embarked upon a "consecration of a specific cult of Leninism" in an attempt to appear as the next leader of the Party. (H)

Example of: Summary sentence

Overall although Source C explains some of the strategies used by Stalin in his rise to power it fails to mention many other strategies he used such as having Zinoviev, Trotsky and Kamenev removed from the Politburo.