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INTRODUCTION

This is a collection of exemplar scripts from the 2015 examination of GCSE History B Modern World (J418).

For Paper 1, (units A011-A017), examples have been provided per question showing a high mark and a mid or low mark response.

For paper 2, (units A021 and A022), five examples of each question have been provided, showing a range of marks for each question.

We hope these examples are useful for you in informing future teaching and learning for this specification.

If you have any questions around these scripts, please contact the OCR History team at history@ocr.org.uk.

Please note that the last year of examination for this specification (J418) will be June 2017. You can find details of our new GCSE (9-1) in History A (Explaining the Modern World) here: http://ocr.org.uk/qualifications/gcse-history-a-explaining-the-modern-world-j410-from-2016/.
Response A – 7/7

The message of the cartoonist was that he believed that war was greater and more influential than the League and so their efforts to bring about peace were futile. The cartoonist is critical of the League and believed that war is one of its new influences; as shown by the giant figure of war at the head of the table.

At the time, an Italian advisor general had been killed in Greece and Mussolini had demanded that the League act to reprimand the Greeks. When they refused, he sent planes to bomb the island of Corfu and 15 people there were killed. The League was forced to condemn Greece and make them pay reparations to Italy. This showed that it was impossible for the League to control its member states. If they did not cooperate. The League had been enjoying some humanitarian and border disputes success and what they believed to be steps towards peace at the time, but this started to appear impossible, as is shown in the cartoon by the War’s sword laying on top of their peace plan. Mussolini looks smug, sitting by the war figure, and this shows that the League had no real control over its member states as it had no army or way of enforcing its decisions and was therefore easily influenced. The other leaders sitting around all seem incredibly drawn to ‘war’; looking at him intently, which shows that a threat of war was always apparent at the time.

Response B – 3/7

The message of the cartoon illustrates the league negotiating what to do after the Corfu crisis. I can see this because the document “peace plans” is sat next to a giant named “war”, exemplifying how the league wanted to avoid it. I know this because in 1923 Mussolin, the Italin fascist, invaded Corfu after the death of the Italian diplomat and demanded an apology and money. From this the league took action and upheld the peace – as it was one of it’s aims. Although, they did nothing when Mussolini overturned the ruling and ended up getting the money and apology.
Explain why the League of Nations had some successes in the 1920s.

Response A – 8/8
The League had some successes in the 1920s because smaller states were more willing to accept the league’s decision. For example, when both Poland and Germany wanted to take control of Upper Silesia in 1921. The League held a successful plebiscite and it was found that the industrial areas wanted Germany but the rural areas were in support of Poland. As a result, the League split the industrial region in two and war was avoided. Furthermore, many countries did not want any hostility after World War One, they did not want to see the carnage of the war again so were happy to accept the League’s ruling. For example, when Finland and Sweden wanted control of Aaland Islands and it was concluded that it should be given to Finland and Sweden accepted. Another success was in Bulgaria, 1925 when some Greek soldiers were killed by Bulgarian troops. As a result Greece demanded compensation and invaded Bulgaria but was forced to back down by the League and they abided by the League’s decision.

Response B – 6/8
The League of Nations had some successes in the 1920s because of their non-aggression ways in handling disputes. The league allowed negotiations and appeasement to some of the countries.

In 1921, there was a huge dispute between Finland and Sweden because they both wanted to take over the Aaland islands. This involved the League when it came to settling disputes and resulted in Finland having the Aaland island and both Finland and Sweden agreed. The League tries to give fairness and Sweden actually allowed Finland to have the island once the League came.

Furthermore, within the same year, 1921 Upper Silesia was wanted by both Germany and Poland. Germany has hated Poland and this caused aggression between them. The League came and tried to settle this and plebiscite happened in Upper Silesia. Upper Silesia favoured Germany, but the League decided that upper Silesia should be split in half for both countries to have and they both agreed. The League succeeded because they always tried to satisfy both countries.

Lastly, the League also succeeded in helping Austria and they prevented the collapse of their economy. Therefore, the league succeeded as they showed care for the country which made the country like and appreciate them.

Response C – 4/8
The League had some successes because they mainly dealt with small nations – without sending in an army. In 1921 Germany and Poland both wanted Upper Silesia therefore, the League held a plebiscite, which had mix votes; no they split up it’s industrial region and both Germany and Poland were happy.

Secondly, Greece invaded Bulgaria in 1925, to which the League morally condemned Greece and therefore they were forced to leave. Moreover, Switzerland and Finland wanted the Aaland but the League stated it went to Finland and both countries agreed.

Therefore, the league enjoyed success in the early 1920’s because they dealt with small colonies who were not powerful against the League and it’s members of the council like: Italy and Britain.
Describe how Austria was punished in the Treaty of St Germain.

Response A – 4/4
In the Treaty of St Germain, Austria had an army reduced to 30,000. Conscription was not allowed so they had to be volunteers. Austria were not allowed to have a navy. Austria Hungary empire had been dismantled. Land from Austria was given to Italy.

Response B – 2/4
Austria was punished in the Treaty of St. Germain and made to pay repreations also lost a lot of land under the treaty. They were also forced to sign and agreement that they were not allowed to alliance with germany.

Explain the role played by Lloyd George in the peace negotiations at Versailles.

Response A – 6/6
Lloyd George was seen as the ‘middle man’ during the peace negotiations at Versailles. This was due to France’s representative George Clemenceau and the USA having the President who was Woodrow Wilson, both having opposite views. Since Clemenceau and his country had suffered the worst from the war with Germany, he believed they should be treated extremely harshly, whereas Woodrow Wilson believed that Germany should not be treated harshly as it would be unfair. Hence his idea of a plebscite where they could govern themselves. This was seen as one of the reasons why the terms of Germany took twelve months from 1919. David Lloyd George had his own personal opinion which was ideas of both France’s and the USA’s. He felt they should be treated harshly but not as harshly as Clemenceau had wanted persue. At the same time he felt that although Wilson’s ideas were making sense, they were not harsh enough for how Britain wanted the terms to be.

David Lloyd George's role was generally mixed as although he felt that Germany should not be punished too harshly, he was pressured by the public of Britain to see this through. Therefore, his personal opinions and how he felt about what should happen to Germany and its allies was negated. This was because people in Britain had seen their families suffering as it was accounted that at least one person was lost in the war from each family. Thus the reason why the people of Britain stated to side with France’s terms as well as people wanted solid revenge towards Germany and its actions in the first world war. Therefore, not only were Lloyd George's ideas not persued but he was also confused as to what to do during the 1919 Paris Peace Conference.
Response B – 3/6
David Lloyd had a fairly prominent role at the Paris Peace conference in 1919, as he was the Prime Minister from a leading power, Britain. Lloyd George wanted to punish Germany for its actions, however he didn’t want to completely cripple them, unlike France he wanted reparations to be set, but too high so Germany wouldn’t be able to trade and the navy to be drastically reduced, and this is because he wanted Britain to have the largest navy.

David Lloyd George also wanted Germany’s colonies to be confiscated and given to the victors and another aim of his was to stop world communism. This was because Britain was a nationalists based country and hated the idea of communism.

Lloyd George was an important member of the conference as his aims were fairly reasonable towards Germany and in between George Clemenceau and Thomas Woodrow Wilson. He was able to settle the reparations in the middle being £6,600 million and the army and navy were drastically reduced. Britain still wanted to keep Germany as a valuable trading partner.

‘At the time, most people thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Response A – 9/10
At the time the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh. In the terms the reparation bill was £6600 million and Germany lost a lot of territory overseas and they lost their coalmine: The Saar – becoming a mandate. This angered Germany and they had a loss of pride. Furthermore in the 1920s, it caused hyperinflation and starvation in Germany. Therefore the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh because many Germans suffered from unemployment and starvation because the reparation price was too high.

Also, the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh and unfair to Germany. In the terms, Germany was to reduce their army to 100,000 men and conscription was banned. They were not allowed armoured vehicles or submarines and aircrafts. This humiliated Germany and though Wilson’s 14 points was to get everyone to disarm: no one else did. Therefore, the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh because it embarrassed Germany and made them vulnerable to attacks because they nearly disarmed.

However, some people at the time did not believe the Treaty of Versailles was harsh. After the Great War, the USSR and Germany signed a Treaty: the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. This was much harsher than the Treaty of Versailles and the USSR suffered. Therefore, at the time, the Treaty of Versailles was not harsh to some people because Germany was harsher to Russia and they suffered much more. People saw this as a double standard and believed they should have been treated as harsh as Russia was by Germany.

People at the time also believed the treaty was not harsh because Clemenceau believed it should have been more harsh. France lost farmland, homes and roads and had 3.1 million casualties during the Great War, and wanted Germany crippled by the Treaty. However, Wilson and Lloyd George stopped this as they believed it would cause Germany to seek revenge. In the terms the reparation was £6600 million, instead of the full sum. Therefore, at the time the Treaty of Versailles was not seen as harsh because it did not completely cripple Germany and later they did recover and sadly, seek revenge.

The Treaty of Versailles was harsh, but to an extent. It did cause devastation to Germany in the 1920s and it left them in debt. However, they were not treated as harshly as the French and Clemenceau wanted and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was much harsher.
Response B – 5/10

I agree with this statement to an extent as at the time many people thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh of Germany. At the Paris Peace Conference Germany were forced to sign the War Guilt taking full responsibility for World War One. Many people, especially Germans thought that this was unfair as they thought they were able to keep on fighting and did not want to take full responsibility for the war, especially since other countries took part.

Some people in Britain also thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh on Germany as the reparations were not at 6,600 million pounds which would cripple the German economy and send them into hyperinflation, and this would meant that they could not be a useful trading partner. Furthermore the people living in Germany, were already incredibly poor from the war, so by setting the reparations extremily high would effect the German citizens who weren't the direct cause of the war.

In addition, countries such as America also thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh on Germany. This is because they would not be able to defend themselves in case of another war, especially since the other countries around them were not disarming many German refugees had fled to America after the war, hence why they felt so strongly about the Treaty of Versailles. However, there were also people at this time who did not think the Treaty of Versailles was unfair towards Germany, France had also been completely devasted by the war, with 1 million deaths. The French economy needed the money from Germany to rebuild their own economy, and in return for every thing they had lost.

Furthermore many people also believed that Germany was fully responsible for the war, so should be punished severely. They were the country that started the war so should have to pay for the consequences. By their colonies being confiscated Germany would not be able to build up a massive army.

Countries also wanted to ensure that Germany's navy and army were drastically reduced as they wanted to prevent the start of another war. Countries were still unsure what Germany were going to do next, but wanted to make sure another war was not going to break out.

In conclusion, many people thought the Treaty of Versaille was too harsh, as it would plunge Germany into a large amount of debt and they would not be able to defend themselves. However countries wanted to ensure that they would be safe from another world war.
Describe how Germany’s position in Europe became stronger in 1935.

**Response A – 4/4**
- The population of the Saar voted to rejoin Germany (the area was a coal-mining region given to the League after WWI)
- Anglo-German naval treaty allowed Hitler to ignore military restrictions of the treaty of Versailles
- Stresa front between Italy, Britain and France was abandoned; Hitler was not challenged for remilitarizing Germany
- Hitler introduced conscription and the Luftwaffe, restoring Germany’s military power in violation of the terms of the treaty of Versailles

**Response B – 3/4**
Germany had fully rearmed, and had displayed it to the world. This made it a strong fierce nation that it hadn’t been since before World War One. This made it a world power because of the size of its increasing army. Also the Naval agreement was signed in 1935. The allowed Germany to have it’s navy 35% that of Britain’s. This would have been bigger than most countries, therefore showing how they had grown as a super power. Also it signaled an end to the treaty of Versailles.

Explain why Britain followed a policy of appeasement in the 1930s.

**Response A – 6/6**
Britain followed a policy of appeasement in order to avoid warfar as long as possible, because many of Hitler’s demands seems reasonable at the time, and because there was some sympathy for Germany.

“Chamberlain wanted to avoid war because Britain was unprepared economically and militarily. Britain was still recovering from the effects of the Great Depression” and could not have funded the war in the 1930s. As part of the covenant of the League of Nations, Britain had been disarming and would need to remilitarise if there was to be a war (by 1936 Britain did begin to rearm as war seemed increasingly imminent). Therefore giving Hitler what he wanted seemed the best way to conserve the peace.

Hitler was a charismatic man, according to historical sources, with a veneer of legality; many of his demands seemed reasonable. At the 1933 disarmament conference, he walked out of the league stating that Germany needed to be able to defend itself if France would not disarm. When he marched into the Rhineland, Chamberlain said he was “marching into his own back yard”. Also, neither Britain nor France would act without the help of the other, so Britain saw no reason to stop Hitler and allowed him to have what he wanted.
The Treaty of Versailles was very harsh on Germany, so many had sympathy for them and consequently allowed Hitler to restore Germany to its previous strength by appeasing him and letting him have his demands.

However, it eventually became evidence that there was no end to Hitler’s desires and war became inevitable with Germany’s rise to power. Despite this, I think it was a reasonable policy at the time because many of the arguments against it can only be seen with foresight – They could not have predicted the extent of Hitler’s hunger for power.

Response B – 3/6

Britain needed time to build an army up. After the first world war, Britain’s army size had decreased because of the amount of deaths that occurred during the war. As a result, Britain didn’t have an army big enough to fight the large army Germany had. Therefore the appeasement gave Britain the time it needed to build an army up again, it wouldn’t have had enough men, bullets, bombs etc, if appeasement hadn’t taken place.

Also the places that were being taken were not places that had no connection to Germany. Everytime Hitler took a new place he made a fair comment about how it either had German people or wanted to be German. For example, when Austria was taken by Germany, a vote took place where the Austrian people decided if they wanted to be German or not. The results were that 99.75% of Austrian people wanted to be German, therefore nothing could have been done to stop him. Appeasement took place because, until Poland, Hitler had a fair claim to all the places he invaded, Britain could do nothing to stop it.

Which was more important in bringing about the Second World War, the failure of Britain and France to act over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland or the Munich Agreement? Explain your answer.

Response A – 10/10

Both of these factors are valid reasons for the start of the Second World War as they allowed Hitler to gain power and confidence in Europe.

In the Treaty of Versailles the Rhineland was agreed to become de-militarised (meaning no soldiers or any army was allowed in that area). Therefore what Hitler did in 1936 was breaking the Treaty of Versailles Hitler timed his decision perfectly as the league of Nations was busy sorting out the Abyssinia Crises with Italy. Therefore it made it hard for Britain and France to focus on two things at once. However from hindsight we know that Hitler’s army was very weak at the time and he was taking a huge risk. As a result of Britain and France not stopping Hitler, he grew more confidence as he realised what he could achieve without people stopping him, for example union with Austria in 1938. The Munich agreement was organised to discuss what to do about Hitler wanted the Sudetenland. It was a further example of appeasement because in the end they gave it to Hitler. This was crucial because we know Hitler later went and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia. What was important about this agreement was that Stalin was not invited. This worried him as he saw Britain and France were just giving Hitler what he wanted. As a result him and Hitler later signed the Nazi-Soviet pact and then went on to invade Poland (which caused WWII).

In conclusion, the failure of preventing Hitler from marching troops into the Rhineland allowed him to grow confident and it showed him how Britain and France would let him get away with most things. The Munich agreement is an example of this, and in the long term caused WWII because of Stalin signing a pact with Hitler invade USSR. However, overall I believe the failure to prevent the remilitarisation is the most important factor. This is because Britain and France would of easily prevented Hitler, meaning he wouldn’t become more confident. It would have prevented Hitler from demanding more and more (the Sudentenland) to the point where war broke out.
Response B – 5/10

To a medium extent, the failure to act over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland was more important for a few reasons.

Firstly, in 1936 Hitler was still rebuilding Germany and stopping him then would have been a lot easier that dropping him in 1939.

Secondly, remilitarising the Rhineland breached the terms of the treaty and so there should have been a punishment. War wasn't the only option to punish Hitler yet nothing was done.

Finally, by not enforcing a punishment here Hitler felt that he could get away with quite a lot. This only emphasised his ego and encouraged him to take risks.

However, to a similar extent the Munich agreement was more important for a few reasons.

Firstly, the meeting was too nice on Hitler. By allowing him to take the Sudetenland it gave Hitler the impression that Britain and France were pushovers which encouraged him to go on to invade Poland.

Secondly, by further appeasing Hitler, it let him know that Britain and France were still not ready for war and so he tried to exploit that by invading Poland.

Finally, the Munich agreement was a wasted chance. Britain and France could have been very firm on Hitler but decided to try and be nice. This was their final chance to avoid war and they didn't take it.
A011-A017 ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS – THE COLD WAR, 1945-1975

Study Source A.

What is the cartoonist’s message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7
The cartoonist is criticising John Kennedy’s response to Cuba and is mocking him for his failure. The message of the cartoon is that the USA’s attempt to remove Castro has failed and has ended in embarrassment and humiliation for JFK.

This cartoon was written after the Bay of Pigs fiasco in April 1961. This was where Cuban exiles (who had been trained up by the CIA) invaded Cuba with the intention of starting a revolution. However, the exiles faced 20,000 well equipped Cuban troops and within 3 days all the exiles had been killed or captured. The USA hadn’t provided the support they had promised and the invasion ultimately failed.

The content of the service reinforces the message of the cartoon. JFK is depicted as smoking an exploding cigar. This could be in reference to the exploding cigars that the CIA sent Castro in an attempt to remove him. The fact that the cigar is blowing up in his face suggests USA has taken a blow and that it has been a disaster for the USA.

Response B – 7/7
In source A, the cartoonist’s message is one of contempt towards President Kennedy of the USA and the tactics he employed at the Bay of Pigs, a failed invasion attempt to overthrow the new Communist leader, Fidel Castro. This is known by the fact that the cartoonist portrays Kennedy as smoking a cigar to which has its top (labelled ‘Cuba’) blown off, and to the cartoonist is demonstrating his disapproval, if Kennedy’s use of 1400 anti-Castro Cuban exiles to try to overthrow the Communist regime by their failed attack at the Bay of Pigs, rather than Kennedy using his own superior forces, in the field attack that took place in April 1961, the same time the source was published. The cartoonist’s message is also that in this failed attack of the Bay of Pigs, Kennedy has damaged relations with Cuba so much that they cannot be fixed. This is known once again by the fact that Kennedy is smoking a cigar and the blown off part with the word ‘Cuba’ insinuates it was a Cuban cigar, one of the USA’s most popular imports from Cuba. In this way the cartoonist is showing his contempt for Kennedy as he portrays him blowing up the cigar, and so is a metaphor that Kennedy has in fact destroyed relations with Cuba.

Response C – 5/7
The cartoonist is critical of Kennedy’s attempt to defeat the communists in Cuba during the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961. Kennedy was unhappy that Fidel Castro had overthrown the previous US-backed dictator Batista. Kennedy was also unhappy to discover that missiles had been placed on Buba because Cuba was within America’s sphere of influence. Therefore, in April 1961, Kennedy led 3000 America troops to the Bay of Pigs. However, the attack was a disaster; they were met by 20,000 Cuban troops who managed to capture or kill all American soldiers within 2 days. The cartoonist is critical of Kennedy’s feeble attempt to stand up to Communism. The Bay of Pigs failure revealed that Kennedy was weak because he was not serious about maintaining the policy of containment.
Explain why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully.

**Response A – 8/8**
I believe that the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully, because of Kennedy’s strong leadership. In 1961 a U-2 spy plane flying over Cuba detected nuclear missiles. The missiles were placed there by the USSR, led by Khrushchev. The missiles could have been used to attack Eastern US cities with very little notice or warning. The Defcon was raised to Defcom 3 which was one step below full scale war. The first thing Kennedy did which helped end the crisis peacefully was set up a naval blockade. This meant all ships entering Cuba were searched for missiles before being let in, therefore preventing any more missiles entering Cuba. This was a good move by Kennedy, as it gave him more time to negotiate with Khrushchev, whilst showing the strength to make a move to Kennedy’s strong leadership helped end the crisis peacefully through his negotiations, he made an agreement with Khrushchev. US missiles were secretly removed from Turkey and the US promised not to invade Cuba, whilst the Soviet Nuclear missiles were withdrawn from Cuba. This peaceful end that prevented nuclear warfare and mutually-assured destruction was thanks to Kennedy, as he had the strength to negotiate with Khrushchev and convince him to withdraw the missiles.

**Response B – 8/8**
The Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully thanks largely to the diplomatic work of both Khrushchev and Kennedy in October 1962. Kennedy has a large reason for the peaceful ending of the crisis because he refused to use any force on Cuba or the USSR and that could be seen as an act of war. Initially, Kennedy introduced a blockade, and so ensured that if Khrushchev wanted to continue applying nuclear weapons in Cuba, he would have to do so by force. Also, despite an American plane being shot down by Cuba, Kennedy resisted people in the American government who wanted immediate physical retaliation which might have led to war. In doing so, he allowed peace talks to flourish.

Similarly, the USSR leader Khrushchev was equally vital in ensuring peace was reached, as Khrushchev infact opened peace talks with Kennedy in several letters to Kennedy on 26th and 27th October 1962, where Khrushchev put forward fair proposals for the removal of the nuclear weapons from Cuba, allowing peace to come in diplomatic fashion during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

**Response C – 4/8**
The Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully as the dangers/risks at stake were huge considering both sides had nuclear weapons. Both sides knew this and didn't want to be responsible for starting a nuclear war. This was because there would be huge damage to both countries as it was an example of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). For example, on 27th October Kennedy delayed a reprisal attack on Cuba for shooting down a US spy plane and killing the pilot.

**Response D – 3/8**
Kennedy and Khrushchev had seen how their game of brinkmanship had nearly resulted in a nuclear war. As a result, for the rest of the Cold War, they fought through their Allies when possible. Both Kennedy and Khrushchev were concerned about the idea of MAD – Mutually Assured Destruction. If one country were to launch a nuclear attack on the other, there would definitely be an armed response, resulted in the destruction of both countries. Therefore, neither the USA nor the USSR were prepared to make the first move as they know it would be suicide. Khrushchev was happy that Cuba remained Communist because they would be able to help Communist movements in South America. Khrushchev had also boosted his own support in the USSR, by getting Kennedy to remove his missiles in Turkey. The Cuban Missile Crisis had revealed that America was never be able to close the Missile Gap. As a result, the USA and the USSR signed a Test Ban Treaty, banning the testing of nuclear weapons.
Describe what happened during the Berlin Blockade of 1948-9.

Response A – 4/4
During the Berlin Blockade of 1948-9, first in June 1948 Stalin blocked all railways, canals and roads, and routes from West Germany to West Berlin for the allies, hoping to force an act of retaliation or the Allies out of Berlin. However, instead the Allies used planes to airlift many supplies into West Berlin, continuously until in May 1949, Stalin realised that he could not force that Allies out nor shoot down planes as this was an act of war, and so reopened the normal routes into West Berlin for the Allies.

Response B – 1/4
During the Cold war, being problems in Potsdam, which with how America and Britian wanting to rebuild Germany once again. America, Britian and French merged all their zones together, this was known as the “Trizonia” later known as west Germany. West Germany was beginning to emerge as an attractive place to live as a contrast to East Germany controlled by Stalin. When Stalin gained knowledge that West Germany had introduced a new currency and that was nothing he could do about it, he then block access from West Berlin to West Germany. He created a blockade around this zone that he possessed in Germany. He cut up all transport, and made Eastern Germans support.

Why were there disagreements at the Potsdam Conference in 1945? Explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
There were several reasons for the disagreements at the Potsdam Conference. First the disagreements stemmed from the dislike between the new President of the USA Truman, and Stalin, as Truman took over the recently deceased Roosevelt, and was much more suspicious of Stalin and unwilling to negotiate with him, so an immediate distrust stemmed. Also, in July 1945 Churchill lost the general election in Britain to Clement Atlee became Prime Minister, and Stalin did not have as much respect for him as he did for Churchill.

Also, Stalin and Truman disagreed on many things to do with reparations, Germany and Soviet policy in Eastern Europe. Stalin wanted to cripple Germany’s economy and receive large amounts of reparations as 20 million Russians died in the Second World War, but Truman did not want to repeat the mistakes of the Treaty of Versailles and so disagreed. Also, Truman was suspicious of Stalin’s influencing of European countries and so tried to limit Stalin’s influence in Eastern Europe as he did not want Stalin taking over Europe.

Response B – 2/6
Disagreements in Potsdam in July-August 1945 were caused by Stalin wanting to cripple Germany however Attle and Truman wanted to rebuild Germany as trading partners. There are several problems with this, new elections called for new leaders. Truman was passionate to stand up to Stalin and was heavily anti-communist. Also the fact that American wanted to rebuild, Germany made Stalin very curious and with this Stalin started to loose faith. Other disagreements were also caused by competition of the Arms race which started at Potsdam. Because Neither America or Russia, wanted each other to do well. They made sure that in Potsdam there were more disagreements that at Yalta to both countries could advance in the Arms Race.
Response A – 10/10

I agree quite strongly with the statement that ‘The Marshall Plan was an attempt by the USA to control Europe’. This is because first, Churchill himself had called Europe a rubble of ground breeding with hate, and following events in Czechoslovakia where Communists took power by force and killed opposing party leaders and members, it was clear to Truman and the USA that Europe needed to be controlled from the Communist threat. Since there were already large Communist parties in large countries such as Italy and France, Truman, by giving $17 billion dollars of aid to European countries, would show kindness and allegiance to the countries, influencing them into cooperating with the USA and favouring the USA to the USSR, as the USA would fix Europe’s economy and lifestyle, gaining favour.

Similarly, the Marshall Plan, by giving $17 billion US dollars in aid to European countries simply manipulated Europe into their control, as these loans made the European countries dependent on the dollar. Therefore, Truman and the USA were able to limit the Communist influence in these countries, forcing them to stay away from joining the USSR and Communist regime as the USA could pull out the funding of the countries or recall loans at any times which would destroy their economy, and so the USA controlled Europe from becoming totally Communist in doing so.

However, the Marshall Plan may not have necessarily been put forward by the USA simply in order to control Europe. One of the new US international policies, from the Truman Doctrine was ‘containment’, meaning to contain the number of Communist countries loyal to the USSR in the world, and allowing the USA to provide aid to anywhere in threat of their freedom being taken away. Therefore after the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia, the USA was forced to put its new policy into action by providing aid through the Marshall Plan.

Also, the USA may not only have introduced the Marshall Plan in order to control Europe, but simply to restructure the economy of all the countries so that they wouldn’t be in ruin, much like after the Wall Street Crash in 1929, which would eventually become a main factor for the beginning of the Second World War, so in introducing the Marshall Plan, Truman and the USA were in fact keeping Europe and the world safe, and improving the world’s economy.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that ‘the Marshall Plan was an attempt by the USA to control Europe’ as through the Marshall Plan may have been used simply to save Europe from widespread economic ruin, it was mainly used by the USA as a way of manipulating European countries into their favour, in order to control Europe from becoming largely Communist.

Response B – 5/10

I agree with this statement to a certain extent because the Marshall Plan offered money to Any countries which were communist or which were fighting communism. I believe it was an attempt to control Europe because they didn’t want Communism to spread and tried to contain Communism otherwise they believed in the domino theory, that Communism would spread to it’s neighbouring countries. The USA tried to stop Communism spreading through the Marshall Plan so that they could have allies in Europe, through this way they tried to control Europe. The USA tried to say we will give you money to prevent you from becoming Communist, just don’t let Communism overtake your countries or tried to help the countries that were already Communist to try and turn them back to democracy. I believe that the majority of the intentions of the USA was to attempt to control Europe. On the other hand I feel that the USA were just trying to stop communism from ruling the world and protect their own country by stopping the domino theory and trying to contain communism. In conclusion we can see that the usa’s main intention was to attempt to control Europe.
Response C – 3/10

The Marshall Plan in 1947 was in place to help protect countries from the fall into communism, with this America would pour so much money; billions and billions was been given to European countries to withstand the fall of Communism. Because of this I feel that the Marshall Plan was not to take over Europe. Truman himself would never admit that the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine where there to contain Communism. If he did that would put complete distrust in Stalin. Also Truman never showed any initiative to take over Europe because it was only after 1949 did Americans truly come out of isolationism from the rest of the world. Also Truman felt that there would be no gain from having many countries in his possession especially in Europe. All he wanted was complete containment. However you could argue that Truman’s plan and the Marshall Aid was to take over Europe so this would have a positive affect on containment as this would mean that Stalin can not assert his own dominance in Europe which is also what Truman wanted.
Describe how the USA fought the war in Vietnam.

Response A – 4/4
During the Vietnam war the US used several tactics to win, for instance the used Napalm which was a strong chemical weed killer which was useful because most of Vietnam was jungle. They used the method Search and destroy: where they would search and ambush the enemy and destroy and kill them. Also the used B52 bombers which were bombs. These were aeroplanes which let out several bombs close together completely destroying everything in the area. However, they did use a non violent method; hearts and minds where they would help build new schools, church etc for the civilians to try and win them over.

Response B – 3/4
The USA fought in Vietnam using agent orange, napalm strikes, rolling thunders to weaken Vietnam. Yet they killed innocent people. Mothers daughters sons and fathers were killed. Civilians.

Explain why Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA’s involvement in Vietnam.

Response A – 6/6
Kennedy increased the USA’s involvement in Vietnam to prevent the Domino theory from becoming a reality. The Domino Theory, linked to containment, was an idea that meant that if are country fell to Communism, its neighbours would follow. Previously, before Kennedy, they had been sending money to the French Army and then money to the South Vietnamese government under Diem – to prevent the North Vietnamese Communists invading the South. However, to show that Kennedy was taking a strong stance against communism and was serious, he sent 16000 advisors to South Vietnam to train in guerilla warfare – the tactic used by the VC. This was especially important as Kennedy had felt humiliated after the Bay of Pigs, the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and he felt he had been pushed around at Vienna in 1961 so felt the importance of taking a hard line against Communism.

Johnson, similarly, wanted to be seen to take a hard line against communism and did not want it to spread. Johnson was given virtually unlimited power after the Gulf of Tonkin attack which lead to the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. This enabled him to send in troops in Vietnam. Him and the military believed that they would easily defeat the Vietcong due to their mere presence through the fighting proved otherwise. This goes hand in hand with the military industrial complex which suggests that some areas of and the military benefit from tensions and war this was not why they increased their involvement but was a factor.

Response B – 3/6
Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA’s involvement in Vietnam because the Vietcong were winning and destroying the US army. The US got involved in Vietnam because the French were defeated and Vietnam was split in two: South Vietnam and North Vietnam. North Vietnam was led by Ho Chi Minh, a communist leader. These were more stronger than South Vietnam who was led by Ngo Dinh Diem, a capitalist leader. USA decided to help the South Vietnam because they thought they were more weaker and would eventually become Vulnerable to communism. If Vietnam became communist than surrounding countries would too. Kennedy sent advisors to Vietnam to help them, whilst Johnson sent money and troops.
Response A – 9/10

No, I do not agree. It is undoubtable that the reporting of the Vietnam war was an important reason for American withdrawal, but there were other, more important reasons. Reporting was important because the Vietnam war was the first televised war, which meant people at home saw the aftermath of atrocities like the My Lai massacre of 1968, and saw bodybags being loaded onto planes home. They heard from newspaper reporters the awful cost of the war – Life magazine reported that it took $400,000 to kill one Vietcong soldier, and that the war cost $30 million a year, when 300 American troops were killed in the same amount of time. The reporting led to public outrage and protest like at Kent State University in Ohio, where 4 people were shot, and reporting stirred up a lot of hatred for the war at home.

However, there were other factors – because of the Vietcong tactics the war was virtually unwinnable. The Vietcong used guerilla tactics to avoid direct confrontation with the US troops who outnumbered them. The set booby traps and committed sporadic acts of violence which demoralized American troops. They wore no uniform and blended in among ordinary villagers. They exploited American weaknesses, and were very hard to kill, meaning the war could almost never be won by the USA outright.

Another factor is the American troops' failure in Vietnam. They never won the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people, so could never really win the war. As a consequence of this, they withdrew. American tactics, such as search and destroy, and use of chemical weaponary were not very effective, and often hit civilian targets. Their other policy of relocating and militarising strategic villages went against Vietnamese religion, which is based around ancestor worship.

If you add to this the fact that Americans often spoke no Vietnamese; and that atrocious conditions and guerrilla tactics of the Vietcong played mind games on many Americans, and made them commit terrible atrocities (like the My Lai massacre of 1968 where William Calley was prosecuted for the murder of 109 civilians in an innocent village), it is no wonder that American troops were seen by some South Vietnamese as the aggressor, rather than protector, and some peasants chose to actively support the Vietcong.

In conclusion, although reporting of the Vietnam war was a large reason for American withdrawal in 1968 onwards. I think the most important reason is the failure of the American troops to win the hearts and minds of the people.

Response B – 4/10

I disagree that the reporting of the Vietnam War by the media was the most important reason why the USA withdrew its troops because there were other reasons too. For instance, the unpopularity of the draft. This was when the US made young black men in particular to join the war because they weren't allowed to get the education like white people could. Also lots of men went out to university just to avoid going to war. In 1968 the Vietcong led a huge attack over Vietnam called the Tet Offensive. Presidents Richard Nixon decided to withdraw US troops from Vietnam to let the Vietnamese fight against themselves. Also in the time of the Vietnam War there were huge culture changes which showed how the US public turned against war. Also the tactics used by the Vietcong made the US troops withdraw. The Vietcong would use the term war of the flea which meant they wouldn't stay in one place all the time and that they are constantly moving. They would also build tunnels where they would live and melt away into to stop the US from finding them. Also they would use booby traps and panji traps which would injure the US soldiers to make it easier for the Vietcong to destroy them.

However, I agree that the reporting of the Vietnam War by the media was important reason of the withdrawal of US troops because the US public received pictures of the horrific burns and deformatives the US tactics caused. The US tactics were horrific because it wasn't just older people they hurting but also young children. The whole of the Vietnam War was televised which meant the public were able to see the torture to the whole of Vietnam from the US troops.

In conclusion, I disagree that the reporting of the Vietnam War was the most important reason why the US withdrew troops because there was several other reasons to such as the Vietcong tactics used against US troops which meant more and more US troops were being injured or killed. Also the cost of the war. Millions were spent on the war each day and nothing was happened.
Response A – 7/7
The cartoonist’s message is that the IRA’s use of violence is rather unnecessary but also it is exaggerated and unjustifiable. In the pocket of the IRA terrorist there is a bomb that was lightened. This refers to the suicide bombers that caused massive devastations. The IRA hated the British presence (British troops) in Northern Ireland and they were keen to remove them and join Republic of Ireland; becoming a single united Ireland of 32 counties. They often carried out attacks on British troops however the cartoonist alludes to how the majority of the attacks affected innocent civilians. Moreover, the IRA accepted no responsibility and used this as a form of propaganda: listing out example of injustices carried out by British government on the Irish people. This is emphasised by the carless manner in which he disposes of the cigarettes. Furthermore, the IRA terrorist is presented as crying which is ironic. Evidently the IRA are simply ruthless, inconsiderate and dangerous. They should not be trusted and sympathised with as they are carrying out attacks for attention.

Response B – 2/7
The Source shows an IRA terrorist standing within a grave yard with a gun in his hand, that’s still smoking with bullets on the ground.

The cartoonist message is ironic, as the IRA terrorist is warning innocents (babies) not to use pubs that British troops use, which could mean as it’s for their own protection, yet the terrorist is the one standing with the smoking gun in a grave yard.
Response A – 8/8
Terrorism has often failed to achieve its aims due to the government’s response; use of terror. Al-Qaeda carried out an attack on the twin towers in the World Trade Centre in 2001 (US) in which 2974 people died. The US government dealt harshly with this by invading Afghanistan. Al-Qaeda’s training bases, equipment and archives of informations were destroyed. Osama Bin Laden was killed in 2011 and the coalition troops put a friendly government in place. Bush’s war on terror proved to be very effective as Al-Qaeda was defeated, Israel still exists and the presence of foreign troops actually increased in Iraq and Afghanistan. Al-Qaeda was unsuccessful in achieving its aims.

Another reason is that government attempted to negotiate with terrorists. For example, in 1993 the British Government and Irish government signed the Downing Street Declaration which improved security co-operation and most importantly, it stated that British government has no selfish interest in controlling Northern Ireland. The Good Friday agreement was signed in April 1998; although Northern Ireland has limited autonomy and the opportunity to leave and join Republic of Ireland whenever they want through democratic means, IRA failed to unite Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland.

Lastly the lack of support is also a reason why terrorism fail. The citizens of Palestine were fed up with the amount of violence caused by the conflict between them and Israel therefore they were eager to accept the 1993 peace agreement in which the PLO declared that Israel has a right to exist.

Response B – 2/8
Terrorism has often failed in achieving its aims because they’re crushed by the more powerful opposition.

This has been the case with both the IRA, and to a certain extent, the PLO.

Both of these Terrorist Organisations fighting for a common good, to get their own land back (Nationalism). The way that The super powers dealt with this, is to negotiate with them.
Describe the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact on Berliners.

Response A – 4/4
On the night of the 13th August, 1961, Soviet Red Army and East German troops constructed a barbed-wire fence across the division between West and East Berlin, which they would then go on to replace with a large wall of stone, with constant guarding by heavily-armed soldiers and a number of checkpoints through which East Germans could not pass. For Berliners, this wall split families and friends apart and many were shot trying to get over the wall.

Response B – 2/4
The building of the Berlin Wall meant that whole families were torn apart. The Berlin wall meant that some people couldn’t get to their job because it was on the other side of the wall. Two very different lifestyles were created on each side of the Berlin Wall.

Why did the Polish government find it difficult to deal with Solidarity? Explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
One reason why the Polish government found it hard to deal with Solidarity was because of the huge popular support of the organisation. Starting out as an independent trade union with a strike of workers in Gdansk in 1980, the movement appealed to so many Polish people, who suggested with low living standards and high prices, that by 1981 it had amassed over 9 million members. Furthermore, it had the support of the West and the Church – as the Pope John Paul II was Polish and declared his support for Solidarity. It was difficult to act against it without provoking strong retaliation and criticism from all of its members and supporters.

Another reason why it was difficult to take decisive action against Solidarity was because of it organisation. By 1981, with so many members, the movement had split into various separate sections, all united by the idea of improving quality of living for Polish workers. It was even difficult for leader Lech Walesa to keep control of so many – and so when the government did clamp down on Solidarity following an army takeover by General Jaruselski, the movement still survived underground as people still kept hope for these ideas and changes Solidarity had offered.

Response B – 2/6
Solidarity was a difficult organisation to deal with as it had masses of support from workers and because they asked for many small changes; the majority of the requests made were reasonable.
‘The Hungarian Uprising in 1956 and the Prague Spring in 1968 were very similar.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Response A – 10/10

In many ways, the 1956 Hungarian Uprising and 1968 Prague Spring were very similar. In both cases, a more moderate leader had come to power demanding reforms which would change communism to make life better for its people – both Nagy in Hungary and Dubcek in Czechoslovakia. These reforms included more freedom of speech, free elections, an end to secret police and a reform in living and working conditions so people’s lives would be better. Furthermore, these leaders had the support of the majority of their people with the reforms they promised – and in both cases, the Soviet Union could not allow these big changes to the communist system and so responded with violence. In Hungary, on 1st November 1956, thousands of Red Army troops and 300 tanks were sent by Khrushchev to invade; and again in Czechoslovakia, on 30th August 1963, hundreds of thousands of soldiers took over Prague. This was a violent reaction which in both Hungary and Czechoslovakia ended with the replacement of the country’s leader with a more Soviet-friendly one.

One crucial difference between the two, however, was that in 1956 Nagy said that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact and become neutral like Austria had done a year earlier. This was the deciding factor which provoked invasions in Hungary; Dubcek was careful to reassure USSR leader Brezhnev that he would not leave the Pact, yet still suffered invasion. The two events also differed in the response of the people – in Hungary, serious fighting led to 3000 Hungarian deaths and 7000 Red Army ones – in Czechoslovakia, perhaps because of the failure of the Hungarians’ resistance; years earlier, people used more passive resistance to Soviet invasion. There is a final difference in the fate of the two leaders of the countries; while Nagy was secretly executed, Dubcek was merely removed from power and demoted to be an ambassador to Turkey.

In conclusion, there were many similarities between both events, with two moderate leaders who wanted reform of the Soviet system; however, the two are only similar to a certain extent, as there are clear differences in the strength of resistance, both from the Soviets and Eastern Europeans – perhaps greater in Hungary both due to the threat of Warsaw Pact exit and the fact that it was nearly a generation earlier.

Response B – 5/10

Both the Hungarian uprising and the Prague Spring were similar in that they were small groups fighting against a large, more equipped force.

The reasons for rebelling against each of their authorities differ however Hungary had been being oppressed by russian forces which included tanks in the street. Eventually those of the oppressed who wanted to be free did something about it and came together. They armed themselves and fought against the russian army in the streets.

Whereas, for the most of the time, the Prague Spring was peaceful by comparison, for example gatherings of those who felt their human rights were being violated peacefully protested in the streets.

There were incidents of aggression wherein the protestors smashed windows and raided government buildings also destroying documents. During these outbursts the police often fired upon them, often responding the same way and returning fire.

It is difficult to compare the two as the Prague spring was quite possible inspired by the Hungarian uprising as they saw it as a stand against authority however the two are not dissimilar as both events fight a higher power to achieve a freedom.
Describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq.

Response A – 4/4
Saddam Hussein was an infamous dictator most well known for the poor treatment and conditions he provided for the people of Iraq. For example, he used chemical attacks against his own people leading to suffering and human rights abuses. Saddam also defeated the uprising of the Kurds, people were persecuted and in some cases purged due to this. Saddam did not care that people lived in poverty and suffering due to the economic sanctions implemented by the UN as long as he and his family were not affected. He also drained marshlands that many people in Iraq depended on for a variety of needs. He was left unaffected by the horrors the Iraqi people had to endure.

Response B – 3/4
Saddam Hussein rules Iraq very unfairly. Because Iraq was ruled by a dictatorship the public were in fear of their own safety. A perfect example would be that if you were caught disobeying Saddam’s policies then you could suffer serious consequences like torture or even public execution. This overall is bad as many could not speak up for what they believed could make their country more suitable for them.

Explain why there was opposition around the world to the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Response A – 6/6
One reason there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq was America’s use of double standards regarding Israel and Iraq. It was well known that America’s ally Israel was in possession of nuclear weapons and America did not act. However, it was unsure whether Iraq had weapons of mass destruction yet, George W Bush pushed for a campaign to invade Israel suggestion that he had other reasons for invasion such as oil and financial gain.

There was also opposition to the war as many believed it was illegal as it was not approved by the UN, yet the coalition invaded regardless. Many people also worried about the death of civilians which would occur if war went ahead and therefore, the legality of the war was highlighted and was controversial to many. Some even argued that they wanted Saddam Hussein brought down as he was an oppressive dictator but did not want this task to be completed by America.

Response B – 4/6
There was opposition around the world during the invasion of Iraq because it was unclear that Hussein was in possession of nuclear weapons at the time. United nations sent in Hanz blitz to investigate and found the Iraq did not have any nuclear weapons and almost all of the UN voted on not invading Iraq although Britain and the U.S. did anyway, causing questions to speculate on what their aims really were. It is suspected that their agenda was securing oil fields.
Response A – 10/10
I disagree that the international consequences of the Iraq War were more important than the consequences inside Iraq. On the one hand, the Iraq War undermined any public sympathy felt internationally towards America due to the 9/11 attacks. This occurred as a consequence of the alleged use of torture and human rights abuses at the hands of coalition troops. Also, after the liberation of Iraq the international instability occurred as many countries felt threatened by various insurgency groups that arose. Also, many countries felt that the Iraq War diverted attention away from the real threat of terrorism. Overall, internationally America’s influence and ability to put pressure on other countries in the UN were reduced. However, consequences inside Iraq were more important.

After the liberation of Iraq, chaos followed as the uprising of many insurgent groups previously kept under control of Saddam’s harsh regime occurred. A large amount of looting occurred targeting important services such as hospitals and schools. This looting rendered areas such as Baghdad unsafe. The coalition failed to plan for what would occur after the liberation and therefore did not have enough troops to deal with the insurgency. Due to the actions of a small minority of soldiers (torture and human right abuses) the people of Iraq did not trust the coalition and instead turned against them. Many people of Iraq believed that at this stage life was worse than it was previously.

In conclusion, many historians would agree that despite America losing some of its international reputation and increasing international instability was somewhat less important than the effect on those living in Iraq. This is strongly supported by statistics released showing the death toll in Iraq which suggests that more people died in the two years post invasion than they did during Saddam’s regime.

Response B – 5/10
Both the international consequences outside Iraq and inside of Iraq were important for different reasons.

The obvious destruction and anarchy was that was created within Iraq after the invasion was devastating.

Within Iraq, after the invasion in 2003, The Insurgentsy began, which was effectively civil war between different factions within Iraq. Such as fights between the Kurds, Sunni and the Shi-ah. All these people are religious and each are fighting for power among themselves. As well as that, another groups – The Islamic State, also are fighting for a foot hold in Iraq.

The International consequences of the Iraq War are equally devastating. Surrounding countries are being flooded with refugees and civil war is going on outside Iraq in surrounding countries.

I believe that the Iraq War was a catalyst for later events in surrounding countries, like Syria. Extreme Islamic Fundamentalists are gaining more power, and they have managed to do so by using civil war in their own countries to their advantage.

Civil War wouldn’t have necessarily been a problem if The West hasn’t invaded Iraq for the oil that resides within it.

I agree that both of the situations, inside and outside are important and I believe that they’re both closely linked.
Study Source A.

Why was this painting published in Nazi Germany? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7
This painting was published in Nazi Germany for several reasons, to promote Aryan families and superiority, to emphasise need for children and to emphasise family life. This is shown first by the fact that in the painting, 5 children are present. This emphasised strong Nazi values that children were highly important to Hitler, as Hitler himself stated he needed children in order to build his Third Reich to last ‘1000 years’. Also, the painting put across Nazi policies aimed at women, as one Nazi policy has that women who had eight children would receive a gold star and a special seat in Nazi party meetings, and so the large number (5) children promoted these Nazi policies. Also, all the people in the painted are depicted with blue eyes and blonde hair, putting across the very important Nazi idea of Aryan superiority as they believed Aryans to be the pure perfect Germans. Furthermore, the background is also shown to be the countryside, and so this further promotes the Nazi slogan ‘Blood and soil’ which called the rural population as being the purest of Germans.

Response B – 4/7
This painting was published in Germany as it shows Hitler’s ideal race – blonde and blue eyed. Hitler tried to promote this race and show how the family should look. The painting shows an Aryan Family – Father reading a newspaper and Mother caring for the kids. They also have 5 kids which Hitler wanted to promote as it meant more soldiers in the future. The painting was published in the 1930’s which was when Hitler upraised – starting with largest party, chancellor, further and then the only party. The painting was published to shows Hitler’s idea family, so people knew what was ‘superior’.
Response A – 6/6

Source B, taken from instructions agreed by Heydrich, the lead of the Gestapo (German secret police) is very useful evidence about Nazi Germany. Since the instructions were decreed on 10 November 1938, the day upon which Kristallnacht, where 91 Jewish people were killed, hundreds of synagogues and Jewish businesses were destroyed, and thousands of Jewish people were taken to concentration camps, it allows us to understand whether these actions were truly the work of the people or of German police undercover. The source clearly shows that the police were aware of the riots which were to happen, stating demonstrations against the Jews are to be expected; therefore contradicting what the Nazis said following Kristallnacht that it was a totally sudden occurrence. Also, the source shows that the police would allow harm to the Jewish people to be done, as long as people ‘do not endanger German lives or property’ and that the police may have been directly involved in the destruction, as it says things belonging ‘to the Jews may be destroyed’. The source is very useful, not only as it is directly a high ranking Nazi official as instructions and it is highly reliable, but also as it shows that the Nazis could lie to the public and had a plan for taking the Jews to imprisonment, as they had claimed Kristallnacht was simply a sudden act from the German people, which the source proves otherwise.

Response B – 3/6

This source is useful as it shows the brutality of the Nazi people – it shows they’ll willing to harm thousands of people from what one person did miles away. Within the source it states about the killing of von Rath by a Jew in Paris, and then goes on to say how Jews in German should be punished. The Source is referring to what is now know as Kristalnacht – mass killing of Jews. It took place in November 1938. The Source is telling us that Nazi were willing to harm the Jews with little persuadasion. This is useful in showing us how the Nazis acted against opposition – however, it doesn’t tell us anymore.

Response A – 7/7

I agree with the statement to a small extent because although not many people acted there was a lot of opposition to the Nazi regime.

Many religious people such as the Pope or protestant pastors such as Niemellor were against the Nazis openly. The protestant pastor started a new church which went against Hitler’s Reich church. This open act of rebellion resulted in Niemellor being set to a concentration camp. The Pope also critisized Hitler and his words were heard in every church.

People called “swings” used to listen to jazz and critisize Nazis openly. They would do everything that was despised by Nazi teachings. There were more violent groups who were called Pirates they would use violence against Nazis. But after they killed a gestapo leader 17 of the members were publically hung. This created a lot of fear.
Within Munich University students produced anti-Nazi posters. They were secret so they couldn't be arrested however they were eventually caught and arrested. Another group called the White Rose used to vandalise railway lines as well as spy on the Nazi's. These were also a small group who acted in secrecy in fear of the Gestapo.

Although there were a few groups/people who acted against the Nazis they were all very small groups. There was no national uprising or protests against Hitler. Therefore it can be argued that there was little opposition.

But in 1943 a group of people plotted to assassinate Hitler. They planted a bomb in the building however Hitler survived and 5000 people were arrested.

Overall I agree with the statement a bit but I mainly disagree with the statement. This is because there were many groups, small or large, that rebelled and opposed Hitler. Most were caught and then executed and hung which created fear in public. This meant that many of those who did oppose Hitler didn't speak out because of the fear of being arrested.

Response B – 5/7

I disagree strongly with the interpretation ‘There was little opposition inside Germany to the Nazi regime’. This is because from my own knowledge I know that large groups of teenagers aged 14-17 primarily, greatly opposed the Nazi party, and would meet with Jews, females and even listed to American or jazz music. These groups were either known as the Swing movement, made up of middle-class teenagers, or another group called the Edelweiss Pirates, who had members throughout Germany, including Dusseldorf which is mentioned in source C. The Edelweiss pirates would do things such as attack Hitler Youth, and even one attacked the Gestapo. Source C supports this, as it says these young people adopt a hostile attitude towards the Hitler Youth, as well as that ‘there is suspicion that it is these youths who have been writing slogans like down with “Nazi brutality”’. Therefore, source C also disproves the statement that the Nazis had little opposition in Germany, and infact by 1943 (when the source was written), in the midst of the war, discontent with the Nazis was growing as the ‘gathering of young people have become more common’. Also, other groups, such as people led by Bishop Galen (a Catholic Bishop), greatly opposed Nazis in the war too, openly protesting against the killing of the mentally disabled and actually forced the Nazis to stop.
Describe the Spartacist rising of January 1919.

Response A – 4/4
There were many uprisings, some in Berlin, some in Barvaria. Rosa Luxembourg helped lead this uprisings. Communes and councils were put in place. The SDP used the Freikorps and army to help put these risings down. In Barvaria, over 600 Communists were killed by these forces. Rosa was also killed.

Response B – 2/4
In January 1919 Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liberecht led a group of spartacists also known as communists in Berlin to seize power. However the Freikorps quickly stepped in and many spartacists were killed, including the two leaders.

Why did the Kapp Putsch take place in 1920? Explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
The Kapp Putsch was largely in response to a rising right-wing sentiment following the war. This Putsch was run by the Freikorps, who were usually ex-soldiers who felt betrayed by the “left wing politicians” who had signed the war treaty, as they had thought they were winning as Germany had not actually been defeated in battle. This feeling of “dolchstoss” (stab in the back) was a primary feeling among many of these soldiers. They also resented what they saw as weakness in politicians by creating a democracy.

They also had felt they were stabbed in the back by Communists, as their uprisings towards the end of the war were significant in causing the resignation of Germany. Therefore, when the Communist party began to rise immediately after the war, they felt especially keen to take control of the country in the Putsch and eradicate them. The Communists had risen up largely due to the same circumstances as the Freikorps: due to the fragile social and political climate of the time, with national income at 1/3 of its pre-war value, and with 2 million fatherless children. The political ineffectiveness of Ebert’s government made Kapp and Communists feel that 1920 was the time to host the uprising, to place Germany into a more stable future.

One of the primary aims of the Freikorps was to reverse the Treaty of Versailles, as they felt it was vastly unfair (they didn’t believe the war was their fault) and knew it could cripple the economy with the 132 billion gold marks debt and loss of national pride in the army being reduced to 100,000 men, and losing 13% of their land. They had hoped to remove the Treaty once they came into power.

Response B – 3/6
The knapp Putsch in March 1920 occured for a range of reasons. Wolfgang Knapp, leader of the uprising, knew the constitution was weak due to the previous Spartacist uprising. He knew many others also felt this way so was encouraged to perform the putsch. Wolfgang Knapp was a nationalist who saw democracy as weak. He wanted, along with other right-wing nationalists and some Freikorps, for the Weimar Constitution to fall and be replaced by a dictator. This encouraged the putsch as he believed the workers of Berlin would support him rather than strike like they did.
Response A – 10/10
The tumultuous beginning of the Weimar republic, characterised by opposition from the left and right wing parties, economic failure and social chaos, certainly effected Germany through its “Golden Years” of the 20s.

In some respects, Germany certainly did recover: foreign policy was a notable strength of the Republic. Having the international chaos with the Treaty of Versailles and the invasion of the Ruhr, Stresseman managed to form much better international relations. Notably, by being accepted into the League of Nations, and the Locarno Treaties, wherein he agreed on new and better borders with France and Belgium, marking an improved relationship. However, these policies did not all go down well with political extremists back in Germany, wherein the right-wing saw it as an acceptable of the Treaty of Versailles, whereas the left-wing thought it was preparation for attack on the USSR. However, the Young Plan in 1929 (although never put in place) was largely popular with everyone, as it reduced the war reparations down to 119 billion gold marks, and would therefore help the economy recover better.

The economy was certainly a great recovery for Weimar. With the Dawes Plan in 1924, receiving 800 million marks, industry began to pick up and by 1927, Germany was again the second greatest industrial power in the world, having reached its pre-war standards of production. However, not everybody benefitted from this: farmers still suffered, and unemployment actually began to rise, to 6% of the population, as the country recovered and there were less jobs of rebuilding the country to employ workers. Also, shopkeepers suffered with the competition of rising department stores. Also, the Dawes Plan loan ultimately put the German economy into risk with the Wall Street Crash leading to the recall of debt, ultimately leading to the terrible depression which ultimately enabled the Nazis to come in to power. Therefore, the improvement of the economy was short-lived and unsustainable.

Culture certainly also boomed and recovered during the 20s, with some of Germany’s greatest writers, artists and musicians blossoming at that time. Marlene Dietrich is an example of prospering culture in the film industry, and in Berlin, the 900 cabaret clubs (in 1927) mark an increased liberal attitude, with songs about sex and criticising politicians. The freedom of expression was certainly a social recovery from the tense climate of the early Weimar, and the peaceful expression of dislike of politicians, in songs and paintings (notably by Otto Dix), shows that society as a whole was more stable as it resorted to violence less.

However, these effects were not seen as positive by everyone. Particularly soldiers and farmers who had suffered during the war especially, and who had greatly disliked the government during the early years, were vastly unimpressed by these developments, viewing then with mora outrage. Among the middle classes too, there was a rise in right-wing sentiment. This can be marked with reactionary groups such as the Vandervogel youth, and in Hindenburg being invited to be President, while he certainly represented the attitudes of the Kaiser. There was also cultural outcry at the “moral indecency” of having 35% of the workforce being made up of women, when indeed they had still been outraged by females working during the war.

National politics however didn’t massively improve during this period. The average Reichstag lasted for 6 months, and 30% of votes regularly opposed the Republic. With many coalitions of opposing parties, the Reichstag found it hard to pass laws. Also, Stresseman faced issues with the Kaiser’s old companions still holding important positions throughout society, blocking many of the developments he attempted. However, in 1928, Hitler only had 2.6% of the votes, and so while the extremist parties such as the Communists did do quite well in some parts of the country, Nazism didn’t.

Overall, many aspects of society did recover from the events of its early years – especially notable is the recovered economy, considering the deep chaos of hyperinflation in 1923 – but opposition from extremist parties was only exacerbated by many of these developments, seen as immoral and a betrayal of various ideologies. And while some people, namely industrialists and bohemian-minded people, benefitted from the 1920s, others markedly didn’t. And furthermore, the actual Weimar Republic as a system did not truly recover, with its constant opposition and never-ending instability. The ultimate rise of the Nazis is a testament to the instability of the Weimar Republic, regardless of other improvements in society.

‘The Weimar Republic never recovered from the events of its early years.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.
Response B – 5/10

I partially agree with this statement.

The Weimar Constitution faced a range of problems from 1919-1923 including the Spartacist uprising, Knapp Putsch, Munich Putsch (Hitler uprising, 1923), Invasion of Rhur (1923) and Hyperinflation. (1923). It faced significant challenge and these feelings remained throughout the Republic’s era. The Weimar Republic was built from bitter terms from the Treaty of Versailles. When Germany signed what they claimed was a diktat, the population felt bitter towards the government or November ‘criminals’. The Weimar Republic was a symbol of Germany’s defeat. The Weimar Republic faced sever economic problems with £6.6 billion of reperations to pay starting at 125,000 million marks annually in 1922. The economic set backs of hyperinflation and the Invasion of the Ruhr were overcome, only for it to fall economically again in 1929 during the Wall Street Crash. The Republic never prospered economically in the beginning and this effected it later. The public’s bitter feelings of the Republic further revealed themselves in the depression and the vote of Hitler becoming Chancellor and fhurer. Germany wanted a dictatorship, and the Weimar Constitution didn’t provide this. This was shown in the uprisings and continued into the depression.

However, the Weimar Republic did recover. In 1923 Gustav Stresemann role to power and changed the Republic’s bitter defeat around. He ended hyperinflation by creating the retenmark and started Rhur production again by calling off strikes. Stresemann began Germany’s Golden Era, by introducing a range of treaties. The Dawes Plan in 1924 gave Germany a loan from the USA and extended reparation payments. In 1926 Germany joined the league of nations and in 1929 the Young plan meant Germany gained a second US loan and till 1988 to pay reparations. Stresemann restored German economy, it’s reputation as a strong and powerful country and altered the Treaty of Versailles terms. No more uprisings took place during The Golden Era and extremist groups such as The Nazi’s and Communists had barely any seats in the Reichstag. This shows that the country had restored and recovered and people were beginning to accept the Weimar Republic.

Overall, I disagree with the statement. The Weimar republic recovered it’s reputation as a strong and successful country under Stresemann’s treaties. However it’s economic recovery could be argued as a failure due to it’s dependency on US loans. Yet the constitution and Republic became individual to the Treaty of Versailles and lost it’s bitter reputation of being a symbol of weakness during its golden era.
Describe how the Nazis used the Depression in their political campaigns.

**Response A – 4/4**
The Nazis used the depression as part of promoting their propaganda to the struggling families and middle class workers and the unemployed. Most of the German people had lost hope in the government as they wouldn’t deal with the depression and turned their hopes to the Nazis as they believed the promises that Hitler had made. The depression caused millions to become unemployed and they turned to the Nazis for help as the government weren’t doing anything. The German people were still bitter over the T.O.V being signed and so they lost hope in them because they didn’t trust the Weimar gov anymore.

**Response B – 4/4**
The Nazis used the Depression in their political campaigns in many different ways. They propaganda relied policies to bring Germany out of the depression, and also blamed others for it. They blamed Jews for being richer than the rest and has their corruption is what led to the depression. They also suggested that Germany must be returned to the people in the country, and their promises to expand the armed forces and use public works to get people back to work seemed like a more practically approach than all the other parties.

**Response C – 2/4**
Depression was used by the Nazis as an opportunity to turn things around. Many people were out of work and could not support a fammily. Hitler said he’d offer jobs for all working class families in germany. Also, trade unions were forcing business owners to pay what workers there were huge sums of money. Therefore, by irradiating the trade unions Hitler promises a financial boost for business owners. As well as this, the economy was in ression, Hitler promised to fix this with a new currency solving the problem of hyperinflation.

Explain why Hitler was appointed as Chancellor in January 1933.

**Response A – 5/6**
Hitler was appointed chancellor because by 1933, his party was the largest party in the Reichstag. Ex Chancellor’s such as Von papen and scheilcher tasked to win the hearts of the german people and during the meetings in the Reichstag the Nazis would storm out of the Reichstag, it would lead to disruption in the court room. Hindenburg realised he couldn’t have chancellor’s that were not popular and didn’t have the support of the Reichstag. By 1933, Hitler had become very popular because of his speeches in which he criticised the Weimar government and many saw him as a right wing hero. Events such as the ‘depression’ helped the Nazis become popular and in return lead to Hitler becoming more popular with the German people. Hindenburg believed that he would be able to control Hitler if he became chancellor. (Boy was he wrong!)
Response B – 3/6
Hitler was appointed chancellor in January 1933 because of the background deals of influential aristocrats in power. In the first election of 1932, the Nazis were the largest party, but President Hindenburg refused to make Hitler as leader of the party chancellor because they thought he was too radical, but also too low a claim, not aristocratic with a name like ‘von Hindenburg,’ ‘von Papen’ etc. Therefore Hindenburg’s friend von Papen was appointed chancellor. However he was unsuccessful so called another election in 1932. The Nazis lost share of the vote. SPD remained the largest single party in the Reichstag. Hindenburg still refused to support Hitler and appointed von Schleicher instead. However he didn’t last long either and so von Papen and Hindenburg agreed to appoint Hitler as chancellor so that they could at last pass laws through the Reichstag, but also restrict his power with Hindenburg as president and Von Papen as vice-chancellor.

Response A – 10/10
However, it was only a short term failure and more of a long term success for the Nazis because in Hitler’s trial; he was able to get the judge and the jury on his side because he was able to show them that he only committed the Putsch because of the anger and humiliation he felt from the treaty and many of the jury agreed with him and started to see Hitler as a right wing hero. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison but only served 9 months. While in prison, he wrote his auto-biography called Mein Kamp was became a best-seller and sold a lot of copies which made Hitler and the Nazis a lot of money. Also, while in prison he rethought his strategy and decided to change his tactics form violence winning votes legally through constitutional means. Also, he was treated very good in his prison as he had his own private bedroom, he was allowed visitors inside his room and the prison guards respected and admired Hitler. In my opinion, the Munich Putsch was more of a short term failure but a long term success because even though they failed the putsch and Hitler got arrested, Hitler was able to convince the jury and judge that he attempted the putsch for the reasons and he turned himself into a right-wing hero in their eyes. While in prison, he changed tactics and made millions from his book. So the Putsch wasn’t that much of a disaster because it was a long-term success as Hitler eventually becomes chancellor and the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag.

Response B – 6/10
The Munich Putsch was not that much of a disaster for the Nazis because it offered them attention, influence and little punishment to their leader, Adolf Hitler.
Adolf Hitler became leader of the Nazi party only in 1922, but was a very powerful speaker, attracting many visitors to hear him speak at the Munich beer halls. In 1923, Germany had just recovered from the hyper-inflation earlier that year because the new chancellor Gustav Stresemann had invent the new currency, the Rentenmark. Hitler decided to do this attempted Putsch at the time when Germany was especially unstable still because of the effects of the first world war on the economy. While the Putsch failed and resulted in Hitler’s captains on trial, it was not necessarily a disaster for the Nazis.
At the trial, the media reported Hitler’s every word for the rest of Germany to reach. It was at this trial where Hitler’s views of ‘liebensram’ (living space in Eastern Europe), the fault of the Jews and the shame of the Treaty of Versailles were illustrated. The trial gained a lot of publicity and Hitler’s ideas were becoming more influential and dispersed some of it. Had Hitler not been brought to this trial, his Nazi party may have never reached as much influence as it did by 1932.
Next, the trial resulted in Hitler being given a 5 year sentence for treason why usually lifetime imprisonment would be given, out parole after just 9 months. The relatively light punishment suggested people in high positions supported Hitler and were right-wing themselves, reflecting how many of the government officials from the Kaiser’s time were still in these positions and holding their right-wing views. The light sentence also gave Hitler to write his book ‘Mein Kampf’ (My Struggle), in which he illustrated his political views and ideas for the future of Germany. He served his time in prison in relative comfort too, so that when Hitler was released from prison, he was not too affected by it.

However, the Munich Putsh was no question a failure of the Nazis in their intentions to take power, and opened them up to ridicule for ignoring the democratic system of government. But nonetheless, the Nazis recovered from this failure and won 3 seats in the 1928, not many but enough to survive as a party until 1930s during the depression. Furthermore, the Munich Putsch was during a time of great political instability in Germany, as political assasinations were common and other uprisings had been attempted already such as the Spartacist Revolution of 1919 and the Kapp Putsch of 1920. These uprisings failed but reflected the opportunity for extremism to occur in Germany. While the Putsch did fail, it was only one of a few attempted rebellions so could be considered less traitrous than normal.

Therefore, the Munich Putsch was not a total disaster for the Nazis because their leader received light punishment, they gained great attention and were able to win seats even during the boom time years in 1928.
A012 DEPTH STUDY – RUSSIA 1905-1941

Study Source A.
Why was this poster published in 1930? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7
The poster was published in 1930 to encourage peasants to join the collective farm – known as Kolkhoz – in order to help Stalin’s policy of collectivisation. In the poster, a man can be seen on a tractor and this war, at the time, modern technology which greatly increased yield and would have encouraged peasants to join a kolkhoz – tractors were made available through the government’s motor tractor scheme. Also, both people on the poster look happy – they’re smiling – and this may have been needed to convince peasants to join Stalin’s policy of collectivisation as it was asking them to abandon a way of life that they and their ancestors had lead for centuries. Stalin needed collectivisation so that enough food could be produced to feed workers and to sell surplus and thus agriculture needed to be reformed and he wanted as many people as possible to go and join collective farms.

Response B – 3/7
This source was published as propaganda for Stalin’s collectivisation method to try and get peasants to go and work on collective farms. The source shows two young happy Russians asking peasants to ‘come join our collective farm, comrade!’

The word comrade is used to make it seem like they are working as a team for a good cause and it welcomes them as if it is a good thing to do for their country. I know that these farms didn’t have very good living conditions and the peasants would have to leave their farms behind to join them therefore this source and others like it had to be made as propaganda to encourage people to join these farms.
Study Source B.

How is this source useful as evidence about the Soviet Union in the 1930s? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
The source is useful as it shows how the Soviet Union brainwashed young people and used propaganda to turn citizens against the kulaks. It shows how the right thing to do is to capute kulaks and hand them to the authorities which suggests kulaks are inferior and unworthy of privilidge. During the 1930s, due to kulaks ‘rebellion’ they were liquidated as a social class with 18 million sent to the terrible Gulags and 10 million killed. However, the source is biased, written by a government who are trying to demonise kulaks, and is only a single source and therefore whilst the source is useful about what Stalin wanted people to think it is not factual – kulaks weren’t ‘second class’ – and is thus not useful for statistical evidence.

Response B – 3/6
This source is useful as evidence about the Soviet union in the 1930’s because it shows us how the peasants ‘chased the kulaks from the land’ in the 1930’s telling us what the Soviet Union wanted children to know about their history. The source was also produced at the time of the Soviet Union so it shows how Russia’s history was taught in schools at that time. On the otherhand, this source isn’t very useful because it was written by the Soviet Union themselves so it is quite unreliable. The Soviet Union would want their young population to think the kulaks were bad and greedy and the peasants were heroic by chasing them away. This is why they produced this source which could mean it isn’t truthful which would make it unreliable.
Study Source C.

‘Stalin’s industrial policies were a success.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7

‘Stalins industrial policies were a success’ I agree with the statement as from my own knowledge we know that the ‘five year plans’ developed in the Soviet Union industrially and provided more work and food for the people. It also ensure trading with other countries providing the Soviet Union with allies. The Five year plans were a successful Industrial policy.

However from the Source we can tell that work conditions were not improved and the workers were not given enough supplies. ‘Workers got no butter, and almost no sugar or milk.’ This quote from the Source suggests that the food shortages were low, farmers and food were not being produced fast enough compared to the Industrial scale.

Also, the source is not realiable as its been taken from an American volunteer worker. The opinion could be biast against the working conditions and possibly not 100% true. In addition, the book was published in 1941, 30 years after he had been working their. Resulting in a faulty memory and inaccuracy.

Also the American may have published the book to lie and depick the improvements of The Soviets to show the Americans that the Soviet Union hasn’t rebuilt.

In conclusion the interpretation I agree with as the Source tells to us an unccessful working environment.

Response B – 5/7

From the Source it would be right to assume that Stalin’s policies were not a success as the work conditions were very poor and lead to huge inefficiencies such as working time lost due to bad organisation or workers not having correct materials. However under the Five-Years-Plans Stalins aims for industry, industrial growth was staggering with, for example production of pig iron almost doubling between 1929 and 1933 and electricity production increasing by over 250% during the second Five-Year-Plan. Therefore, I would agree with this interpretation however, I would argue that this ‘statistic’ was only in terms of growth and facts + figures and statistics. This is because of the appalling working conditions of the workers – as seen by the source – and it was the toughness of these people, and not Stalins ‘technique’, which caused the industrial policies to be a success. The workers survived on only “bread and grain” for entire winters, yet were still productive enough to allow for the staggering industrial growth that the USSR achieved.

Response C – 2/7

I only partly disagree with this statement. This source shows that the working conditions and efficiency of the industrial processes were very bad in Russia. The source mentions that tools were missing, there was a lack of food and disease was present in the working areas. This shows that the industrial policies weren’t a success because the workers were treated badly and many of the jobs weren’t properly alone. This source makes out as if work was done quickly to fit targets but badly and in bad conditions.

However from my knowledge I know that some of Stalin’s industrial policies were a success because statistics show that the economy improve under Stalin and the industry worked better than before.

Overall I partly agree with this intrepretation because I think Stalin’s policies had successes and failures.
What promises did the Tsar make in the October Manifesto in 1905?

Response A – 4/4
In the October manifesto on the 30th October 1905 the Tsar promised political rights such as the right to free speech and the right to free conscious. Also the manifesto agreed to give financial aid to peasants family in the countryside. Also he promised that an elected Duma (a parliament) would be formed. With this he also gave people the right to form political parties.

Response B – 2/4
The Tsar promised to make a duma in the october manifesto which enlightened the middle class in particular as they wanted a say in how their country was ran. However he later dissolved the dumas showing that he created false promises.

Explain the importance of the Tsar taking control of Russia’s war effort in 1915.

Response A – 6/6
The Tsar taking over Russia’s war effort in 1915 was important because with Nicholas II as full commander, the army and people could now fully blame him for failures as war. Battles like the Masurien Lakes where Russia was fully beaten now fell completely on the Tsars shoulders. The fact many of his soldiers were without boots and coats could not be blamed on his other military leaders. This was all important as it raised peoples hatred for the Tsar and in the end brought about his downfall. Now not only the people but the army had a reason to hate the Tsar which was why in 1917 he was forced to abdicate as the army no longer supported him.

Also by taking control of Russia war effort the Tsar left his wife at home in charge of the rest of Russia. This was important because rumours started flying round the capital that, because she was a German decent, she was helping the German enemy. Also people started to think Rasputin, the Tsarina’s reported love affair, was now running the country. This was important because, without the Tsar at home, people were now turning on his wife. Not only did they trust the Tsar but the Tsarina was also being accused of treachery. So from September 1915 onwards, not only the Tsar was coming under scrutiny but also his wife which was important because now the country was united against the whole noble family, not just the Tsar.

Response B – 2/6
By the Tsar taking control in the war effort in 1915 Russia suffered badly. For example war communism took place so inflation occured and all resources where going to the front line for the soldiers. The Tsar was not a trained fighter and therefore left his position to fight when it wouldn't nesecerally help. Whilst this happened Rasputin came very close to power and the Russian citizens were very frightened that he was influencing the Tsarina about his ways. Rasputin was a drunken man whom came very close to power which was atrocious of the Tsar to let happen as his country were in fear and also Rasputin had an affair with the Tsarina. By letting Rasputin that close to power, made the Tsar appear very weak and unsure of his ways of leadership putting his country in danger.
How well did the Tsar govern Russia between 1905 and 1914? Explain your answer.

Response A – 9/10
The Tsar governed Russia well between 1905 and 1914 because his Prime Minister, Peter Stolypin, from July 1906 put down many minor revolts and restored order in the country. Stolypin employed a carrot and stick method. On the carrot side he was lenient on wealthier peasants and let them opt out of the backward family system of mirs. This produced impressive agricultural growth and was better for the Russian economy. However he was not to lenient. He was brutal on revolting peasants an over 1000 were hung. The noose became known as 'Stolypin's Necktie'. This brutal use of force to restore order improved Russia as minor revolts did not get out of hand. The Tsar and Stolypin got the Russian economy going and made sure there were no more chances of a revolution between 1905 to 1914.

However the Tsar was not successful in governing Russia between 1906-1914 as he failed to properly work with his Duma and after 1910 strike once again began to rise. The first two Duma's were dismissed within a year because they were too crytical of the Tsar. He did not co-operate with them and felt threatened by the able and talented minister. The Third Duma lasted until 1912 because it was less crytical of the Tsar but than even that Duma was dismissed. Nicholas II failed to work with his elected parliament which prevented Russia from being properly governed. Also, after Stolypin’s death, the number of strikes began to rise rapidly. The number of strikes rose by 3000 according to the Tsars office in government between 1910-1914. The Tsar had once again lost control and his failure to deliver on some of the promises made in the October Manifesto angered the people.

Overall the Tsar failed to govern Russia well between 1905-1914 because strikes began to rise again and he failed to co-operate with Dumas. Although Stolypin was a succesful Prime Minister and got Russia's economy going, the Tsar failure to officially use agriculture as well, where 90% of Russia's most fertile land was still being farmed in the backlands mir system, meant the Tsar did not govern Russia very well as it failed to catch up with other countries ecomies in Euope. From 1905-1914 Nicholas II failed in governing his country Russia.

Response B – 6/10
The Tsar governed Russia extremely badly from 1905-1914 due to several reasons. One being his secret police the Okhrana and the way in which he dealt with opposition. For example in 1905 Bloody Sunday occurred. Bloody Sunday was a peaceful protest of workers wanting better working conditions and better pay lead by father Gapon. They marched to the winter palace with a petition for the Tsar to sign and instead of meeting peacefully The Tsar ordered his military to kill over 200 people, which caused many riots throughout Russia. Another example of badly dealt with opposition would be Munity on the battleship potemkin. This was many members revelling in front of a large supporting crowd, the Tsar dealt with this by killing mass amounts of his own navy of course losing support of not only his navy but his people also. However the Tsar had Peter Stolypin the leader of the Duma on his side and he also helped with force. Under the Tsar inflation occured significantly causing bug factories to lose out as mass poverty hit Russias economy. Later a rouble had to be introduced as a new currency by Lenin to end inflation.

Under the Tsar everything was ran under a hierarchical scheme meaning only noblemen got a say. Peasants wanted land and he failed to give it to them, workers wanted better pay and working conditions and he also deprived them of that. However he did give the middle class a say by introducing Dumas but eventually he dissolved them also taking away their political voice. The Russo-Japenese war had also occured under the Tsar which Russia lost due to lack of weapons and leadership meaning that war communism was taking place and great poverty was occuring.

Overall, from 1905-1914 The Tsar govered Russia very negatively appearing to be extremely weak and crippling Russias economy making it corrupt intol he was forced to abdicate.
Describe how Stalin used a cult of personality.

Response A – 4/4
Through the use of excessive propaganda, including Stalinist poster, statues, films and art work, Stalin presented himself as a simple Georgian peasant, a man of the people. In schools children were taught a Stalinist version of history, in which he was the only true hero of the 1917 October Revolution. Through extreme censorship (all art and music, as well as newspapers, were carefully monitored and selected by the Communist party) Stalin managed to erase any criticism, and if people didn’t admire him after his excessive propaganda the NKVD, secret police, through Red terror and the purges, ruled with fear, scaring survivors to think like Stalin and praise him.

Response B – 1/4
Stalin used a cult of personality to scare his Russian people. He was almost a dictator but tried to look loving and friendly.

Explain why Trotsky failed to become leader of the USSR after Lenin’s death.

Response A – 6/6
Trotsky failed to become leader of the USSR following Lenin’s death, Stalin, Kamanev and Zimoviev formed the triumverate in 1924 which dominated the policy making politicians of the Communist party. Here Stalin opposed Behlemann and Trotsky, and later in 1925 Trotsky was sacked as Commissioner of War then later teamed up with Bukharin against Trotsky in debates on controversial topics like collectivisation and Trotsky was eventually expelled from the party in 1928.

Stalin also attempted to appear as close to Lenin after his death. He forged photos, did his best to conceal Lenin’s true opinion, and also even tricked Trotsky into missing Lenin’s funeral in 1924, where Stalin himself appeared as chief mourner and Lenin’s best friend.

Despite his brilliant leadership, Trotsky was also arrogant. This, and also his plans for a worldwide communist revolution, worried many followers, as they feared Trotsky would draw Russia into new conflicts. Many perferred Stalin’s policy of ‘Socialism in one country’.

Response B – 4/6
Trotsky failed to become leader of USSR as Stalin provided Trotsky with a fake date to Lenin’s funeral so that he wouldn’t make it. This made Russia very angry as they saw it as Trotsky being very disrespectful towards Russia’s beloved past leader. Stalin turned up to the funeral which in Russian peoples minds made him look better and a more caring leader for the people.
How far did the purges benefit the Soviet Union? Explain your answer.

Response A – 10/10

In some ways the purges did benefit the Soviet Union. For example, it meant that Stalin could get rid of his rivals and people who were against his controversial policies. This meant that the purges benefitted the Soviet Union because it meant that Stalin was able to focus on his industrial and agricultural policies without feeling threatened by his enemies. Stalin felt that Hitler was bound to attack within the next few years and therefore Stalin felt anyone threatening him must be purged. This was effective as it meant that no-one attempted to prevent Stalin from industrializing the USSR due to the fear they had of being purged. Secondly, Stalin’s purges enabled him to industrialise Russia at an immense pace. During the purges, Stalin sent those he felt threatened by to Gulags (concentration camps) in remote places to build showpieces such as Magnitogorsk. It can therefore be argued that the purges benefitted the Soviet Union because it meant that Stalin could industrialise Russia and make it prepared for war. This therefore benefitted the whole of the Soviet Union, as it prevented a greater loss in the upcoming war. One example of why the purges helped the industrial revolution was the production of tanks. The Battle of Kursk was a tank battle fought between the Russians and Germans and without the tanks the Russians wouldn’t have stood a chance.

However, it can also be argued that the purges were bad for the Soviet Union. For example, there was a huge human cost. Over one third of the Communist party was purged, including the leader in Leningrad, Kirov. This means that the purges did not benefit the Soviet Union because it meant that many key speakers and influential people in Russia were being purged. Stalin, at the time, was considered to be paranoid and on the run, this showing that the purges were bad for the Soviet Union because they meant that Russia was an extremely unsafe place for people to live in. Secondly, the purges can be seen as being incredibly unfair and inhumane. Many people who were purged were sent to Gulags, where they worked for long hours with little food or drink. Many millions of people died in these concentration camps and everyone was at risk from being sent to one. This suggests purges were not beneficial to the Soviet Union because Stalin simply appeared to look like a murderer, and the people of Russia were in the hands of a paranoid, ill man. In some ways these reasons do link together, for example, the huge human lost in the Gulags enabled Stalin to build up enough weapons to prevent millions of deaths in the upcoming world war.

In Conclusion, I believe that the purges did not benefit the Soviet Union. Although they enabled Stalin to build his country up to be able to fight a war, the human cost was huge and could have been avoided. The Soviet Union was an unsafe and inhumane place for people to live in, and they were being controlled by a paranoid, ill man. Therefore, I believe that the purges was simply due to Stalin's unions, and that he could have industrialised without the human cost.

Response B – 8/10

The Purges were carried out by Stalin as a result of his paranoid nature, as he was very worried about the security of his leadership. Following show trials of mencheviks in 1931, where they confessed to made up charges. In 1934 Kirov leader of the Leningrad communist party, was murdered, this gave Stalin an excuse to purge his enemies within the USSR, and it is suspected that Lenin himself organised Kirov’s murder.

Leading Bolshevists, like Bukharin, Kamanev and Zinoviev, were put on trial in show trials broadcast to the whole of Russia, where they were tortured into confessing to made up charges, of being ‘traitors to the state’. Slowly but surely, Stalin dominated all his opponents, and this, coupled with his propaganda fueled ‘cult of personality’ movement, made him much more secure in his role as leader of the USSR after the Purges.

The Purges, and particularly the NKVD (Stalin’s secret police) that carried out the Purges, created a fear culture in Russia. Nobody dared to speak out against the state, which meant when Stalin introduced the New Constitution in 1936, which allowed more free speech and ‘free’ elections, very few people dared to voice negative opinions against Stalin. The NKVD made the USSR a police state ruled by fear, it was easier due to the purges for Stalin to destroy his opponents.
However, the Purges had disastrous side effects. When Hitler invaded in 1941 Russia were very nearly defeated, as during the Purges 25,000 army officers had been killed, that’s one in five. In fact huge swathes of the Red Army had been purged, as well as its general commander. Teachers, politicians, doctors and scientists were all purged, resulting in a decline in free thinking in Russia, which very nearly resulted in its defeat in World War Two.

The Purges did result in a total of 10 million people sent to Gulags, 10 million of which were killed. Russia’s population was significantly depleted, weakening not only the army, but also having a massive effect on the second and third five year plans. The third in particular was little increase in oil production, due to a huge decreased workforce size, many whom had been killed.

In conclusion, although the purges helped to significantly secure Stalin’s role as leader of the USSR, they also significantly weakened the country itself, having an adverse effect on the army and industrialisation.

**Response C – 3/10**

The purges would have benefitted the Soviet union by killing rivals of the Soviets. Powerful people who made lots of profit for themselves or owned successful businesses were put in camps to work.
**Response A – 7/7**

This cartoon was published in 1932 in order to express the results of Hoover’s ideas of ‘prosperity being around the corner’. It shows how the idea of prosperity was clearly not going to occur and would have a striking impact on America. This is symbolized through the lightning bolt striking Uncle Sam. It shows how America will fare during this period, and shows how Hoover’s idea of prosperity is totally wrong. America will require a lot of effort to get back up.

Another reason why this cartoon was published was to create and understanding that prosperity would not occur but depression would. It comes about the time of the election, thus suggest that America will require a different President as Hoover’s idea of prosperity will not occur. This is due to the result of the Wall Street Crash in 1929, which presents why Uncle Sam, America, has been struck on the ground. Clearly, this shows why the cartoon was published in 1932.

---

**Response B – 5/7**

This cartoon is criticising president Herbert Hoover for his lack of actions to deal with the depression. The message is that the USA is in a bad state with the depression and Hoover is doing nothing to deal with the depression which is damaging the USA.

This source was published in 1932, the year of the election between Roosevelt and Hoover. This cartoon may have been published by supporters of FDR or even the democrats themselves. America was in a ‘great depression’ after the Wall Street Crash in 1929 and Hoover as doing nothing about it. At this time unemployment was high, shanty towns were widespread and ‘Hoover blankets’ kept the homeless warm. Furthermore, there were huge banking problems with 2294 banks failing in 1931 alone. Hoover was seen as a ‘lame duck’ president and did little to end the depression and even furthered it by rejecting the Warner-Garner Relief Bill, which would’ve provided $2.1bn to provide jobs. This shows how Hoover isn’t helping to tackle the depression, but its harming the USA even more.

The details of the source help reinforce the message that Hoover is harming USA. USA is shown to be on the floor, suggesting USA is stunned and is suffering. He is shown as being struck by lightening from a black cloud laybelled ‘Hoover “prosperity”’. This relates to from Hoover didn’t react to the depression quickly enough and said ‘the bus of prosperity is just around the corner’. The fact that the cloud is black shows the negative connotations surrounding Hoover and his response to the depression.

---

**Response C – 4/7**

The cartoon was published in 1932 Firstly because it shows that the “President hat” was off his head which represents that there were general elections in 1932 and he wasn’t re elected. The cloud which says “Hoover prosperity” was in a black storm and was far away, which represents that Hoover never reached his goal of prosperity. last of all the storm of “Hoover prosperity” hits hoover with lightning represents that Hoover’s Promise of “Prosperity is round the corner” came back to hit him as he never achieved it, he was then known as a “do nothing President”.
Study Source B.

‘Roosevelt won the 1932 election because of his campaigning methods.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7

I agree with the interpretation that FDR won the 1932 election because he had an effective campaign, as shown by the source. The source says how he saw thousands of Americans’ referring to his 20800km campaign trip. Furthermore, the source describes how he was ‘warm’ and ‘friendly’, qualities that greatly contrasted to the other candidate – Hoover (he was perceived as heartless and cruel, as demonstrated by the bonus marcher’s incident). FDR provided America with hope and at a time of depression where many relied on soup kitchens for their next meal, this was a powerful drive behind FDR’s energetic campaign.

However, there were other factors that contributed to FDR winning his landslide victory of 7m more votes than Hoover in the 1932 election. The source fails to acknowledge these other factors as her purpose was to praise Roosevelt, as shown through her congratulatory tone with words such as ‘personal’ and ‘affection’. Other factors that influenced his victory was the unpopularity of Hoover. Hoover, at the time, was seen as an uncaring man who had little concern for the poor. During the depression he did little to tackle it as he believed in rugged individualism and laissez-faire, which made people see him as a ‘lame duck’ president. He harmed his reputation no several occasions, such as rejecting the garner-wagner Relief Bill proposed by Congress to spend $2.1bn to fund employment schemes and ineffectively deadling with the bonus marchers. Hoover’s character greatly contrasted to FDR’s and this is shown by how Hoover often received a hostile welcome where food was pelted at his campaign train.

In conclusion I do support the statement that FDR’s victory was partly due to his effective campaign but this wasn’t the only factor influencing his victory, as shown by the contrast of character to Hoover.

Response B – 2/7

I believe that Roosevelt’s campaigning methods played a big part in Roosevelt winning The General election in 1932. As we can see from the source that Roosevelt liked to interact with the people and see their problems and get to know the people. For the Public this meant that he cared about the Public and cud not just himself and the government, this helped persuade the Public that he would change America for the bettermen of its country from the source we see that he was a caring man and he used to talk to the Public and have Phone calls with them this meant to the Public that he was going to be a good President. I think this factor played a huge part in Roosevelt’s election victory in 1932. But there were other things that played a huge part in his victory in the election, such as his intentions as a President and his background, which he did before becoming a President. In conclusion we can see that Roosevelt’s campaigning methods played the Majority of the part when it came to Roosevelt winning the election, however there were other factors which also played a part.
Study Source C.
What is the cartoonist’s message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
This American source is praising FDR’s promise of reform and is trying to raise support for the upcoming reforms. The message of the cartoon is that hope for the USA has arrived by FDR and that the USA will soon be on the road to recovery.

This source was published by early 1933, within FDR’s first 100 days. At this time USA was in a large depression with 11.3m unemployed when FDR came into power and 1.3m unemployed by 1933, which was 25% of the population. FDR had many plans to reform USA, such as repealing prohibition, dealing with unemployment through the CCC (1933) and dealing with the farming crisis with the AAA (1933).

The details of the source help reinforce the message of the cartoon that USA is on the road to recovery. FDR is walking up the road, where he comes to face many question marks. These question marks represent. The problems USA faces and shows how FDR must overcome them. FDR is depicted as smiling and is holding large suitcases, which represents his many plans for USA reform.

Response B – 2/7
The cartoonists message was that Roosevelt was walking into the White house, as he is walking up to the White house he see’s the “Question mark People’ which represent all of the factors which Hoover has left to Roosevelt to sort out which Hoover had created when he was in charge. There are several things like: Prohibition, taxation tariffs, Economy, farm relief and unemployment. They are standing there outside the whitehouse, at that moment when Roosevelt is walking into the white house, he hasn’t even moved in and the problems are in front of him. This represents that the General Public want Roosevelt to deal with these problems immeditely. This is the cartoonists message.
Describe the policies of the Republican presidents during the 1920s.

Response A – 4/4
The main policy of the Republican Presidents (Harding, Coolidge and Hoover) during the 1920s was of Rugged Individualism. The Republican Presidents believed that the government should not interfere with the lives of the people and that it was people's responsibility to earn their own wealth. The Republican Presidents also kept taxes and interest rates low and encouraged banks to loan money to spend on new consumer goods such as fridges and radios. The Presidents also introduced quotas for immigration into the USA, which discriminated against people from Eastern Europe and Asia. This is because White Anglo-Saxon Protestants (WASPs) feared unionists and Communists going to the USA and damaging their way of life. WASPs were the largest group in the USA so had a lot of power.

The Presidents also had high taxes on European goods to prevent cheap European goods damaging US business.

Response B – 2/4
The policies of the Republicans in the 1920s were very much what may have made the Wall St. Crash so crippling. The policy 'Laissez Faire' is the idea that the state leaves things alone and doesn't support the country. The idea as that the country could sort itself out. The Republicans feared creating a 'nanny state' in which the country was dependant on the Government.

Explain why some industries faced problems before 1929.

Response A – 6/6
Some businesses already faced problems before 1924 and the Wall Street Crash because of new industries and overpopulation. By 1924 there was 10% less coal being mined than in 1914, as there was large competition from oil in the 1920s. Oil was being used far more frequently, as trucks were often being used to transport goods rather than trains.

The cotton industry also suffered in the 1920s whilst it had flourished during World War I. In 1921 the Boll Weevil destroyed 30% of the cotton crop, this damaged profits as there was much less to sell, therefore causing farmers to lay off employees forcing some people into poverty. However, in the mid 1920s cotton also suffered but from overproduction. The demand was much less than during the First World War, this led to a massive decrease in value and massively damaged profits. Congress did pass a bill to buy excess farm goods, however Coolidge rejected it, as he felt it encouraged further overproduction.

Response B – 3/6
Industries such as agriculture and farming faced many problems. Such as high levels of competition, another was farmers produced too much surplus because of new farming techniques, another one was that the rich people wanted fresh foods and fruits. Because of these reasons farmers had to sell their farms because they were not selling enough fruits, and vegetables, and foods which meant they were losing money.
Response A – 9/10

I feel that the First World War was the main reason for the boom in the US in the 1920s, however there were other significant causes. The USA entered World War I (WWI) late and benefitted massively. The US did not suffer the damage of many European countries as there was no fighting on US soil, their economy was also not badly damaged as they did not have to fund the war effort. The US also overtook European countries in industry as European countries stalled during the war. For example, the USA overtook Germany in the chemical industry.

There was also a large demand for US goods thanks to World War I, the USA exported food and weapons to Europe during the war which earnt US businesses large amounts of money and strengthened the US economy. Also, after the war European industries were damaged, they therefore bought US goods with US loans. This increased demand and strengthened the US economy, possibly causin the boom.

Another factor which contributed to the boom was the policies of the Republican government. They made taxes and interest rates low, this meant people had more disposable income which they used to buy US goods, which strengthened the US economy. People also mainly bought US goods, as the Republicans used high tariffs on cheap European goods, for example, Harding used the Fordney-McCumber tariff to raise duties on industrial and farm products.

New technologies also contributed to the economic boom in the 1920s in the USA. New technologies such as radios, fridges and cars became big business in the US. People often used hire purchase which meant many people could afford these goods, this increased demand, supplied more jobs and strengthened the economy.

People were also able to afford the new goods such as cars thanks to their prices decreasing, in particular Model T Ford. Henry Ford developed the assembly line which made the production of cars much faster and more efficient. This decreased their price, increased demand and could therefore be seen as contributing to ‘the boom’.

There were also new developing industries which also helped contribute to the boom. Film, radio and advertising became big business. Film was the mass entertainment with films silent until ‘The Jazz Singer’ in 1927. The demand for films put a large amount of money into the US economy.

To conclude, I feel that although the First World War was the main cause of the economic boom in the US, there were other significant contributors. Such as, new industry, new technologies and Republican policies.

Response B – 6/10

I agree with this statement to a certain extent because the USA Joined World War one later, it allowed them to sell fire arms and weapons alongside food stuffs and other supplies to countries fighting in the war, which they did and this improved industries which was one of the key factors which led to the economic boom. On the other hand there were many other things that led to the economic boom in the 1920s. Such as new industries, the new industries like the motor industry meant many people bought cars with their own or with loans, the high number of sales of new products from new industries was a key reason for the economic boom. Another factor was tariffs which meant there was less import tax on goods which helped American goods, it meant they were cheaper and increased sales, this improved the economy and was another factor which led to the boom. Another factor was less taxation, the government taxed the public very little. It meant the Public had more money to expand business’s or buy new products or invest in the stock market or do with their money as they wish. These three things are part of government policies and I believe contributed more towards the boom than America’s involvement in world war one, however America’s late entry to the war still did effect the boom in the 1920’s.
Describe the difficulties faced by African Americans in the 1920s.

Response A – 4/4
African Americans faced many difficulties in the 1920s. America in the 1920s was a very racially intolerant place, therefore African Americans were treated with very little respect and earned very little in any job they worked, even if they worked well. Another problem African Americans faced was the Ku Klux Klan (the KKK), as they were very prejudiced against black people and went as far as murdering and lynching them. African Americans were treated poorly in the 1920s, therefore it would be a very difficult lifestyle.

Response B – 3/4
Difficulties faced in the 1920’s by black people were:
- Racism – people abusing them because they’re black
- Discrimination – people treating them unfairly
- Death – the KKK was very brutal in the 1920’s
- Robbery – they as over charged for the basics like bread, water, food etc

Explain why people joined the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s.

Response A – 5/6
The Ku Klux Klan was an extremely popular organisation in the 1920s, as they discriminated against minorities such as African Americans, Catholics, homosexuals and Jews. America was a very intolerant place in the 1920s, therefore many people joined the KKK to inflict their superiority on those who they believed were inferior to them. Many people who joined were white people who believed that America should be kept traditionally “pure” and white people would join the Ku Klux Klan if they were racist or disliked minorities, so they could hurt them, and enjoy watching them suffer and die. People would also join the KKK as they wore white hoods and cloaks to hide their identities therefore nobody would know they were a member and they would feel secure.

Response B – 3/6
People joined the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920s because they didn’t like the fact that black people could work and live along side the white race.

Another reason people joined the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) is so that they could kill black people as it wasn’t seen as killing a person back then because of how much they hated them.

Finally, people joined the KKK so that they could assert their “superiority” and “dominance” over the black people. They did this so they would make black people feared and fear for their lives.
‘Prohibition failed because it encouraged corruption.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Response A – 9/10

There were many reasons for the failure of prohibition, one of them being that it encouraged corruption. Some people believe this is the main reason for prohibition whilst others disagree.

Prohibition, otherwise known as the Volstead Act, was put in place to stop the selling and prohibition of alcohol. This encouraged corruption as prohibition agents, who were put in charge to destroy any alcohol they saw and persecute those it belonged to, were easily bribed and sold out when offered money. Gangs such as Al Capone's gang, would illegally smuggle alcohol into the country, and offered prohibition agents and police officers money if they allowed this to happen. This was called bootlegging, and become extremely popular with gangs during the time of prohibition was pointless due to this, as prohibition agents were so corrupt that they were allowing alcohol in the country anyway, so the volstead act may as well never have been put in place.

Another reason for the failure of prohibition is that many people in America didn't agree with it in the first place, therefore proceeded to drink alcohol when it was made illegal. Speakeasies were secret bars America would go to, where bootlegged liquor was sold to them. So many people attended speakeasies that prohibition became questionable as it was not actually stoping many people from drinking alcohol. The large number of people that didn't agree with prohibition drank alcohol when it was illegal, therefore it can be seen as a huge failure in this instance.

Another reason why prohibition failed was once again due to the gangs. Prohibition caused a huge amount of competition between gangs as they all wanted to sell bootlegged liquor and make profit, yet if they all did this they would all make less of a profit. This resulted in conflict between many gangs. An example of this was when Al Capone's gang pretended to be police officers and proceeded to massacre a rival gang. This event is known as the St Valentine's Day massacre. The increasing amount of violence caused by prohibition between gangs led to the failure of prohibition and ended with the Valstead Act being withdrawn.

To conclude, I agree that prohibition failed because it encouraged corruption, however I didn't believe his is the main reason prohibition was a failure. When the Volstead Act was introduced, huge numbers of US citizens argued that it should be revoked, and therefore the fact that many people disagreed with the prohibition, encouraged illegal activity, and I believe this was the key reason why prohibition failed. Violence caused by gangs also made America much more unsafe, therefore this was quite important to why prohibition was a failure.

Response B – 7/10

I agree with this statement to a certain degree because it did cause corruption like: bootlegging, speakesis, moonshine making and for a lot of gangsters to become very powerful. This meant that bribing was very common with police officers as gangsters would simply slip them some money if they got caught.

Another reason I agree with this statement is because when something that people want is taken it makes them want it more, this means that people would go to extreme lengths to get some beer. Which then lead to people making moonshine which got so extreme, because people couldn't brew it properly, that some people would go blind because of it.

Some people may disagree with me, however, as they would say it failed because it wasn't was well thought threw. the law of prohibition never actually stopeed people drinking alcohol it just stopeed them selling it. This meant that it was eventuallly discarded from the law because it was slightly contradictory.

Another reason people may disagree with me is because it failed because a very small number of people suported the prohibition. Because of this it meant it was very hard to uphold it because it was impossible to cover both borders, with Canada and South America, and its massive coastlines to stop alcohol entering the country.
Response C – 5/10

I partly agree with this statement because from my own knowledge I know that Government and Police took bribes and sold alcohol illegally. Prohibition allowed the Government to sell alcohol at a higher price than normal. The main reason why Police was corrupted was due to low wages. Police weren't paid enough to feed their families therefore they took bribes. 1 in 5 policemen got sacked from bribes.

On the other hand, the involvement of Gangs was the main reason why prohibition failed. People still drunk and wanted to drink, therefore it was perfect opportunity for gangs to make money. Gangs made moonshine in speak-easys which were illegal alcohol pubs. Al capone was the biggest Gang leaders and made billions from selling alcohol. The ‘21’ club was the most popular speak-easy around.

In Conclusion, I thing Gangs involvement was the main reason why prohibition failed and also the fact people wanted to drink.
A014 DEPTH STUDY – MAO’S CHINA
c. 1930-1976

Study Source A.

‘China had a good relationship with Russia under the leadership of Mao.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7
The poster, published in 1949, after the CCP had defeated the GMD and had declared the People’s Republic of China at the Forbidden City is a very positive Soviet propaganda peace towards the Chinese Communists using social realism. The woman in the picture is looking up, out of the picture to the future, the great Communist triumph. The Soviet Union wanted to encompass the world in Communism and helped the CCP win the civil war in China leaving Japanese weapons in Manchuria for them to rearm themselves. Naturally the emergence of another large nation as a communist country was very positive for their movement. Mao visited Moscow in 1949 to solidify relations between the two countries.

However, as the poster is propaganda, flooded with Communist red; it doesn’t show any of the conflicts between the USSR and China. Mao accused the USSR of not helping enough in the civil war of China and the Soviet also stole $2 billion worth of industrial plant from China at the time. In the years after this poster was produced, the USSR and China signed the Sino-Soviet Agreement (1950) where the Soviets loaned China $300 million, but expected interest, a large amount of China’s bullion reserves and housing and feeding for the 10,000 Soviet advisors lent to China.

Khrushchev’s secret speech in 1956, criticizing Stalin, was taken as a direct criticism of Mao, who was trying to create his own cult of personality. They also had conflicts over subordinate Soviet states, such as Albania and Czechoslovakia and Mao ignored the Test Ban Treaty of 1962 to explode an atomic bomb in 1964. Red Guards besieged the Soviet embassy in Beijing in 1967 and in the 1970s, they often fought on opposing sides of conflicts, although not directly.

This poster doesn’t give a good representation of Mao’s relations with Russia as it was published right at the beginning of his leadership of China and the poster is propaganda so would want to be portraying communism as a positive, united movement.

Response B – 2/7
I agree with the comments that Mao had a good relation with Russia. The 5 year plan involved Russia scientists, therefore they must have been friends for a country to improve another country so much. The scientists were sent to China to teach them how to make metal and other things needed to improve china. Also, this source is from the Soviet Union in 1949. In 1949, Mao had just beaten the Guomindang in the Civil War, as soon as he won the Russians praised him by saying he brought ‘freedom,’ ‘independence’ and ‘happiness’. If Russia and Mao didn’t have good relations then they wouldn’t have spent time celebrating Mao.
Study Source B.

What is the message of the poster? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
The message of this source is that in 1969 the Chinese believed themselves superior to the USSR and the USA. It is a propaganda piece, again with the Chinese looking out of frame towards a stronger and superior China once the USSR and the USA have been crushed. There was a lot of propaganda similar to this at the time. The Chinese, must bigger and more powerful than the defeated leaders, hold weapons and Mao’s Little Red Book.

At this time, Bresnev, the leader of the USSR wanted to outlaw China over the Ussuri river conflict on its border and the USA was blocking the CCP from being recognised as the government of China by the UN and was imposing a trade ban of China. Nixon was trying to follow the policy of containment as he feared the domino effect.

Other propaganda in China included the film ‘Resist America, support Korea’ and the Chinese were warned of the dangerous American capitalist threat.

Response B – 2/6
The message of this poster is that China are stronger than both America and Russia. The poster shows Red Guard members holding Mao’s red book, crushing the leader of both America and Russia. Also the Chinese people in the poster are a lot bigger than the American and Russian leaders. This may show chinese people to be bigger and more powerful than the leaders of America and Russia. The chinese people are shown to be stronger because they’re crushing the leaders under their fists.
Study Source C.

How useful is this source as evidence about relations between China and the USA up to 1971? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7

This source is relatively useful in portraying the relationship between the USA and the CCP, but only to a certain extent as this comes more towards the end of Mao’s reign and is limiting as it doesn’t show their whole history of relations.

By 1971, the USA aimed to befriend and improve relations with China after their split from the USSR. They wanted to take advantage of this split as this was during the Cold War between American and the USSR. President Nixon even visited China in 1971, showing the attempt to make peace. Mao was also keen for improved relations due to his want for modern and improved technology in terms of trading with the USA. This source does illustrate the new friendship with the USA, but is only useful to show this, not the rest of their relations.

America and China, prior to 1971, had a very bad relationship due to America’s hatred of Communism and their opposing sides in the Korean and Vietnamese wars. This source is not useful as it doesn’t indicate any evidence of their poor relations and the USA’s hatred of communism.

In conclusion, whilst this source is useful in showing the improving relationship between the USA and China by 1971, it is very limiting for historians in showing the entire relationship between China and the USA prior to 1971 and gives a false view of their relationship if one was to only look at this source.

Response B – 5/7

This source is useful as it shows that the American opposition to China’s Communist party was starting to fade in the early 1970s.

Nixon mentions that he wants to bring about ‘peace’ with the ‘participation of the People’s Republic of China’. At the time, relations were thawing and Ping Pong diplomacy was taking place, where US ping pong players were invited to China for the first time.

Nixon’s ‘initiatives’ to encourage more normal relations include the lifting of the trade ban and the encouragement to the UN to recognise the CCP as China’s government.

However, this source is not useful as it does not mention the Vietnam war, which both the US and China were involved in and which the USA were desperately trying to withdraw from without seeming weak. Nixon was practising Realpolitik at this time and wanted to draw China and the USSR apart from each other and weaken them by improving his relations but doesn’t give insight into whether China wanted better relations as well. Therefore, it is useful to some extent as it shows the USA was willing to improve relations but does not give either the Chinese perspective or the reasons for Nixon’s change of policy.

Response C – 2/7

The source is not very useful because up to 1975, China and America had taken part in conflicts for many years. Both China and America fought in the Korean and Vietnam wars against each other, showing extremely bad relations between the two countries. Also in the speech Nixon says ‘there can be no peace without the participation of the People’s Republic of China’. This shows how useless it is, because up to this point America hadn’t even recognised Mao as the leader of China.
Describe the tactics used by the Red Army during the Civil War.

Response A – 4/4
The Red Army which was the communist army, employed tactics of guerilla warfare in the civil war. Guerilla warfare involved ambushing nationalist soldiers from mobile bases. These tactics were employed because the Red Army at that time was very small and didn't have much equipment. However the tactics were very successful and negated the modern equivalent of the GMD. The Red Army also used Revolutionary Warfare, in which they treated peasants respectfully and kept firm law and order. This contrasted to how badly nationalist forces treated the peasants.

Response B – 2/4
The red army cut phone lines so that the Guomindang and Japanese couldn’t use them to communicate long distances. Also they broke railway lines to stop any food or resources getting to other parts of the country.

Explain why the Communist Party was strengthened by the Second World War.

Response A – 5/6
During the second world war, Mao put his personal interests and his party’s interests aside for the sake of the country. This won him support as the Chinese people wanted to be rid of the Japanese as they treated everyone badly, destroying homes and killing people. Chiang on the other hand focused on the Communists and so people turned from Nationalism to communism.

Furthermore, Mao was tactics of guerilla warfare against the Japanese, and they were very successful, he was seen as a liberator: communist soldiers taught villagers to plant mines which would blow up Japanese soldiers and the idea was a great success. People looked to communism as the way forward.

In addition, during the Second World War, the Red Army treated the communist areas fairly, keeping firm law and order. This contrasted to the inflation in GMD areas which caused the middle classes to lose faith in Chiong and support Mao instead. By the end of the war, the communists had gained a lot of support.

Response B – 1/6
The communist party was strengthened by the Second World War because it weakened Japan, and made them easier to defeat. Before the start of World War two China had been invaded by Japan and Japan had taken over large parts of china. After the Second World War, Japan had a small army and were still recovering from the bomb that had been dropped by America, This made Japan easier to defeat, therefore the Communists could get the support of the peasants who had seen the communists get rid of people who had killed many.

Also, the Guomindang knew they had to try and stop the Japanese. This made it easier for the communists to fight them because they weren’t souly concentrated on the Communists. Also the tactics used by the Guomindang were not popular to the peasants because many crop fields were burnt and flooded. This lost the support of the peasants for the Guomindang, therefore they were getting no support in comparison to Communist party.
‘The Long March was a success for the Communists.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

**Response A – 8/10**

I agree with this statement to an extent. The Long March was a success in that it marked the survival of the CCP – they had escaped Nationalist forces and now had the time to rebuild and recuperate in Yemen. Furthermore, Mao proved his dominance over the CCP after the Long March – he took over military tactics from Otto Braun and lead the CCP to safety despite the strength of the nationalists. Mao was now the undisputed leader of the communists and would lead them to further success.

Also, the Long March enabled the communists to spread the message of communism through the provinces of China. They gained a lot of support from peasants who took heart in the bravery of the CCP.

However, in many ways the long march was not a success. The communists had lost hold of their base in Jiangxi, which was the main communist base and was very successful. The march did not defeat the GMD but just escaped them – the only thing the CCP achieved was a successful retreat.

Furthermore, the Long March was not a success as the Red Army took a while to break out of Jiangxi and when they did, they lost 50,000 men. The tactics first taken failed as the communists took a direct route, making their movements easy to predict so were ambushed by Nationalist forces. Finally, the significant loss of life on the Long March cannot be ignored. Out of the 87,000 that left Jiangxi; only 1 in 10 survived which was a huge loss to the communists. Many died in the appalling conditions and many more were injured. This significantly weakened the communists.

In conclusion, the Long March was a success because the CCP survived and spread the communist message. However, the significant loss of life and the loss of Jiangxi means it was only a success to an extent.

**Response A – 5/10**

The long march could be considered as a success for the Communists. Firstly, it allowed communist ideas to be spread. At this time people in china (peasants) wouldn’t have had anyway to read about new ideas that were going across China. The long march allowed Communists to go across to the peasants around the country and spread their ideas. This would have been crucial to the success of the Communists because peasants would find communist ideas to be perfect for their life style. Also the long march could be considered a success because the Communists didn’t all die and they managed to out smart the Guomindong. At the start, the Communists had no chance of surviving the long march because they were carrying too many pointless items like typewriters, and they were being to predictable. After this they changed their tactics and began moving in a different style across China. The communists began ambushing the Guomindang and slowly becoming increasingly more powerful. The communists could consider the long march a success because not everyone died on it, which was looking unlikely at the beginning.

However, some may see it as a failure for the communists. This is because 90% of the communists died on the long march. From one hundred thousand men, only ten thousand finished the long march. This could be considered a failure because they lost so many men. Also if they lost this many men then they wouldn’t have had as bigger support as they thought when they finished the long march. Also the long march showed that the communists would run away from conflict, rather than face it. This may make people doubt it because they may not want leaders who run away when being threatened.

Overall I believe that the long march was a huge success because it allowed the communist ideas to be spread across China, this could have replenished some of the members that died with completely new members. Also, the long march was incredibly strategic, this was what showed Mao to be a great leader. This made Mao became leader and improve the country.
What was the Cultural Revolution?

Response A – 4/4

The Cultural Revolution was from 1966-69, it began with the formation of the Red Guards in the summer of 1966. The Red Guards religiously followed Mao’s Little Red Book, which was published in 1978. They took part in ‘monster rallies’ with over 1 million participants, such as the ruling on 18th August 1966 in Tianemen Square. The Red Guards were against the four olds, anything ‘bourgeois’ or ‘capitalist’ and ‘reactionaries’. They humiliated, looted and performed acts of violence, killing about 40,000 people.

Response B – 3/4

The Cultural Revolution was an event in China to turn China back to what it was before. It introduced the Red Guards, they aimed to rid China of all western influences. It almost completely undone what the Five Year Plan and Great Leap Forward had done.

Response C – 3/4

The Cultural Revolution was introduced in 1957. Mao introduced this as he realised that many people in China were not following Communist ideas as they were following nationalist (Guomindang) ideas. Mao sent Red Guards to many places across China and he told them to find the people who were anti-communists. Those who were anti-communist were either killed or re-educated about communism.

Explain why the Cultural Revolution had important consequences.

Response A – 6/6

The Cultural Revolution had important consequences in education as schools and universities were closed for 2 years and teachers were victimised by the Red Guards. Many of the Red Guards were students and so their lack of school attendance led to a whole generation of poorly educated youths. After the Cultural Revolution, when Mao reopened schools there were fewer exams and a greater emphasis on vocational qualifications. This impact is hugely important in the future of the young people.

The Cultural Revolution also had important consequences in life in cities; cities, such as Beijing and Shanghai, were brought to a standstill. Work output also fell by 13% in 1967 due to strikes and inattendance. In Beijing, a 1/4 to 1/3 of all houses were searched and ransacked and over the cultural revolution about 40,000 people were killed.

The Cultural Revolution also impacted life in the countryside as youths were drawn into Red Guard activity and agricultural output fell. In 1967, 12 million youths were sent to the countryside many Maoist ideas were undermined for them once they saw how many of the peasants were living in poverty. This undermined much of Mao’s support.
Response B – 4/6
The Cultural Revolution had many important consequences.

The Cultural Revolution had almost completely undone what the Five Year Plan and Great Leap Forward done. Besides many reforms that the Five Year Plan had set, most industrial work had been stopped and farming was the main priority.

With the introduction of the Red Guards all western influence was to be eliminated. Western-like shops were vandalised, western hair cuts were shaved, hand holding was band, all Western-like things came to an end with their introduction. This was because China was not looked upon as communist anymore.

Response C – 2/6
The Cultural Revolution had many important consequences. One consequence that was in the Cultural Revolution was that many people were killed. Red Guards killed so many anti-communists and almost more than a million were killed. There was a decrease in population in China.

Another consequence in the Cultural Revolution was that the Red Guards started to kill and attack eachother. This is because they probably had different ideas or some were against Mao. This also led to many Red Guards being killed. The third consequence that the Cultural Revolution brought was that many people went against Mao. People went against him as he killed many people. Mao's policy led to many people being killed or tortured. The people of China went against Mao as he was considered as a cruel leader by many people. This led to some people not following communism and they didn't follow whatever Mao said. The Cultural Revolution had many consequences and most of them were for the Chinese Communist Party.

Response A – 9/10
The Hundred Flowers Movement began in 1956 as the First Five Year Plan, 1953-57, put a huge strain on the country. Mao said ‘let a hundred flowers bloom!’ Free speech was encouraged and people were allowed to say what they wanted about the CCP and its leaders. This was done to ease the people’s tension and stress.

The Hundred Flowers Movement was a failure as in June 1957 Mao cracked down on those who spoke out against him. He realized the extent of the disdain for the CCPD and send thousands of people to the countryside to the camps for ‘thought reform’ to be ‘re-educated’. He increased censorship and dubbed those who spoke out ‘reactionaries’. Thousands of people were sacked from their jobs or executed. The Hundred Flowers Movement introduced to relieve the country of the large strain of the First Five Year Plan led to a sense of fear and a greater strain on the country as people were censored and many now out of work. The crackdown on the Hundred Flowers Movement also led to the arrest of many intellectuals and as a result, a brain drain. This also led to the arrests of opposition party members who could have kept Mao’s radical politics in-check.

The Hundred Flowers Movement was successful as the aims are uncertain. Some historians believe Mao introduced the Hundred Flowers Movement to identify his opposition and then remove the threat to his power. This was successful as following the Hundred Flowers Movement Mao was the undisputed leader of China as people were afraid to speak out.
This meant when Mao set unrealistic goals for the Great Leap Forward in 1958, of 700 million tonnes of steel and 430 million tonnes of food by the 1970s, no one opposed this and 600,000 backyard furnaces were set up, as were communes with 20,000 people per commune. Although the Chinese Central Committee did not approve this figure there was no great opposition as people were too afraid to speak out due to Mao’s reaction in the Hundred Flowers Movement. In terms of Mao’s agenda the Hundred Flowers Movement was a success as he removed opposition, increased his authority and rid China of intellectuals, as he followed basic education.

However, it could be argued that the Hundred Flowers Movement’s consequences were catastrophic for China as no one dared to oppose Mao and so the Second Five Year Plan or Great Leap Forward occurred with huge failures. 3 out of the 11 million tonnes of steel produced were brittle and labeled as ‘pig iron’, city populations rose and resulted in overcrowding and in 1959 only 143 millions of tonnes of food was produced which was even worse in 1960 due to famine and drought. In 1960 9 million people died of starvation. The Great Leap Forward occurred due to Mao’s totalitarianist control following the Hundred Flowers Movement and that no one prevented it or spoke out shows the fear of the people after the Hundred Flowers Movement, and thus its failures reflected by the failures of the Great Leap Forward.

Despite this, one could argue that the lack of opposition following the Hundred Flower’s movement actually united China and led the people being determined to adhere to Mao’s unrealistic goals, so much so that emigration routes remained low and 1 in 10 people were employed in backyard furnaces. The lack of opposition and intellectuals means that there were no disputes over authority and the leadership of the country so it had constant, predictable leadership. This also meant that the country could focus on becoming the industrial power that emerged in the later 1970s under Mao’s leadership and which tested its first nuclear weapon in 1964.

Overall, the Hundred Flowers Movement was a failure in the extent of opposition to Mao, the casualties and lack of opposition which enabled the Great Leap Forward but successful in achieving Mao’s aims to remove opposition and write China through fear.

Response B – 7/10
I agree with the statement “The Hundred Flowers Movement was a failure”.

This is because was confident in asking for the people’s opinion on China yet it backfired on him. The intellectuals of China had totally criticised Mao and the China he had created. This was due to Mao introducing the literacy drive which educated peasants, this gave them a much more developed understanding of what was going on with China and Mao. He was also unable to handle the criticism and jailed the intellectuals that he created in the first place. It was an utter failure as a movement it resulted in people not trusting Mao.

However this could also be a success as a movement, this means I also disagree with the statement. I disagree because it can be argued that Mao planned this from the start. Mao was afraid of the intellectuals as they are a threat to him and his power. He may have wanted to knew who was against him and the movement was made to give them the opportunity to speak poorly of him. He deceived them into talking bad about him to catch those who oppose him and jail them as a result, making the movement a success.

To conclude I agree and disagree with the statement. I agree because Mao was incapable of handling criticism and resorted wrongly. And I disagree as he could of planned to jail the intellectuals from the start as they were a threat he was afraid of.

Response C – 5/10
I do not agree with this statement. This is because it will not a complete failure. The Hundred Flowers movement was when people were allowed to speak freely about Mao and the Chinese Communist Party ideas. Mao introduced this as he wanted to see who was against the communists. This was a success for the Chinese Communist Party as they could see who was against them and who was anti-communist. Those who were caught criticising Mao were either killed or re-educated about communism.

However, I do agree with this statement. This is because many people were killed in this movement. It was also a failure as many people who were communist thought that it wasn’t fair that innocent people were killed for no reason. Moreover, Mao didn’t get much out of the Hundred Flowers movement as he only killed anti-communists.

But I do not agree with this statement. This is because it struck fear into China. From my own knowledge, I know that many people were scared when they heard that they would be killed if they were anti-communist. It was successful for Mao, as he could easily brainwash and indoctrinate people into following communist ideas.

Overall, I agree with this statement as many people died but I do not agree with this statement as Mao successfully brainwashed people into becoming communist.
A015 DEPTH STUDY – CAUSES AND EVENTS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR 1890-1918

Study Source A.

Why was this source published in Britain in 1890? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7

Source A was published in Britain in 1980 to show the citizens that Germany was causing trouble and tension but the allies are just sitting back because they are too scared to stop him. This is shown in the source by the Kaiser standing at one end and rocking the boat in an attempt to tip it over and just scare the allies and Austria-Hungary. The allies and Austria-Hungary are all portrayed as weak and un-willing to stop Germany as they are all sitting down and two of them are old men whilst one is a woman and one is a baby. This relates to when Kaiser Wilhelm began increasing his navy and empire size to compete with other members of Europe to become the greatest power in the world. The cartoonist is telling the British this to explain to them the increasing tensions and how war may be likely.

Response B – 2/7

This cartoon was published in Britain in 1890 to show that the way in which Germany was behaving was havin unwanted consequneces on the other great powers. This is shown in the cartoon by the way the Kaiser is standing up and trying to rock the boat and tip it over whilst Russia, Britain, France and Austria-Hungary are telling him ‘Don’t go on like that or you’ll upset us all!’ This suggests that Germany is rebelling against what the other countries want as the figures representing the rest of them look unhappy and are trying to persuade the Kaiser to sit down. This is because at the time Germany wanted to become more powerful and were constantly sticking their noses in where they weren’t wanted. In order words they were trying to ‘rock the boat’ and disrupt the peace beteen the countries, as shown in the cartoon.
**Study Source B.**

What is the cartoonist’s message? Use the cartoon and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

**Response A – 5/6**

The message of the cartoon is that the Kaiser is crushing Agadir (the second moroccan crisis). The Agadir crisis was where the French wanted to expand their influence further across the country. However the Kaiser wanted to stop this shown by the iron fist on top of Agadir. The Kaiser encouraged moroccan independence which is shown by the first moroccan crisis in 1905 where he tried to make them become independent. The way the Kaiser tried to stop French influence growing in morocco was to send the panther over which was a new gunboat. This is shown by the Kaiser emerging out of the sea. The cartoon was published in Germany which explains why the cartoonist has portrayed the Kaiser as large and powerful crushing Agadir. However we know that this isn’t the case as Germany actually backed out of Agadir once Britain had arrived to help the French.

**Response B – 2/6**

The message of this cartoon links to the Agadir crisis, which was when Germany attempted to take over as much land as possible as they wanted to gain control of as many countries as they could. The cartoon show the Kaiser with an ‘iron fist’ on a dome labelled ‘Agadir’, to emphasise the fact that Germany have annexed Agadir and are in complete control of it, as the Kaiser is shown as quite a dominating figure – which indicates Germany’s strength and that they are not to be messed with.

**Study Source C.**

‘The naval race was the main cause of tension in Europe and in the early 20th century.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

**Response A – 7/7**

In some ways the statement can be agreed with, but it in other ways it cannot.

The statement can be agreed with because as seen in the source Germany clearly wanted to build up her navy as she was a “young and growing Empire”. This can also be seen as the Kaiser announced in 1898 that was to build up the navy. This caused tension because the British could accept that the Germans needed a large army because it was a large country. However, the British could not accept that they needed a large navy as Germany had a small coast line. Therefore, a naval race began especially as the British had the Two Powers Standard, and the development of the Dreadnought on 10th February 1906.

However, the statement cannot be agreed with because the was major tension in the Balkans. This led to the actual declaration of war. There was tension here because in the Blackand the Ottoman Empire was the ‘sick man of Europe’ so the Balkan League decided to attack her in 1912. This League consisted of Bulgaria, Monteneogro, Greece and Serbia. After this, the Second Balkan War occurred in 1913 which was Bulgaria attacking the rest of the Balkan League. Serbia came out as double the size in terms of the size of her country.
This therefore led to resentment by the Austria-Hungarians who wanted to crush the Serbs to stop the Serbia nationalism which had erupted in their country.

In conclusion, the naval race was a cause of tension in Europe that only between Britain and Germany. Source C suggests that there was no tension. However, there were many more obvious causes of tension such as the trouble in the Balkans, which involved many more countries including Germany and Britain who instigated 'peace' there.

Response B – 4/7

I agree with this as Britain had the biggest navy at the time and so wouldn't want to loose that title to Germany also dispite the kaisers peacefull intentions stated in source C a country wanting to grow it's military so quickly could be a threat to any nation and therefor contributed to the naval race and tensions rising.

However there were other causes of tension in the early 20th century for example morroco which had no part int he naval race however contributed gretly to tensions between nations also the kaisers intentions could have been entirely peacefull however that is all he said in the interview so we can't know.

Overall I believe the naval race did increase tensions dramatically as it got both sides ready for a war unintentioly however I believe there were bigger causes then that.
Describe what happened during, and immediately after, the Battle of Jutland.

Response A – 4/4
At the Battle of Jutland in 1916, the Germany navy and the British fought in the North Sea. They used battleships such as Dreadnoughts when fighting with 14 British battleships being destroyed and 11 German. Germany claimed victory but never left their ports after the battle leaving the British to conquer the North Sea and be able to effectively use a naval blockade to starve the Germans into surrendering.

Response B – 2/4
During the Battle of Jutland General Beetie led Britain’s Naval fleet. The Battle ended because of a stale mate but immediately after both sides claimed victory. I think that Germany won because they defeated more of Britain's fleet than vice-versa. Britain still claims victory to date but it is still debated.

Explain why Russia was defeated on the Eastern front.

Response A – 6/6
Russia was defeated on the Eastern Front as the Russian's had been about 50 years behind everyone fighting in technological advancement as their revolution had put them in a bad place. This caused them to have a lack of equipment for the amount of troops they had to fight with as they began the war with 6 million soldiers and only 4 and a half million rifles meaning many soldiers ran into battle with a gun and had to pick them up of the dead around them. Also, their railway lines were slow and ineffective meaning that their were food shortages for men fighting as they were unable to get the food to the soldiers. This meant many starved as the conditions were cold and damp. There was also the Germans and their amazing tactics which meant that the Russians were finding it hard to defeat them, with many battles including Stalingrad ending badly. The Germans machine guns were very effective a slaughter of the Russians and gas meant that they could easily kill the Russians without going near them.

Response B – 2/6
Russia was defeated on the eastern front because they lacked resources. They had hardly any food to feed their men and people. Another reason was because they lacked guns; guns were shared between men so four or five men would be using the same gun. They lacked food because trade routes had been blocked due to the opposition and Russia’s harsh winter conditions. They lacked weapons because they weren't expecting war so soon, they only could use what they had already.
‘The situation inside Germany in 1918 was more important than the war at sea bringing about German defeat.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Response A – 8/10

I slightly agree with this statement because the situation inside Germany meant that the government regime wasn’t working effectively and also many thousands of people were dying of starvation. With a revolution occurring Germany wasn’t in a stable position to continue fighting as they knew soon that, with the US entry into the war, they would be overrun. This was caused as Kaiser Wilhelm decided to remove himself from power meaning Germany was in a bad state and could sustain a war of this size.

However, on the other hand I disagree with the statement because the war at sea played a huge part in causing Germany to collapse. This was because due to the Battle of Jutland it meant that the Germans wouldn’t be able to leave their port meaning Britain could use a naval blockade to prevent supplies from getting to Germany. This caused starvation on the front and in Germany with around 300,000 deaths because of starvation. German people were dying and soldiers couldn’t fight any more as they were exhausted. So this caused the government to collapse as without the blockade Germany could have easily continued fighting. This could have meant that the soldiers that were used in the Blitzkrieg offensive could have continued pushing as they wouldn’t have had to have stopped because they were starving.

Overall, I disagree with the statement given as I think that the war at sea was more important in bringing about German defeat than the situation in Germany. This is because the war at sea caused the unstable situation in Germany and without it it meant that they may have been more successful. This is why the situation of Germany wasn’t as important as the war at sea as it was only caused because something else occurred.

Response B – 3/10

In 1918 the war was drawing to an end because of Americans entry, Germany was weak and they lacked food and resources for their people. Therefore I agree with the statement ‘The situation inside Germany in 1918 was more important than the war at sea in bringing defeat’. After the British published that they had defeated the Germans at Jutland, Germany didn’t want their people to find out any rumors, this would have hurt the German more but I still think that trying to get resources was more crucial than stopping this. In conclusion I strongly agree with the statement because food was the bigger issue.
Describe the use of new technology in the First World War.

Response A – 4/4
New technology used were tanks which were introduced in the Battle of the Somme. Also new machine guns which Britain made 250,000 of as lloyd George thought they were amazing. Also new artillery war introduced which resulted in around 75% of death. Also aeroplanes were designed to help in the war effort. As well as balloons and zeppelines.

Response B – 1/4
The use of new technology in the First World War was significant as Britain used the tanks for the first time, which were more superior to the technology of other countries, which made them jealous. The advantage of having technology such as the tanks was one of the factors which led to Britain being successful in the First World War.

Explain the consequences of American entry into the War in 1917.

Response A – 5/6
The consequence of America entry into the war were that it lead to the eventual defeat of Germany. This is because after America enter war in April 1917 they were supplying 50,000 troops per month which were well trained and equipped. As a result the Allied had the advantage as they new the could counter act and German move because they would have more troops who were better supplied.

Also the consequence of America entry was that Ludendorf, german commander knew he headed a swift victory in Europe before felt full force of America. Consequently after Russia accepted defeat Ludendorf transferred all his men to west in one final attack. But the German troops were tired and exhausted and not of the quality of 1914 therefore despite making 40km of ground they lost 400,000 men and were pushed back. Consequently asked for an Armistice on 11th November 1918.

Response B – 3/6
The entry of America on the 6th April 1917 is what allowed the allies on 18th July 1918 under Ferdinand Foch to successfully counterattack the lindenoff offensive. The Germans had gotten extra men since they had won on the eastern front. So the allies were extremly out numbered and the introduction of the Americans evened the playing field. Thus the Germans were eventually pushed back to Hindenburg line.
How far did Haig achieve his aims at the Battle of the Somme? Explain your answer.

Response A – 10/10

General Haig was the British commander in charge of the Somme. There is much dispute if Haig mismanaged the Somme or if he achieve his aims because in some ways he did and in other ways he did not.

Haig achieved his aims in some ways because in the Somme did relieve pressure off Verdung in which the French were nearly about to fall. The Somme occurred on the 1st July 1916 however it was supposed to be a joint Allied offensive in late summer in which they all attacked the Central Powers simultaneously. However, the Germans attacked the French at Verdun in February 1916 which meant the joint offensive was not possible as Petain decided to defend Verdun. By May 1916, Verdun was about to fall so the French turned to the British and Russians and the British responded by bringing the attack forward. Although, there was 57 000 British casualties on the first day, the pressure was relieved at Verdun and the French were saved.

Haig could also be seen to achieve his aims at the Somme because he won 12 miles of land. Also, the Somme exemplified the war of attrition and it was not a general’s job to save lives but to win the war. Haig eventually won the war with the Hundred Days Offensive in August 1918, a counter-offensive to the German Spring Offensive in March 1918. Without the Somme, the war many not have been won as he learned from it and used different tactics seen at the Battle of Armiens.

Haig can be seen to have not achieved his aims because he did not change his tactics, after the worst day in British history with 57 000 casualties. He instead pressed forward with the attacks, with many more men to die in the same way. Although, one could say this criticism is unfair as he did adapt later on to use the creeping barrage.

Also, Haig can be seen to have not achieve his aims because he didn’t use the tanks. Although, he did use the tank for the first time but most of them broke down on the way to the trenches. Also, some junior officers claim he didn’t consider the weather. However, one could say this criticism is unfair as he could not wait for tanks or the weather to improve or Verdun may have fallen, meaning the Allies could lose the whole war.

In conclusion, it is obvious that Haig made a few blunders in the Battle of the Somme. However, he did achieve his main aim which was the relieve pressure off Verdun. It was not his job to save lives as he was sent by the government to win a war and in a war of attrition, a high loss of life was bound to occur.

Response B – 4/10

Haig achieved his aims at the Battle of the Somme to most of the extent because he managed to achieve his three main objectives, which included killing as many Germans as possible and destroying the capital of Verdun. As far as the objectives, Britain had won them all. However, Haig failed to change his tactics and kept them the same – which made them predictable and easier for the Germans to guess. This suggests that Haig could have enjoyed an even greater victory if he had decided to change the tactics. The Battle of the Somme is often referred to as the ‘bloodiest battle in history due to the extreme amount of deaths and casualties from both the British and German sides. Overall, Haig achieved the majority of the success, but failure to plan his tactics better and other factors such as bad weather prevented Britain for reaching an even fuller potential.
A016 DEPTH STUDY – END OF EMPIRE
c.1919-1969

Study Source A.

Why did Kenyatta make this speech in 1952? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7
Kenyatta made this speech because the Kikuyu tribe and the KAU were being falsely accused of being involved with the Mau Mau rebellion. The Mau Mau rebellion was a violent response to the British restricting KAU which aimed to return the land that the white settlers had taken to the black people in Kenya. It did this by attacking farms, burning livestock and killing anyone suspected of collaborating with the British. The Mau Mau caused panic in Kenya and the British announced a state of emergency in 1952. As members of both the Mau Mau and KAU were from the Kikuyu tribe, they were assumed to be similar or the same group by the British and prosecuted as such. Kenyatta made the speech to ensure that the British knew the intentions of the Mau Mau and KAU were different and that the KAU fought peacefully. The speech was also made to ensure that the chances of advancement stayed possible so that Kenya would still be able to get independence from the British despite the Mau Mau rebellion.

Response B – 4/7
Kenyatta made this speech to inform. He wanted the two show there is a difference between the Mau Mau and the KAU. From my own knowledge I know that the Mau Mau was a terrorist group who wanted independence for Kenya, however they went about it the wrong way as they would kill Africans who would not take the Mau Mau oath and they killed a few white civilians as well. The KAU was a party who wanted independence for Kenya as well but they “despise those who rob and murder.” The KAU was not a “fighting nation” and Jomo Kenyatta believed that the Mau Mau are “wrecking” their chance of “advancement”. This suggests that Kenyatta believes that the Mau Mau are limiting the chances of Kenya gaining independence and Kenyatta does not want the KAU to be interpreted “of being the Mau Mau.”

Study Source B.

What is the cartoonist’s message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
The cartoonist’s message is that using brutality against the Kenyans was ineffective and was leading them nowhere. The officer’s dog, labelled ‘counter brutality’ appears to be leading the officer away from ‘around and around to nowhere’ whilst the officer opposed him. The cartoonist is conveying that Britain should use methods that are not brutal to control the Mau Mau after unsuccessful attempts to control them brutally.
The British put anyone suspected of being in the Mau Mau rebellion in detention camps where they were treated badly and encouraged members of other tribes to attack Kikuyu villages. Their attempts at controlling the violence were fruitless as it continued until 1956 and cost the lives of over 1000 Kenyans. The cartoonist's message is that the British should stop ignoring the obvious and loud calls to use non-brutal methods as the methods they are using are ineffective and a waste of time.

Response B – 3/6

The Cartoonists message is that it is hard for Britain to catch the Mau Mau. The cartoon says "In darkest Kenya" and from my own knowledge I know that the Mau Mau would commit killings and then many of them would run and hide in the jungle. The cartoon shows British soldiers in an deserted part of Kenya attempted to look for the Mau Mau. There is a sign which says "around and around to nowhere" this may suggest that Britain are looking everywhere for the Mau Mau but it results in not being able to find them. The fact that they are using a match stick highlights that they are struggling to see, therefore making it more difficult to find the Mau Mau.

Study Source C.

‘In the period 1950 to 1960 British methods against the Mau Mau were not effective.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 5/7

It could be said that the British methods against the Mau Mau were ineffective because the rebellion continued for many years. The Mau Mau were able to use guerilla warfare to beat the British as they used their knowledge of the land to outsmart them. They also had weapons which were more effective in the environment than the British. The British methods were also ineffective because although they managed to hold suspected Mau Mau in detention camps, they were held ‘inhumanely’ as Source C says. The treatment of the Kenyans in the camps was condemned around the world and had a ‘Nazi’-like appearance, as described by Evelyn Baring was later investigated the camps. This undermined the principles of the Empire when taught Christian principles such as ‘love thy neighbour’ and embarrassed the British.

However, the British methods could be said to be effective because a civil war was avoided. The state of emergency which was announced in 1952 was announced because the British feared a civil war. This was avoided by cutting off supplies to Kikuyu villages and detaining all suspected Mau Mau. Although not all Kikuyu were part of the Mau Mau rebellion, the rebellion was exhausted in 1956 when 20,000 suspected Mau Mau were detained.

In conclusion, I agree with the statement as the British treated the Kenyans inhumanely and although they implemented vocational training and education schemes, their treatment of the Kenyans was embarrassing and it took many years to end the Mau Mau rebellion.

Response B – 3/7

Whilst the methods used against the Mau Mau were not effective in eventually removing the Mau Mau there are aspects of British actions that did not combat Mau Mau impact.

Having banned the KAU in 1952 nationalists were forced to form secret societies. Groups such as the Mau Mau fought primarily to reclaim the land taken from them unjustly by British settlers. A clear answer to the issue of Mau Mau would have been to appease them and return some land. However, as Britain could not be seen to be vulnerable to its own colony as it used violent methods such as portable gallows, cutting its supplies to the tribe grid detention camps. Source c displays how methods such as these were used and the issue of in humanity and abuse was clear.
However, if the camps are investigated, the world will see that the actions of the British are inexcusable and therefore make the actions of the Mau Mau excusable. This shows that the brutal methods used may have given the Mau Mau the publicity and the sympathy needed to expose British brutality and injustice.

Despite running the Mau Mau into the ground by 1956, the British did not get rid of the nationalist feelings in Kenya that was responsible for the Mau Mau’s actions and the eventual independence of Kenya in 1963.
Describe the extent of the British Empire in 1919.

Response A – 4/4
In 1919 the British Empire was at its peak. It had many countries around the world such as India, Ghana, Jamaica and many more hence the saying that the sun never set on the empire. The empire brought Britain a lot of wealth commodities such as cotton, sugar and Gold were brought to Britain to the factories, and after they had been manufactured they were shipped back to the colonies were people brought them.

Response B – 1/4
In 1919 the British Empire was at its zenith. After World War one the League of Nations gave Britain mandates to take care of and help to grow economically. The term was taken loosely however and so that mandates became part of the British Empire left by a government of imperialist supporters. The empire was thriving through trade links and expanded over a large area of the world benefitting the economy of the U.K.

Why did nationalism grow in parts of the British Empire between 1919 and 1939? Explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
Nationalism grew in parts of the British Empire between 1919 and 1939. Factors such as the first world war left many colonies believing that they, due to helping Britain’s war effort deserved to be granted independence. When these demands were not met then they turned to nationalism to voice these ideas. Moreover, the nature of the British wall escalated nationalism as the Empire made a clear distinction between white dominions and no white colonies. Non white colonies such as India and Kenya saw these dominions gaining independence and started campaigning for theirs. Moreover, the British provided education and religious teachings to the colonies. The education provided the colonial people with ideas to further support their argument for independence and the equality taught in Christianity did not fit with the concept of an Empire. Moreover, the British passed laws in the expense of the colonial people, such as taxation favouring white sellers in Kenya, and Kenyan’s being paid less. The political, social and economical grievances provided a catalyst for nationalism. Moreover, laws such as the governments of India act 1919 restricted the Indian people from having little say in political affairs. Also violence such as the Amritsar massacre killing 379 innocent people fueled nationalist protests as this unjust treatment was not accepted by the native people. Influential figures such as Gandhi also captured masses and allowed the everyday people to revolt through non violent protests such as boycotting taxes such as the salt March 1930.

Response B – 4/6
Nationalism grew in parts of the empire between 1919 and 1939 due to many reasons. After World War One, many of the soldiers felt who had fought alongside the British felt that they ought to be rewarded for their hard work so because of that when they came home they wanted independence and this is a reason why nationalism grew. People in colonies were more educated and enlightened to the world around them. People such as Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana’s first president, had enough of the oppression the British put on them. They did not see it fair that they who originate from the country should be treated as second class citizens and be submissive to the British. In addition the British Brutality in countries such as Kenya made people angry at what was going on so they started to protest to get independence and better rights. Countries such as Australia had dominion states and other countries in the colony did not see why that was fair.
‘After 1945 factors in Britain were more important in bringing about the end of the British Empire than factors in other parts of the world.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Response A – 9/10

I agree with this statement to a small extent. The newly elected Labour party didn’t had the same respect for the archaic empire as the conservatives and so put money and time towards projects such as the NHS in Britain focussing on the problems at home first. Additionally, change in opinions at home having seen the atrocities of the massacre in 1919 many of the British people did not want to support the Empire any longer and felt the post-war economy did not need to be weakened further by the costs of the Empire.

However, influences outside of Britain after the war, I believe, were made important. The emergence of America as a superpower showed Britain to be relatively weak economically and politically. As Britain owed the USA a lot of money as part of the ‘lend lease’ during the war, Britain was in no position to argue with the USA whose policies of self-determination conflicted with the ideas of the Empire. This pressure forced Britain to reconsider its involvement within its empire and how it will be maintained. Having just fought a war for freedom and equality, the Empire appears to represent the exact opposite showing Britain to be a walking contradiction of their principles.

Additionally, Britain’s surrender to Singapore reflected it as weak and incapable in terms of coping with the demands of an empire. Particularly from growing support for nationalist associations such as the KAU in Kenya and the National Indian congress and its famous leaders. Rioting and protesting in the Empire was costly and required money for military involvement. Events such as the Amritsar massacre in which Britain asserted its authority caused deep opposition to the empire at home, as well as a lack of support for further military involvement as having lost many soldiers in WW2 losing anymore would be a disaster.

Also by the end of the war in 1945, Britain had most made white colonies independent such as Canada. This put pressure on the British government to appease the rest of its empire and prevent civil unrest and protest in situations such as the Salt March in 1930 which (through the influence of Gandhi’s peaceful protest methods caused an eventual riot as a result of Britain’s inability to control its empire as a result of external pressures. In 1941 Gandhi was voted man of the year, despite being before world war two it proved the provocation of Britain’s aggression by leaders such as Gandhi contributed to the Empire’s decline causing those at home and abroad to disregard Britain and its rule over the empire.

Response B – 4/10

After 1945, it was the end of the war. The Germans and their Lufwaffle airforce had destroyed Britain during the Blitz. It left Britain in ruins and the prime minister Clemmet Attlee knew he had to fix it.

The Labour government were trying to build a well fare state. This included free health care and other facilities which would cost Britain alot of money.

The empire was not as profitable too Britain as it would have been before. Change in the world of work meant that all the factories were closing down and people were moving on to tertiary sector jobs meaning that there was no need for raw commodities as it would have before.

all the factors above show that things in Britain were more important to bringing the end of the empire however countries such as India who gained independence showed other countries that they could also get independence.

In 1957, Ghana became the first African countrie to gain independence which also influence other African counties.

The Suez crisis showed that Britain was not as powerful as it once was with Nasser being able to get his own way.

The wind of change speech in South Africa was by a conservative MP also influenced the end of the empire.

I partially disagree with the statement because of the facts I've listed above.
Describe how Britain ruled India in the years after the First World War.

Response A – 4/4
Britain ruled India oppressively by passing Acts such as the Rowlatt Act which banned gatherings of groups and gave the government the power to arrest anyone suspected of terrorism. They also ruled brutally as shown in the Amritsar Massacre in 1919 where they killed over 300 innocent, unarmed protesters. They were reluctant to give India independence as the Government of India Act in 1919 only gave India limited power and allowed few people to vote.

Response B – 2/4
Britain ruled India with violence after the First World War, for example the Calcutta killings and the Amritsar Massacre. Additionally, Britain also ruled India by negotiation, for example, having princes in princely states to rule the state and report back to the British.

Explain the importance of the Amritsar Massacre of 1919.

Response A – 6/6
The 1919 Amritsar Massacre was important for many reasons. It exposed the failure of the Rowlatt Acts in 1919 – which kept wartime measures after World War I. The people massacred in the Amritsar Massacre were protesting peacefully, which had been outlawed. The Amritsar massacre showed that the Rowlatt Acts were unreasonable.

The Amritsar Massacre was also important because it showed the British government to be oppressive and brutal. Soldiers (most of which were Indian) were ordered to shoot at men, women and children. As a result thousands died. People were not able to escape as the gates were locked. This made the British government, and in particular General Dyer (who ordered the soldiers to shoot) look ruthless and oppressive to the Indian people.

The Amritsar massacre exposed the negative exploitative aspects of the British Empire and that was why it was important.

Response B – 2/6
The Amritsar Massacre was important because this gained national attention to the events and the violence that happened. The result of this was that General Dyer was taken out of India.

The second reason why the Amritsar Massacre was important was because it was an example of Indians wanted independence from very early on and an example of growing nationalism. This showed the British that Indians were going to get independence one way or another.
Was Gandhi more important than Jinnah in India in the period 1919 to 1947? Explain your answer.

Response A – 10/10

It could be argued that Gandhi was more important than Jinnah in 1919 to 47.

This is because he united many Indians in his cause for independence. He did this through his Satyagraha campaigns or non violent protest, which brought many Indians to support his campaign. Also his movements of Swaraj and Swadeshi gave Indians a sense of pride as they proved their self-sufficiency and felt pride on being Indian.

However, Gandhi was imprisoned a lot of abandoned Satyagraha when it turned violent – he spent a lot of time isolating himself, to introspect. This period of political inactivity may have made him less important.

However, it could be argued that Jinnah was more important because of his representation of Indian Muslims and his bid for a seperate Muslim State, Pakistan. This was something many Indian Muslims identified with as they felt that they would not get political representation of Gandhi and the Indian National Conquers’ idea of a central government in Delhi was pushed through because they would be overtaken by a hindu majority.

However, Gandhi’s unifying cause meant that he became a symbol of Independence and cooperated with the British Labour government – many of which he knew because he had been to university with them. His political cooperation happened during the the Round Table conferences during the 30s – although he was in prison for one of them, and they failed – but he went to Britain and rallied support for his cause there.

On the other hand, it could be said that Jinnah’s support for the War Effort made him important. He believed that if the Muslim League could help the British in World War II, the chance of a seperate Muslim State would be more achievable. This increased the Muslim League’s popularity and also contrasts with Congress’ disapproval of the war, which led to Gandhi’s imprisonment. This increased cooperation in World War II meant that Jinnah became more important.

However, Gandhi’s overt opposition to British rule, as well as his large following made him a popular figure for all Indians.

But Jinnah’s Direct Action campaign showed how he actively wanted to be involved in creating a Muslim state – however the violent front of Direct Action (Jinnah hadn’t meant for it to be violent) could consider it a failure. However the violence, and the absence of British troops in India because Mountbatten removed them, meant that Jinnah achieved his goal of Pakistan due to a faster petition in 1947.

Overall, I think Gandhi and Jinnah were equally important but in different ways. gandhi unified Indians on their goal for independence, but Jinnah provided a stong alternative for Muslims disillusioned with the prospect of having no power under a central government led by Gandhi’s Congress.

Response B – 5/10

I think that Gandhi was more important than Jinnah. However, Jinnah was important too.

One way in which Gandhi was important was the fact that he used non violent methods. For example, he led a resistance called Bardoli Satyagraha, which asked poor people to boycott foreign clothing. Another example was the Salt March he led to the town of Dandi. Another way Gandhi was more important was the fact that Gandhi wrote letters to persuade the British. This showed the British that Gandhi wasn’t going to be violent. Finally, a factor that made Gandhi important was the fact that America’s Time Magazine named him Man of the Year, which added extra pressure to the British for independence.

On the other hand, Jinnah was important too. One way in which Jinnah was important was that he called for partition publicly because he thought the Muslims of India, who were a minority, should have a country of their own and have a Muslim representation. Another reason that Jinnah was important was the fact he had the 14 points. However that failed because the Indian Congress thought the points was too extreme and the Muslim League thought the points weren't enough.

To conclude, there is evidence suggesting Gandhi’s importance and evidence suggesting Jinnah’s importance. In balance, I think that Gandhi was more important because he led a resistance, which gave more pressure to the British to give India independence.
A017 DEPTH STUDY – THE USA, LAND OF FREEDOM? 1945-1975

Study Source A.

‘In the period 1947 to 1954 McCarthyism was successful mainly because of events outside America.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7

I agree with this statement to some extent as the events outside America helped people like Senator McCarthy build fear of communism which is referred to as McCarthyism.

In Source A the USSR and the USA are described as ‘completely obsessed’ with each other which McCarthy successfully built on to create a fear of Communists. America perceived itself as being strong and successful after winning the war referred to as a ‘brilliant victory’ which left them confident in their own strength but still afraid because of events taking place outside America. One of their main fears was the spread of Communism which they could see when the Communist Party won in China and so when they did it created fear which McCarthyism built on of the growing threat of Communism. Communism, people believed, would undermine the whole American society and their capitalist prosperity. America used their first atomic bomb in 1945 which the source refers to as a ‘tremendous triumph’ which shows how proud the American people were of their scientific advancement. However four years later in 1949 the Soviets tested their first atomic weapon. It was believed that the Soviets should not have had the technology for several more years and so shock hit America when it was tested. The threat to American citizens felt real as they knew they no longer had the upper hand McCarthyism grew as Senator McCarthy used this to build on the idea of ‘Reds under the beds’ that Communists had infiltrated America in order to access atomic weapons secrets.

Conversely, events inside America helped the spread of McCarthyism as well. The speeches of Senator McCarthy claiming to have a list of names of people who were Communists in America built on the idea of America becoming overrun with Communists make McCarthyism more successful. As also did the investigations of the FBI led by J. Edgar Hoover a known anti-communist. The FBI investigated hundreds of people they suspected of being a Communist which fuelled the McCarthyism fire and hysteria. The source does not mention this because the author was himself investigated by the FBI for having communist sympathies.

Overall, the events outside America lead to the success of McCarthyism because fear was built of Communism inside America so I agree with this statement.

Response B – 5/7

The source tells us that McCarthyism occurred at a time when the USA was at its ‘highest point of world power’. This implies that events inside the country must have influenced the Red Scare in the USA. The source suggests that it has to have been internal events which kickstarted McCarthyism because it indirectly mentions the Second World War which was horrible. So another factor inside the country must have started it. As I know from my own knowledge Senator Joe McCarthy was the only one who made the communist hysteria in the USA. I also know that other external factors such as the Russian nuclear programme and China becoming communist heavily influenced McCarthyism in the USA. This was because it was as if lots of countries and places were turning communist in the Korean war of 1950-53 accelerated the Red Scare even more as they were fighting against communism.

In my opinion, I totally agree with this statement because the source is limited to 1949 while as the statement refers to events all the way in 1954. The author of the source hadn’t yet been involved with the external factors which were yet to come.
Study Source B.

What is the cartoonist’s message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6

The message of the source is that the Soviets do not plan to be loyal to anyone. This is shown by the man with his hand on a loyalty oath saying casually ‘Yeah – so help me God!’ The Soviets were Communists and a major part of Communism is to be anti-religious so therefore the Soviets are not being genuine with what they are saying because they don’t believe it. The fact that the man in the cartoon is large and ugly shows that the Americans are trying to demonise Communists and make Communism appear unappealing, the hammer and sickle are a symbol of the USSR and they are on the man’s back as if he has been branded a Communist. The Cartoon is trying to build fear, distrust and dislike towards Communists in America in line with the McCarthyism movement. This was published during the Cold War when tensions were running high between the USA and the USSR in the early 1950s after the Soviets had tested their own atomic bomb and the threat of Soviet expansion became real to many Americans. The cartoonist is trying to tell people not to trust the Soviets as Communists are spying and infiltrating America.

Response B – 2/6

The message of the cartoon is that McCarthyism is over exaggerated and that there is no freedom in the USA to be a communist. It is very likely that you will be imprisoned for being a communist person – as there is a hammer and sickle symbol on his back – swearing to the loyalty oath. In the 1950s all of the civil servants had to swear allegiance to the state which meant no communism. The oath made sure you weren’t communist. The caption is very sarcastic which implies that God will not be able to save him from McCarthy. It is too over the top in America.

Study Source C.

Why was this cartoon published in 1954? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 7/7

Source C was published in 1954 because it was during the demise Red Scare. The Source is mocking McCarthyism for going after innocent people- the young girls the men in the cartoon are watching allegories for people in Hollywood and the US State Department that were investigated by the FBI for being a Communism, almost all of whom were innocent. In the cartoon on man is holding a sign with Senator McCarthy’s face on with the caption ‘Our hero’ this is sarcastically mocking the Senator who many believed was heroic for his fight against Communism until they discovered he was lying about having a ‘blacklist’ of names of people who were Communists. This cartoon was published in the mid-1950s like many anti-McCarthyism materials such as Arthur Miller’s ‘The Crucible’ because many innocent people who had been investigated by the FBI or McCarthy and consequently lost their jobs & reputation wanted the truth to be known about how ridiculous the hyteria over Communism was.
Response B – 4/7

The cartoon was published because it wants to show the exaggeration of communism by Senator Joe McCarthy. McCarthy’s methods are too extreme that they are even spying on ordinary girls in the cartoon. It as if anybody could be a communist as I know that suspected communist spies such as the Rosenburgs lived ordinary lives. The caption reads ‘they’re armed with marshmallows’. This implies that anything could mean they are communist. The cartoon is being critical of McCarthy at this point in time because in 1954 McCarthy had began investigating the army and had started to accuse lots of people even with the smallest communist sympathies or tendencies. It is as if McCarthy as his own army of spies as it says ‘legion’ on one of the boards. The cartoonist is condemning McCarthy for his methods.
Describe the methods and ideas of the Black Panthers.

Response A – 4/4
The black panthers aimed to use violence in order to fight for racial equality and supremacy over white people. They used rioting against the police in major cities to prove their point. There ideas were that they wanted African Americans to be proud of where they had come from, their culture and their ethnicity. Lastly, they wanted to be in dominance over white people and didn't want to be equal with them.

Response B – 3/4
the black Panthers were a group that believed in taking equality no matter what and defending ones self with force. They were heavily armed as they had the right to do so and they dressed in a sudo-military style.

Explain why Malcolm X was important for African Americans.

Response A – 6/6
Malcom X was important to many African Americans or several reasons. Firstly, Malcom X advocated ‘Black Power’ which caused many African Americans to have pride in their skin colour and heritage. This encouraged many to get involved in the Civil Rights Movement and gave immense pride, so Malcom X was important.

Also, Malcom X represented the African Americans who were fed up with the lack of progress for Civil Rights with Martin Luther King’s peaceful protests. Malcom X was important as he encouraged African Americans to use violent means to achieve equality.

Finally, Malcom X was important as he encouraged those with the more radical beliefs of a separate black constitution to campaign. This prompted the Race Riots from 1965-1968 which drew media attention to the cause.

Response B – 2/6
Malcolm X was important because he represented the anger of the african american community to many people he was someone that was willing to lake freedom even if it wasn’t to offered. Many saw him as someone who was finally doing something to help stand up for the african american community.
‘By 1975, African Americans had made much progress in fighting inequality.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Response A – 10/10

By 1975 it is argued that African Americans had made lots of progress. Firstly, the Brown V Board of Education case in 1954, which resulted in children being segregated in school being declared as unconstitutional, was a major step. It was the first time since the Plessy V Ferguson case in the 1890s that black and white children were taught in the same school, so black children could receive as good education as white children – equality. Under Nixon’s committee, by 1975 only 8% of black children in the south went to all black schools; this was a major step forward. Additionally, the Voting Rights act in 1965 was a major achievement, as it outlawed the literacy test needed to vote. This means the 3 million (out of 5 million) black people who were previously unable to vote in the south would now have the opportunity to do so. Consequently, black people would be able to vote for politicians that wanted to help black people. This meant that 120 cities had black mayors by 1970, which was a step towards equality.

However, many African Americans felt progress had not been made. The 1964 Civil Rights Act outlawed racial discrimination in schools and jobs, as well as abolishing the segregation system. Although, it was often not enforced in southern areas, such as Birmingham and Montgomery, meaning black people still faced inequality in public areas and jobs. Furthermore, the Montgomery Bus Boycott from 5 December 1955 to 13 November 1956, when bus segregation was declared unconstitutional by the supreme Court exhibited some change, However, during the summer of 1961 when the Freedom Riders attempted to ride the buses in southern states such as Alabama, many faced beatings and arrests. It demonstrated that the law could not gain African Americans inequality, and that the white people still were racist.

In conclusion, African Americans had achieved equality by 1975 to a partial extent. They had had the support of the government (e.g. October 1962 when Kennedy sent in troops to help James Meredith get into university) with many law changes and acts passed (e.g. Voting Rights 1965) but the racist feel of white Americans failed to grant them equality by 1975.

Response B – 5/10

on one hand alot of progres had been made in fighting inequality the montgomery bus boycot had shown that african americans had power when they worked as a comunity. Linda Brown had not only forced the desegrigation of schools it also showed that the supreme court were not against racial quality. on top of this the preseidents usage of the army had shown that he too supported this move for equality.

On the other hand however the southern states were still incredibly racist and some even went so far as to ignore the Supreme court. not only this but it cases where the local state government had the power to make decisions the support of the federal government had little use. african americans still had to, and still have to, deal with tourism in law enforcement and institutional racism making it hard to find jobs near imposable to live in a equal way.

In conclusion the african american comunity had gone a long way to fighting inequality by 1975 but they still had a very long way to go before achieving its eradication.
Describe discrimination in the USA towards Hispanic Americans in the 1960s and 1970s.

Response A – 4/4
Hispanic American suffered poor housing, lack of good education, racism and poorly paid jobs. As they had come over from Mexico with very poorly paid jobs, anything was an improvement on their farm labour or domestic servant wages so this could be exploited and they ended up with poorly paid jobs. Their lack of good education was down to the fact that the majority of school work and courses were irrelevant to Hispanic Americans. The racism faced by Hispanic Americans was so bad they established a new term to describe themselves, Chicanos.

Response B – 2/4
Hispanics in America were treated poorly they weren’t allowed to go to schools they couldn’t get jobs. In the schools children were told they had to leave because they couldn’t speak english and in some cases the hispanic children spoke fluent english and spoke it better than the American children.

Why was the 1965 Immigration Act important? Explain your answer.

Response A – 6/6
The 1965 Immigration Act was very important due to two main reasons.
Firstly, the Act abolished immigration quotas. This meant that Hispanics could move to America when they saw fit, irrespective to how many other immigrants were migrating that year. This was important as it proved that the government was willing to fight for civil rights for all Americans. Additionally, it was important as it made both Hispanics already in the USA and immigrants seeking emigration feel welcome.

Secondly, the Act included a Family Reunification Clause that enabled families of Hispanics to come and join their loved one(s) in the USA. Again, this made the government come across as more appreciative and welcoming. Furthermore, it also gave Hispanics a stake in American society and allowed Hispanics to build a life in America, with all of their family members receiving US citizenship.

Response B – 2/6
The 1965 immigration act was important as it gave Hispanics a better quality of life. It gave the Hispanics who were working in America the right to bring their family over from Mexico. It also gave them the right to send some of their wages across the border to support their families. It also allowed more latinos to cross the border to work in the southern states of America on farms.
Response A – 10/10

I agree with this statement. The women's movement was far more high profile than the Native American movement. The Native American movement did have some points at which it was quite successful and gained lots of public support but they were still quite discriminated at the end of it. The Native American occupation of Alcatraz Island lasted 19 months and cost the government the dollar equivalent of £1/2 million. Despite the Native Americans offering to buy it off the government for $24, there was little result for them. Criticism was directed towards the government saying they broke all ANO treaties with Native Americans but no acts were passed as a result. The occupation of Wounded Knee trading post in South Dakota by Native Americans had more of an effect. The government's response was to send in 200 FBI agents and 15 armoured vehicles to surround Wounded Knee. The siege lasted 71 days, in which 2 Native Americans were killed and 1200 arrests were made. An example of the impact it made was at the 1973 Oscars when Marlon Brando refused to collect his Oscar based on the way Indians were portrayed in films – he sent a Native American to collect it instead. Aside from public support Wounded Knee did not raise many further advancements and Native Americans remained a very poor group in the USA.

However, the women's campaign was overall very successful. Women led a very high profile campaign about the issue of abortion. This resulted in the introduction of The Pill in 1960, however it was not readily available to married women until 1965 and unmarried women until 1972. In 1966 Betty Freiden formed the women's rights organisation NOW. They organised protests etc and helped focus the women's rights campaign. The Fair Housing Act was extended to outlaw discrimination in the housing market based on gender. This gave women more opportunity to be independent and by their own houses. In 1972, the Supreme Court ruled discrimination based on sex unconstitutional. This was a big step forward in the women's rights campaign because it effectively covered all bases where discrimination may happen. However in 1972 a woman name Phylous Schlafley led a very high profile campaign called 'STOP ERA'. It was a campaign that said the women's rights activists were trying to make a woman's role equal to a man and therefore devaluing the female role. It managed to stop the campaign ERA passing through the government as it fell three states short of the number required to approve it. This was a major set-back in the women's rights campaign.

Overall I think the women's rights campaign did make more progress than the Native American campaign. It had far more actual acts and ruling passed that were specifically aimed at them rather than just acts that helped them as an addition, not a whole act dedicated to their one campaign. Women have progressed far further in that time than the Native Americans did.

Response B – 5/10

To a certain extent, I agree with this statement. Women made a lot of legal progress by changing laws to include their rights, for example the equal pay act of 1965 gave women the right to earn the same amount as men. Another example is the Roe v Wade case, where a woman legalised the right to an abortion in certain states.

As well as this, more groups were created to fight the cause for women's rights. Women's Liberation were the extreme side of feminism, and pulled stunts such as burning their bras and not shaving or wearing makeup. NOW were the less extreme. This group fought peacefully, giving leaflets out and petitioning. This meant that lots of people became involved in the women's demonstrations, even if they did not wish to be.

However, on the other hand I do not agree with this statement. Native American's gained respect and rights in this time period. The most important event to happen was the events at wounded knee. This was a Native American tribal site which had been the setting for a massacre in the late 1800's the Native American's held a sit in at the post and stayed there for 72 hours, until they were forced out by state troops. In the process of this happening, 2 men were killed. No advance on civil rights came about after the events.

In conclusion I believe that women did make more progress in achieving civil rights, as they made legal advances rather than just doing demonstrations.
A021 – HOW WAS BRITISH SOCIETY CHANGED, 1890-1918?

Study Source A.

Why was this source published at this time? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 8/8
This source was published to get the wealthy to change their attitudes towards the poor, as there was a time when many people, including Rowntree, were publishing studies in the poor’s favour to try and bring about help from the state. You can tell Charles Booth sympathises with the poor as he mentions ‘few have decent boots’ and ‘many gaps in the bricks which allowed in the weather’, this shows that Booth sympathises with the poor and is publishing this source to help them. This was also an opportune time to publish the source as many sympathisers, such as David Lloyd George and Winston Churchill, were in government, and were willing to use studies like these and Rowntree’s, to bring about change.

Response B – 5/8
This source was published so that the Government would help people in poverty. This is because life in Britain was very bad if you were poor. The research that Charles Booth did shows the reader how bad life can be. “Most were clean although all wore ragged clothes. Few had decent boots or shoes and many were barefoot.” This description of children waiting for food shows the nation that people are finding it hard to get children decent clothes for them to wear.

Another reason why this source was published at this time was to people aware of how many poor children can’t buy any food. Charles Booth describes how 70 children are in “a long queue” to get some soup and bread. This means that they lack food and they are missing out on education because they are of an age to go to school so that they can try and get out of poverty, so that they can have a better life.

Response C – 5/8
The source was published at this time to show that poverty was a problem in Britain. It demonstrates how bad some people were living at the time and shows that it wasn’t a small minority either as there were ‘about 30 boys and 40 girls’ who were waiting to get into the soup kitchen.

We can trust this source because it is written in first person by Charles Booth.

Response D – 5/8
This source was published as part of Booth’s ‘inquiry into the life and labour of the people of London’ and shows his findings concerning the abject poverty in many places in London, so was published to increase awareness of that fact. Before the liberal reforms of 1906, and the ensuing Children’s Act, there was little legislation to protect children, neglect such as having the ‘decent boots or shoes and many were barefoot’ being completely legal, so Booth published the source to shed light on this respect to try and instigate change. This is not only seen with the children, he also mentions the ‘roughly built’ houses and the dock workers having ‘no work available’; again elements of poverty for which there was no solution until 1911’s National Insurance Act, so again Booth was aiming to raise awareness to hasten social change to fix these issues, by publishing the source.
Response E – 3/8

This source was published in 1893 because this was when there was extreme poverty. Charles Booth was a social reformer who tried to stop poverty. I went into London and saw that are 1/3 of the people were under the poverty line. Like I said previously that in 1893 was when there was extreme poverty and due to the industrial revolution many people moved to the big cities making them more cramped and worse conditions. Rowntree also did a similar thing in York where he found 28% were below the poverty line. They also found that because of things like the Boer War 56% of people weren’t fit enough to the war because they were too unfit.

Study Sources B and C.

Which source is more useful as evidence about old age pensions? Use details of the sources and your knowledge of the period to explain your answer.

Response A – 8/8

Source B and C are both useful. Source B is useful as it shows how the Liberals used the Liberal Reforms to get elected, using them as propaganda against the Conservatives in the upcoming election. It also states how much the elderly would get for their pension which is useful, states that you would get this if your income was between 8-12 shillings. Source C tackles with the more negative side of the old age pensions. Typically, the amount you got from your old age pensions was not enough to support yourself, so people still had to save up money throughout their lives, just less than they had to before. Also, as it says in source C, if you took advantage of other government schemes, such as the workhouse, you would lose out on your pension. Source C says ‘the reporter has observed many such cases,’ supporting the idea that this was a common problem with the old age pension act. In source B, the Liberals make special mention that this reform is ‘unconnected with the poor Law,’ suggesting that they want to separate themselves from the older welfare systems to make theirs seem more innovative. Overall, I think that Source B is more useful about the political side of the Old Age pensions, with facts on how much money you got and an example of how they used it as propaganda, however, Source C is a better example of the human side of it and how if affected people, sometimes negatively, directly.

Response B – 5/8

On the one hand source B is more useful because from my own knowledge I know that people who are over the age of 70 could get their pensions and couldn’t get them if they were criminal.

However, it may not be useful because it is the Liberal parties propaganda to try and get them more votes so they are only say good things about it 500,000 people got pensions and that most people died before 70 years.

On the other hand, Source C is more useful because it represents the negative side of the pensions and shows how little it actually did for people. For example, ‘the death of Emma Stevens aged 69’ shows that she was too old and couldn’t afford to live.

However, this source is Labour supporting therefore are trying to show that what the Liberals isn’t good enough because they are the working class party. They want the Liberals to do more so it is not very useful.

Overall I think that Source B is more useful because from my knowledge I know that these were the terms of the old age pensions.
Response C – 4/8
Both of the sources are useful but source C is more useful compared to source B. Source B is a pamphlet created by the Liberal Party, its purpose is to inform people about the pensions old people can get if they are part of the criteria on the pamphlet. This is a good thing to do but it is also used to get supporters. This is due to the sentence at the bottom that says “What the Liberals DO is better than what the Tories PROMISE”.

Source C is a newspaper that talks about the negative impacts of Pensions. The death of Emma Stevens tells us that even pensions can't help people get out of poverty. The fact that the couple had to refuse outside help and the workhouse so that could keep their pensions shows people that pensions can make things worse rather than making them better.

Even though source C is from a Labour supporting newspaper there are similar situations to this happening all over the country. This brings to light that more needs to be done to help people in poverty, even though source B is the first step to achieving this.

Response D – 4/9
Source B is a Liberal pamphlet, so will clearly be heavily biased in favour of the Pension Act, as it was a Liberal policy, reducing its reliability and thus its usefulness. This line is, however, only present in the closing statement ‘what the Liberals do is better than what the Tories promise’, the rest of the pamphlet is purely factual, its lack of opinionated material reducing the effect of the bias, merely stating the terms of the Pensions Act, and so in that regard it is quite a useful source on the subject.

Source C is from a Labour supporting newspaper and because they’re the Liberals opposition, and especially with the 1910 election being only a year after the source was published, the source is clearly biased against the reforms to make the Liberal’s look bad. This is shown in the blatant impressions of the report, as under the reforms a married couple would receive 7s8d per week, not a large amount but enough to live on, especially since the husband is a ‘labourer’ and is still earning income. Combined with the fact that ‘the workhouse’ offers far less than did the pension, the statement ‘the Old Age Pension Act had actually harmed people’ is simply untrue. So Source D is more useful, as although it contains Liberal lies it contains helpful factual information, as opposed to Source C which is merely a primary report.

Response E – 3/9
Source B is more useful evidence about old age pensions because it tells us about the requirements and how much was paid out. Source C doesn’t tell us much about the pensions as it does the negative effects.

Source B tells us that the pensions began to be paid (New Years day, 1909) and how much was being paid. We know from the source that it depended on a persons income as to how much they received.

Source C tells us a negative of the pensions. It tells us Emma Stevens, aged 69 dies because she and her husband didn't want to lose out on the old age pension. The couple were falling behind on their rent and unable to feed themselves even though they were offered outdoor relief and the workhouse.
Study Sources D and E.

Why do these sources give different views of the National Insurance Act? Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 9/9

Source D is a Liberal party poster, and so clearly wants to show the National Insurance Act in the best light to increase its support. This bias is evident in the Messiionic title ‘The Dawn of Hope’ and the ethereal writing ‘National Insurance against sickness and Disablement’; and how could be fighting sickness and disablement be bad! being the implied question. This poster is going to present an especially biased and warped view of the text, as after the 1910 election the Liberals no longer had a parliamentary majority, forming a coalition with 46 Labour MPs, so they need the extra support to get a majority to pass the bill.

Source E is from a Conservative newspaper, so is clearly going to offer a different view of the Act, as they are the Liberal’s opposition, and are particularly opposed as the source is published 2 years after D, after the act has been passed, and the fight in the House of Lords where the first Act was refused the first time and George V had to threaten to create 500 Liberal peers to upset the Conservative majority, in the Lords, has created even more animosity between the parties, so the source will want to show the Liberals in as poor a light as possible, calling it a ‘hated and inefficient measure’, ‘which will not benefit the ordinary working man’, despite its actually being a great help, providing wage security in cases of unemployment for only 4d per week.

Therefore, because they come from opposing political viewpoints and E is specifically seeking to discredit D, they are going to have totally differing views of the National Insurance Act.

Response B – 7/9

Source D is a Liberal Party poster which aims to get more support from the working class. This is shown in the poster by Lloyd George trying to help the sick man with the National Insurance Bill. The Liberal Party support the Bill because they created it and they think that it will help the working class and the party so it is a good idea in their opinion.

Source E is an article from a newspaper that supports the Conservatives. This article says that the Conservatives don’t approve of the National Insurance Bill because they believe that it won’t help the working class. They think this because Trade Unions and workers have ‘expressed great dissatisfaction with the Act’. The Conservatives are trying to stop the Bill because of what has been said and to stop taxes from increasing. They are trying to look out for the whole population and not just the working class.

Response C – 5/9

They give different views about National Insurance Act because they are supporting different political parties. Source D is ‘A Liberal Party poster’ and Source E is ‘an article in a Conservative-supporting newspaper’. The Conservatives are not going to encourage people to vote for the Liberals because they end up worse off. The Liberals are going to promote the National Insurance Act because it is their policy. They have such different opinions because they are supporting different political parties. The Liberals poster has ‘THE DAWN OF HOPE’ written across to persuade people to support them. The Conservative-supporting newspaper claims it will not benefit the working man in any way and may actually harm him’because they want to persuade people it is a bad policy.

Response D – 5/9

Source D and E have different views because they are produced by two different political parties. Source D by the Liberals in support of the National Insurance Act and source E by the conservatives against it. The National Insurance act took more money from the taxpayer to support the poor when they were sick, disabled or otherwise unemployed, or unable to work. This was seen as a good thing in Liberal eyes as it would go a long way to help those who need it the most, the sick and disabled, as found in Rowntree’s study ‘Poverty, a Study in Town Life’.
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This is shown in the source by the title ‘The Dawn of Hope’ suggesting that this new reform is the start of many great things to come, however in the conservative viewpoint, this was not seen as a very good thing. This money was taken directly out of worker’s wages, money which they could of spent on other, maybe more popular, things than other people they don’t know. Also some workers who never got sick or disabled or unemployed took no advantage from the act, and just felt it as a waste of money. Also the conservatives, being based on an ideology of self-help, didn’t like the state interfering with the daily lives of the people. This is supported in the source “Trade unions have expressed great dissatisfaction … as have many working men’ the trade unions being an unlikely ally of the Conservatives, however, they would want more to come from the rich and less to come from the workers, as the trade unions were designed to give workers power.

Response E – 4/9

Source D is supporting the National insurance act because it is propaganda for the Liberal party. The poster is supporting the National insurance act part 1 where you would get paid sick leave for 2 weeks. Lloyd George is shown comforting the sick man because that is what they believed they were doing. In 1911 was when the act was introduced so the Liberals were trying to gain support.

However, Source E gives a very different view on the National insurance act. Because it is an article from a Conservative-supporting newspaper it would clearly be against the act. The Conservatives have mostly middle and upper class supporters who don’t need to like National insurance act because they are already rich enough. Also because this source was written in 1913 a year before the National insurance act part 2 came out, which helped the unemployed which would also raised taxes they don’t want to pay. For example in the source it says they will ‘not benefit the working man’ showing that this party are against the act.

Study Source F.

What is the message of the cartoonist? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 8/8

The message of this cartoonist is that David Lloyd George is living in a dream world. This is shown in the cartoon of him playing the patriotic song “Keep the Home Fires Burning” while unaware that there is no coal or matches left in the shops behind him. This suggests that he is unaware of the conditions faced by the British people in 1917 during the First World War and how badly things were getting.

Also the cartoonist’s secondary message is that the war is crippling the nations economy. Due to shops having nothing to sell because of merchant ships being targeted by German U-boats, shopkeepers couldn’t stay open due to no business happening so they had no money for food. This was happening all over the country and morale was declining and the cartoonist thinks that Lloyd George doesn’t care because he is doing nothing to improve the situation.

Response B – 8/8

The message of the cartoonist is that Lloyd George is trying to be inspiring and patriotic, and is refusing to recognise the domestic shortage of ‘no coal’ and ‘no matches’, telling people to ‘keep the home fires burning’ yet offering no actual solutions as to how to do it. In 1917 the German U-boat blockade of Britain had caused severe shortages in all imported goods, as that year the Germans moved to unrestricted warfare, sinking even non-military trade ships going to Britain, and so the ‘no coal’ and ‘no matches’ signs are a reference to that. Lloyd George’s rather ridiculous figure in the picture is the cartoonist pointing out how ineffective he has been in the war, with events like the Maritime Disaster where British troops simply ran out of artillery shells as the maritime industry was so poorly managed to keep up with demand in 1916, and so his trumpeting figure is the cartoonist’s way of conveying the message that he is a man of empty words who seems patriotic playing the ‘popular patriotic song’, ‘keep the home fires burning’ but not actually
implementing any policies to help the situation, initiatives like DORA addressing only food shortages, not supply necessities like coal and matches, without which Britain, the cartoonist is implying, will simply be unable to ‘keep the home fires burning’.

**Response C – 8/8**
The message of the cartoon is that David Lloyd George is demanding the impossible of his citizens, as that this may be because his Liberal reforms didn’t go far enough. The cartoonist is critical, and mocking of David Lloyd George, making him look ridiculous in the cartoon, to express the ridiculousness the cartoonist feels towards the Liberal Reforms now that the war has come about. The cartoon says ‘keep the home fires burning’ whilst in the background showing a shop with no coal or matches in, commenting on the shortages of resources in the first world war and instead of helping the situation, David Lloyd George is just seen playing on his trumpet, blasting out ‘keep the home fires burning’ as if he is being purposely ignorant of the situation. Compulsory rationing wasn’t introduced until 1918 and therefore at this time there were high food prices and other things, like precious resources like coal. The voluntary rationing scheme wasn’t working and so this cartoon is commenting on, although David Lloyd George did a lot to help the poor, he was not doing enough when they really needed it, in the war.

**Response D – 2/8**
The message of this cartoon is that Lloyd George needs those who are not at war to help Britain. ‘Keep the home fires burning’ means keep Britain going. He needs people to help the country. The no coal and no marbles signs probably symbolise no food or water. Because they were in a war, people were struggling to survive, Lloyd George need help keeping the country afloat.

**Response E – 1/8**
The message of the cartoonist was that Lloyd George was helping to boost moral by singing patriotic songs which could represent the censorship where the Government reviewed films and newspapers before they were published to keep supporting the war which started in 1916. The cartoonists message could also be about DORA where the Government took over large businesses and land for the war effort and one of the main companies were coal. In the source Lloyd George could be keeping the people distracted from what they are doing. ‘Cobbles Limited’ and not ‘flint and steel’ suggest that these companies are not happy because they have to go back to what seems like the stone ages. The patriotic song which is being sung could be irony towards the bombing making it a lethal war killing 500,000 civilians. This, therefore shows that the message of the cartoonist is that Lloyd George is making a fool of himself trying to distract people from what is happening in the war.

However, it could also represent Lloyd George celebrating Britain’s success in the war.
Study all the sources, A-F.

‘In the period 1890-1918, government action improved the lives of people in Britain.’

How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use your knowledge of British society 1890-1918 and the sources to explain your answer.

Response A – 16/16

Between 1890 and 1905, until the Liberal reforms, there was very little government action to improve the lives of British people. There was, however, some progress in the area of women’s rights, laws being passed in the 1890’s which stopped the husband from taking control of his wife’s possessions upon marriage, which gave a wife the ability to divorce her husband on the grounds of violence and bigamy, and which recognised the rape of a wife by her husband as a criminal offence, all positive, but still small points of progress for women’s rights in the period, so government action went a small way to improving some lives there. As is seen in Source A though, there was nothing done to alleviate poverty in the 1890s, or the neglect of children, who ‘all wore ragged clothes’ and ‘were barefoot’ in poor parts of London.

In 1906 the introduction of free school meals for children, 150,000 per day in 1914, as a measure against the malnutrition of citizens seen during conscription for the Boer war, coupled with the 1908 Children’s act, criminalising neglect and providing free health inspections, went a long way to alleviating some of the problems in source A but there were still many issues for children, like how through health inspections were free, treatment wasn’t, and many families were unable to afford it, so although government action definitely improved the lives of children in 1906-1908, the extent of the improvement is questionable.

Source B shows the introduction of pensions in 1909, a vital measure considering the high percentage of the elderly living below the Rowntree poverty line, but again there were problems, as though the poster says ‘half a million old people’ to receive pensions like it’s a high figure, the criteria for pension were strict; you couldn’t have a criminal record, you must’ve been a citizen for 20 years, you must have worked to your full potential, a highly vague point, so many immigrants and other members of society missed out, so again, though government action did improve some lives, there were many unaided. The fact that a pension of ‘5s a week’ still placed elderly without supplementary income below the poverty line was an obvious problem with the scheme, so the improvement in people’s lives was limited.

Sources D and E reference the National Insurance Act, which wasn’t as Messianic as source D, a Liberal poster and so biased in favour of the act, makes it out to be, as the amount received if you became unemployed or sick from the Act still placed you below the poverty line, much like pensions, and barely covered food and lodging, let alone expensive treatment for the illness, a national health service being somewhat lacking. E’s criticism of the act is, though, unfair, as although the Act did require a contribution of 4d per week by the worker, it was heavily subsidised by Lloyd George’s 1909 People’s budget, so on average a worker received more than he had to put into National Insurance, as a net gain, if only a small one, again showing improvement in the lives of British people, just not a large one.

Source F is a satirical cartoon, mocking the efforts of Lloyd George to ‘keep the home fires burning’ under the stress of the U-boat blockade, and to an extent it is illegible in showing the very real shortages of supplies incurred, a marked decrease in the standard of living for British people, and a loss of liberty as well under DORA, allowing the army to seize and desired piece of land for supply or use as a training centre, as well stop and search people and vehicles without cause. This power was, however, rarely used and the farming initiatives set up under DORA went quite a way to reducing shortages, Britian suffering incomparably to Germany’s turning winter in 1917-1918, in which over a million military died, so considering Britain was at war, Government action, although not improving lives, went a good way to alleviate degradation in normal standards.

Where women’s rights are concerned, government action was actually harmful early on, with laws like the cat and mouse act passed and the terrible handling of the suffragette movement not only to harm to the activists themselves, with force feeding, but to the public as well, with acts of violence like 1910’s Black Friday in retaliation to government action. This was remedied to a large extent, in December 1918, when women were given the vote and, whilst, not quite on equal terms with men, this action went a long way to improving female lives, giving them a public voice and parliamentary representation.
Therefore, I agree to quite an extent that government action, with laws like the Children’s Act, National Insurance and Pensions, and far better the handling of the war than other governments, as well as instigating great progress on women’s rights, meant that the lives of people in Britain were improved between 1890-1918, but I don’t agree to an overwhelming extent, as their policies failed to help many of the people they were aimed at, and they took an exceedingly long time, fifteen years from 1903 and the start of large scale women’s rights campaigning to grant suffrage, and so while lives were definitely improved, they were not improved as much as would have been possible.

Response B – 15/16

On the one hand I do agree with the interpretation because from my own knowledge I know that the Government introduced many acts for example, they helped children with acts such as free school meals in 1906 and medical checkups in 1907 and protection act in 1908 which protected children against violent parents and even in 1911 they was free healthcare to children so they could be helped rather than being told they need help. They also helped the elderly with pensions in 1908 and working class people like places to find work and in 1911 and 1912 the National insurance act. And also giving women the vote in February 1918.

The Sources B and D also support this because in Source B it is a poster about the old age pensions and how useful it is towards old people by saying that old people will get 5 shillings a week if they used to get a low pay of 8s a week. The title of the poster ‘old age pensions at last’ suggests that the pensions are an amazing that which will and did help thousands of people.

Also in Source D it supports the interpretation because it is another poster that is propaganda to the Liberal party which is this time supporting National Insurance which is to get people to support it. In the source, it shows Lloyd George comforting another man who is sick which represents what the National insurance act part 1 does therefore supporting the interpretation.

However, both of these sources could be unreliable because they are both propaganda from the government trying to persuade people to vote for the Liberals.

On the other hand I do not agree with the interpretation because I know that all of the laws the Liberals introduced like pensions and free school meals had their limits. For example, the free school meal were not compulsory so that cancel had to choose to introduce them therefore it hardly happened. With old age pensions you had to be 70 years old to recieve it which is too old because most people would be dead by then. Also during World War one they introduced rationing and couldn’t prevent the bombing in cities and German U-boats destroying ¼ of merchant ships.

The sources E, F, A and C all do not support the interpretation. Source A doesn’t support the interpretation because it is social reformers saying how bad Britain in 1893 was and how there were ‘long queue(s) of school children at the soup kitchen’ suggesting they could afford dinner meaning the Government didn’t improve the lives of people in Britain.

Source C also doesn’t support it because it is a Labour-supporting newspaper saying how the Liberals are not doing enough to help and need to do more because people like ‘Emma Stevens’ are dying.

Source E also doesn’t support the interpretation because it is a Conservative-supporting newspaper saying how the Government is wasting the peoples money and are being ‘forced to pay’ for something that they don’t need which in this case is National Insurance.

Lastly, Source F also doesn’t support this because it shows Lloyd George trying hare to distract people by playing his trumpet but people can see what is going on like things which damaged big businesses like DORA.

However, Sources C and E are not reliable because they are both written by opposing parties trying to get the Liberals to loss the vote.

Overall, I strongly agree that the government did improve the lives of the people by introducing many acts to help the lower class people under the poverty line but the source booklet suggests that the government did not improve the lives of people in Britain.

Response C – 14/16

Before the Liberal Reforms, life for the poor and working class wasn’t easy. Working conditions were poor, houses were often overcrowded and their was no real support from the state, apart from the workhouse, a place where someone with no money could go to work for no pay, but for food an accommodation, which had purposely terrible conditions in order to prevent people from seeking help, this scheme also made people heavily reliant on these work houses,
reducing the amount of freedom they have. Many people at the time, however, didn't care for the poor, as the common attitude was that people were poor because they were lazy, and that if the poor worked hard enough they could work their way out of poverty. Also many people believed in self help and didn't want interference from that government. However, the Government did set out reforms which began to help people. I would agree with this statement because, firstly, free school meals would get children to have at least one good meal a day, making it an important factor in helping the poor’s health improve, and therefore the efficiency of British industry. Also the introduction of school health check ups meant better health care for kids, the most venerable to diseases. National Insurance went a long way to improving the lives of the poor by supporting those which would struggle to help themselves, the sick, disabled and unemployed, as supported by Source D, stating it to be ‘the Dawn of hope’. Also old age pensions finally made the elderly less reliant on family or the workhouse and more self sufficient, as shown by Source B, the poor would get 8 shillings a week, making it very supportive.

However, I would also disagree with this statement because, firstly, it wasn't really government which improved the lives of the poor, but the actions of outside pressure which forced the government's hand! For example, Britain was fighting the Boer War and in the end about half of the people joining up for service were unfit for it due to bad health because of their poverty, forcing government to take action. Also Britain noticed that Bismarck in Germany had introduced welfare to support the German people, which made them a much more efficient workforce, forcing the government's hand again as Britain didn't want to fall behind as a leading industrial power.

Also, some of the Reforms could have been viewed as ineffective and therefore, not truly improving the lives of the poor by 1918. The national insurance act was taking money directly from workers, not helping them at all in the short term meaning not many workers would have been able to see the positives of this Act. As supported by Source E, with 'forced to pay the bill for this hated and inefficient measure'making it clear that some truly opposed this reform. Also free school meals didn't have to be accepted by the local authority, making it a matter of where you lived if your child got fed, as well as the healthcare varying dramatically between different counties due to the local authorities control over the matters. The old age pension act also didn't fully change the laws of the old as they were denied it if they went after other aid like the workhouse.

Overall I believe that Source F sums up what the Liberals achieved to help improve people's lives in London. Although they did help pave the way for new Reforms to take place, we will never really know how much these reforms changed the lives in Britain as their effects were overshadowed by the huge effect the first world war had on the country. With most recruited for war.

Response D – 11/16
I agree with this interpretation because some of the things that happened in this time period had a positive impact on most people in the UK.

Sources B and A support this interpretation because Pensions gave poor elderly people a wage that they could rely on getting. Also that National Insurance Bill helped workers during sickness and gave them a small wage so that they could keep on paying for essential they needed. A huge thing that improved was that women were given the vote in 1918. This meant that more of the nation could get their opinion across and make a difference to society. The introduction of free medical check-ups for school children helped them to stay alive and be treated for diseases.

But sources C, E and F don't support this interpretation. This is because some think that Lloyd George was ignorant of what was happening around him during the war. Also, some say that the National Insurance Bill wouldn't benefit all the working class, and some also say that Pensions were more of a hinderance rather than a help to some people.

Source A doesn't take a side but it makes people aware of the problems people were facing during this time period. This made people across the country change their attitudes towards poverty and to try and do something to stop it.

In my opinion, I agree with the interpretation that Government actions did improve people's lives in Britain. This is shown by the social reforms and by the willingness of the government wanting help people. Even though there was opposition to all of this they still happened and they have helped benefit the Britain that we live in today.

Response E – 5/16
I agree with this interpretation because he introduced pensions which brought elderly people to tears as they were able to survive. He introduced the National Insurance act which meant people didn't starve, should they fall ill. He helped bring britain out of poverty. The Liberals took action against poverty which was ‘the dawn of hope’. By Charles Booth analysing the living conditions in London, he used that information to improve the quality of living at this time.
Study Sources A and B.

Why do these two sources disagree? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 6/9
Source A and Source B strongly disagree regarding their view towards immigration in Britain. Source A, is welcoming West Indians into Britain, persuading them to move due to the promise of work and a warm welcome. However, Source B wants to ‘Stop the Jamaicans’ immigrating to Britain because if too many come it will lower the living standard of the British people. However, Source A suggests that British public would benefit from immigration saying that friendships that could last a lifetime would be made. Source A is made by the British government so it is propaganda. It is therefore going to be persuasive and make Britain seem like a welcoming place to live. It was broadcasted in 1944, during WWII, whereby the British government had many recruitment campaigns in the West Indies promising them jobs to help in the war effort. However, Source B was taken from a British newspaper, said by a conservative MP. By 1955, tension had arisen between the immigrants and the British people due to economic factors and ignorance on behalf of the British public by not accepting fully their new neighbours. Britain was starting to become tougher on immigration, which the conservative party agreed, as by 1955, many immigrants had taken full residence in the UK such as the Wind Rush of 1948 which brought 492 West Indians to Britain. Many jobs in the NHS and public transport were occupied by immigrants.

Therefore, both sources disagree because Source A is persuading West Indians to come help in the war effort, whereas Source B highlights that 11 years later, how the British public were responding to growing levels of immigration.

Response B – 6/9
Source A disagrees with Source B for many reason. Firstly, attitudes towards the West Indians. Source A, coming from a government information film during the war. Shows a mutual respect between them and the West Indians on the battlefield. It illustrates equality through images of the British working together with the West Indians.

Source B shows the opposite. Cyril Osborne (MP) says that West Indians are “decreasing the standard of living for the British people. This highlights discrimination against immigrants that was not present during the war.

Secondly, reaction to West Indians. Source B immediately shows that some of the British wanted the Jamaicans to leave as seen the title of the article “STOP the Jamaicans” demands Cyril Osborne MP”. This was due to mass immigration that came due to the introduction of the British Nationality Act in 1948.

Source A shows regret that the West Indians are leaving after the war as shown in the source “we find it impossible to believe that these friendships will fade out when the war is won”. This is in reference to the fact that the British expected them to leave. However, Sorce A is published 4 years before the British Nationality Act. This highlights the great change of opinion from before the war ended (Source A) and after it ended (Source B).

Response C – 6/9
The two sources are different because of their purpose. Source A has a purpose of showing how Britain is a pleasant place to live and work. They talk about how white people and West Indians are becoming friends and “friendships are being made. Source B however talks about how immigration is a bad thing. The members of the conservative party rarely liked immigration after numbers swelled massively.
In 1948 the British Nationality Act was passed and thousands of people gained British citizenship and migrated to Britain. Source B was published after this and so is becoming irritated by the immigrants – Source A disagrees therefore because this was made before the act was passed and so they wanted others to migrate to Britain.

Source B has a harsh tone and by using phrases as "we have to tear" he is implying the immigrants could take over Britain. Source A uses a friendly tone to almost invite immigrants and thank those who fought for Britain in the war. Source A is by the government so they'd have to use a friendly tone to appear genuine about the help they received. They do agree however because they've both talking about immigrants and how they're working in Britain to help rebuild after the war. In 1952 USA put restrictions on immigration, so immigration to Britain increased, this would've concerned the conservative party.

Overall the sources disagree as Source A talks about a love for immigrants due to their help in the war. Source B however talks about how the immigrants are a massive concern to Britain.

**Response D – 5/9**

Sources A and B disagree with each other because it is shown in Source A that during the war, people in the West Indians were respected for their efforts. Source B disagrees with this from an MP who opposes immigration heavily. In 1959 Cyril Osborn had the slogan 'Keep Britain white'. This is shown from source B.

Source A says that during the war, immigrants were respected and seen as friends. This is shown from: "we find it impossible to believe that these friendships will fade out." This shows that even after the war the immigrants will be friends. This is however disagreed from source B. Cyril Osborn says that: "This is a white man's country and I want it to remain so." This is why the 2 sources disagree because now after the war their opinions of the immigrants has changed.

In the Caribbeans, 2 hurricans hit it and the sugar cane industry collapsed. This meant the people had to seek work in Britain. People's opinions changed on them and source B shows that now they do not want them in Britain. This shows that the two sources disagree with their opinions of the immigrants.

We see that in source A it heavily shows respect towards immigrants but it Source B it does the opposite. This shows that the 2 sources disagree with each other in their opinions of immigration.

**Response E – 4/9**

Source A suggests that people in Britain are welcoming Immigrants from the Commonwealth. The British government had allowed immigrants into the country freely to try and fill the roles that were empty in the workplace. The Source is extract from an information film made by the government trying to change what people thought about immigrants entering the country.

Source B suggest that some people in the government were against the large amounts of immigration. Many felt that the mass immigration would cause Britain to become overcrowded and it would cause a lack of jobs for people.

Overall, the sources disagree because Source A is trying to encourage people to accept immigration whereas Source B is trying to discourage it.
Response A – 7/8
To a large extent, this source is not useful as evidence about immigration in Britain in the 1960's. the source however, is useful in seeing that some, although the minority of immigrants, were treated well, in terms of employment, implying not all immigrants were refused jobs. The fact that the passengers are 'so nice' also suggests the British public were willing to accept immigrants into their society. We also know that Britain accepted many commonwealth citizens into areas such as public transport. However, the source proves not useful in providing an accurate overview of the 1960's treatment of immigrants. The fact that he is the first coloured bus conductor implies that there had been some change to the denial of employment to people on the grounds of their race or colour. The source is also taken from a newspaper article which suggests this story was not unique and his job very uncommon, and that immigration is still a topical issue in Britain. Moreover, it fails to mention the 1962 commonwealth immigration act which inhibited the immigration of commonwealth citizens, unless they were issued with special work permits, all implying that immigrants were not being accepted fully like the man in the source C. At this time of 1963, racial tension was high and it was not long since the 1950 race riots. Many immigrants were denied jobs and even those with valuable skills found it hard to gain a job, due to their race. Moreover, source B also suggests that immigrants were not treated as nicely as the man in the source which makes the source less useful. Overall the source is useful in showing that some immigrants were accepted into society and the passengers acceptance shows this, yet this man is in the minority, and many immigrants were not treated well in this time period, therefore it is largely not useful to historians as it does not give a true representation of how immigrants were treated.

Response B – 6/8
This source is useful as evidence about immigrants in Britain in the 1960's. This is shown from the fact that now there was not a colour bar on the Bristol buses. This is useful because it shows that now immigrants had more jobs available and they liked this. This bus conductor, Raghbir Singh describes it as 'very nice', this shows that he likes his new job and now he isn't descriminated because of his race. This shows that the source is useful in showing that now in the 1960's more immigrants could get a better job regardless of race.

In April 1963, there was a protest against the bus company and they refused to let coloured people to join. Now shown in the source that the colour bar is gone and they can join. This is useful because it shows that now the government was taking action of the discrimination towards the immigrants.

During the late 1960's, the government had passed the Race Relations Acts this was where it was illegal to discriminate someone because of their race. This Source shows this from the immigrants being allowed to get the job and being positive about it. This makes it useful for evidence about it.

The tone of the source is also positive of the fact that immigrants can now get these jobs. This also makes it useful for evidence shown from the opinion of it.

Response C – 6/8
Source C is useful to a certain extent Firstly it illustrates that not all British people discriminated against immigrants. This is shown when the first coloured bus conductor said “the passengers are so nice”. This highlights the fact that, there was equality to a certain extent in that only a small minority were discriminating against the immigrants.

This is similar to Source A in that it shows that the immigrants and locals were friendly to one another and did not discriminate.

Secondly, it references the colour bar. The colour bar was a massive hinderance on immigrants as it meant certain skin colours could not access certain facilities. Source C mentions that it ended and which in fact “caused a storm”. This was a huge part of immigration in the 1960's and is referred to in this source.
However, this source is not fully useful as it misses out a key element of immigration, discrimination. Source C only focuses on the positive relationship between the immigrants and the locals. Discrimination was a huge part of immigration as many locals were against them coming to their countries. They were treated extremely differently because of their skin tone and nationality. This factor can also be seen in Source B, where an MP is demanding the departure of immigrants. This factor is completely skipped over in Source C as it does not make it very useful as evidence about immigrants in 1960s.

**Response D – 6/8**

The Source is useful to a great extent. It gives us an idea of how immigrants were treated. The man in the source says he was treated well and he says “the passengers are so nice,” which can show how people are welcoming immigrants into the job and treating them well. The picture is good evidence as it shows a white man co-operating with him and proves white people did actually help. The man is smiling showing he is happy and pleased at how well it is going. However the man is only from one race and by this I mean the source doesn't tell us about people from other races i.e. Jamaicans who migrated. So it is useful to a little extent because it isn't telling us about other people who migrated to Britain. Also the source doesn't mention anything about the 1962 common wealth immigration act which put restrictions on the amount of immigrants allowed to come and settle. The source has a purpose to show to the people of Bristol that the protests in the past have been handled well and they're now hiring coloured bus conductors. So the source is made out to seem better than it was. It also doesn't mention how many coloured people they hired and only talks about one person. Also the source is from one city only meaning that this may not represent how immigration was happening in other cities. Source B is also useful about evidence because although it has a very negative tone it supplies evidence that many immigrants were coming over and this number would just increase. The two sources show different attitudes but supply some evidence that many evidence that many immigrants were in fact coming over.

Overall the source is useful to a little extent because it is only an account of one person. The source was published to make the event seem better and is only talking about one race making the evidence not representative to other races.

**Response E – 4/8**

The Source shows a picture of Bristol's first bus Conductor. When immigrants first arrived in Britain they struggled to find good jobs even if they were well trained. This source shows that Raghbir Singh is very happy with the job he has got because he thinks 'everyone is so helpful.' This is a good representation of how some peoples lives were improved when they moved to Britain. However, it doesn't show us a wider range of people so it can't be said that every immigrant had the same experience.

**Response A – 9/9**

The source was published in 1968 as it was shortly after Enoch Powell’s River of Blood Speech of 1968. Enoch Powell, a Conservative MP made a speech warning people of the dangers of immigration. The photo being published suggests that immigration still is a topical issue, such as sources C and B suggest. However, Powell’s speech was met with thousands of letters of support from white dock workers who agreed with his seemingly racist views. Therefore, this photo may have been published as it shows a different view on Powell's speech as suggests it wasn't so racially driven as it was met with uproar from white workers to. This may have been published to thaw the danger and tension of the immigrants. Moreover, it may also have been used to show the white citizens they too were being affected by Powell. Moreover, that fact that it was published in the dockland area is also significant.
The dockland areas were the places that saw immigrants arriving on mass into Britain. Therefore, dockworkers saw an unfiltered look on immigration and were not angered and affected by it. Publishing this photograph could have been a means of the black and white community promoting ties in the face of Powell’s racist comments. The photograph may also have been used to show the immigrants not all white people agree with Powell.

**Response B – 9/9**

The newspaper published this source to show the main message of Powell hating everyone. The source shows the public reaction towards Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” speech which eventually got him fired. The source was published in a paper near the dockland area. In the dockland area many people, mostly dock workers, who supported Powell marched for him after he was fired. The source is produced to persuade dock workers to not support Powell. The dock workers are a laughing stock because people believe their leader doesn’t like them, so they are supporting the wrong cause.

The newspaper was also published to make a joke out of the dock workers so it has a sarcastic tone as the person who published it believes they’re wrong for supporting Enoch Powell. It was put in a newspaper because it was quite a controversial message that they supported one who hated them. The newspaper was aimed to get people to buy it so it may have been published to get people to buy it. This would make us believe the graffiti could’ve been staged in order to get people to buy this. Overall the source was published to shock Powell supporters and have them believe he was a fraud. This source differs from source E because it shows that people were still being discriminated against. Source D can be interpreted as Enoch Powell’s speech wasn’t racist because he dislikes the white people as well.

**Response C – 6/9**

The newspaper in Source D published this photograph to cause a negative image for Enoch Powell. The image is in reference to Powell’s ‘rivers of blood’ speech in which he described the fact that the black community has gotten the upper hand. He was sacked, as this was not true and just discrimination. This photograph was published in 1968, the same year as Powell’s speech. Powell gained many supporters in the docks due to the fact that many immigrants had taken their jobs. This photograph shows that Powell hated all workers, black and white. This shows the reaction of immigrants, as the graffiti was likely done by an immigrant.

**Response D – 3/9**

The newspaper published this photo in 1968 to show that Enoch Powell didn’t like the workers who were immigrants. The photo in the source disagrees with it saying that he doesn’t like the workers regardless of race. In 1968 Enoch Powell made his ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech, this was where in the speech he said that he didn’t want migrant workers in Britain. Many dock workers supported him and made protests of not criticising him for his actions.

The source shows that it was published to show many people supported him and showed that he wasn’t racist. The photograph is from the dockland area where many of the dockland workers supported Powell because of the jobs ‘taken’ by immigrants. This shows it was published to show that many people didn’t want immigrants in Britain and supported Powell. The actual picture contradicts Powell and this was shown to show that he wasn’t racist to gain popularity.

Overall this source was published in the newspaper to show that Powell heavily opposed on migrant workers but people were trying to make him not seem racist.

**Response E – 1/9**

This Source was published to show how people felt about the working conditions. The dockland employed both black and white workers and it shows that workers are not happy with there treatment. Many working class people during this time period were angry at the government for making it harder for less qualified people to get a job. The newspaper is therefore trying to support the people by saying that “Powell hates the workers” to try and get more people to share there opinion and show what they felt about the government. The message of this picture is that workers are suffering because of that the governments were doing. It was therefore published to gain support against what the governments plans.
Study Source E.

What is the cartoonist’s message? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Response A – 8/8

The cartoonist’s message was to ridicule the white population and highlight the inequality of the British employment. The cartoon shows that Boss’s of companies were not willing to accept workers on the basis of their colour or race. It was published in 1972, when the Race Relations act was passed which made the discrimination on the grounds of race or colour illegal in employment and housing. This could therefore imply that the cartoon could be used as a means of mocking the British people for their ignorance, and used to highlight the issue of inequality that the immigrants faced. At this time, many immigrants were denied jobs, housing or access to public facilities, despite the legal security of the Race relation acts of 1965-1968 due to the unwillingness of many to implement these laws into their business or community. The fact that the cartoon came from a race relations organisation also implies that they want to promote good race relations. The satirical undertone and mere stupidity of the characters is used to really mock the public and make them feel sympathetic to the immigrants who are denied jobs due to the colour of their skin.

Response B – 8/8

The message of the cartoonist in Source E is to highlight the discrimination of immigrants in employment. The cartoon shows that many employers indirectly discriminated against coloured people by lying e.g. no vacancies. This was because of the Race Relations Act in 1965, then again 1968 and finally in 1976. This act banned the discrimination against immigrants in general and in employment. The cartoon was published in 1972, after the act was enforced, to show many still disobeyed the act.

In the cartoon, we can see that the man approaches the employer and says “you sounded as though you thought I might be coloured”. This highlights how many did not want to hire immigrants to do their race.

The cartoon is also used to promote the race relations organisation as propaganda. It shows the negativity of discrimination and why many should not do it.

Response C – 8/8

The message of the source is to show that people were still being discriminated against. The man is taking advantage of the fact he is white and enquiring about the job in person. He is also inferring the other man is racist but as this is so casually done the message shows discrimination was not rare and people often accused others of being racist and saying there wasn’t a problem with that. The source was published in 1972 after two race relations acts had been made. This cartoon is showing they were quite ineffective as people were still being discriminated against. The 1968 race relations act prevented discrimination in the workplace but the cartoon shows how this isn’t working as discrimination in the workplace is still happening.

The cartoonist was from the race relations organisation and its purpose was to educate others in that open discrimination was still a wide spread issue. They wanted people to sympathise for immigrants and coloured people. The race relations organisation was set up to help coloured people. The race relations board which was set up in 1966 was ineffective in tackling complaints and so the Source shows that white people are being racist in a different way. The guy thought that he was being discriminated against because the other man thought he was black. He didn’t like this idea so the source highlights how easy it was for a white man overcome supposed racism and shows how a coloured person could sadly never do this. Coloured people were often discriminated against in all areas of life and this highlights how in employment.
Response D – 6/8
The message of the Source is that black people were being discriminated against because of the colour of there skin and they were therefore less likely to get work. Many immigrants who came to Britain were extremely well qualified as things such as doctors and lawyers, however they were unable to get employed in these higher paid jobs due to discrimination and were stuck doing lower paid jobs such as cleaners. The cartoon is trying to make the point that what employers were doing was rejecting black people in favour of white people even if the black person was much better qualified.

Response E – 5/8
In Source E, the cartoonist’s message is to show the colour bar in Britain was discriminating people because of their race. The source shows a white person who is talking to a personnel officer saying that he thought he was treated like a coloured person. This shows that many people heavily discriminated people because of their race and the person in the source shows he was treated with disrespect, much like an immigrant at that time was treated. The message of the source is that many people who were immigrants were treated differently; much like shown here the white man didn’t get his vacancy.

Many immigrants were treated harshly shown from the summer of violence. In 1968 there were clashes with immigrants and white Teddy boys. This was in Nottingham. This shows that much like the Source, the message is that immigrants were discriminated because of their race and people were shown this.

Overall the message of the source is to show that many people discriminated immigrants because of race and they were seen differently to the white people.

Study all the sources, A-E.
‘Between 1939 and 1975, immigrants made a valuable contribution to Britain.’
How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use your knowledge of British society 1939-1975 and the sources to explain your answer.

Response A – 15/16
Between 1939 and 1975, thousands of immigrants migrated to Britain to assume full residency.

Between 1939 and 1975, thousands of immigrants migrated to Britain to assume full residency.

During world war 2, immigration increased greatly due to the need for help in the war effort. There were recruitment campaigns in the West Indies and the 1948 British nationality Act allowed all commonwealth citizens to come and live in Britain despite their race, colour or religion. Therefore many migrated to Britain with the promise of work. With this romantic view of Britain in their minds, such people on the Empire Wind Rush of 1948 where 492 West Indians arrived. Britain was working to recruit these immigrants both during the war, such as source A suggests. Source A shows that Britain was persuading immigrants to come over with the promise of friendship and opportunities. Moreover, along with this contribution during the war, immigrants were heavily contributed to the NHS and our public transport systems, all of which helped rebuild postwar Britain. Moreover, many immigrants were starting to gain jobs, which were previously white dominated such as the man in Source C becoming the first coloured bus conductor.

Immigrants brought over new food, music and clothing. New fabrics brought over from India helped in the textiles industry, new music appealed to the teenage population which helped them start to identify with new trends, instead of trends that were previously set for them. Immigrants were making Britain a more multicultural place as people were beginning by 1975 to accept new cultures and people.
However, not all immigrants were allowed to make such a contribution to British society. Many skilled men and women who previously had high earning jobs, were refused in the early 1930's and beyond, jobs despite their skillset due to their race. These racial barriers inhibited many immigrants making valuable contribution's to society. Many acts such as the 1962 commonwealth citizen acts and race riots such as those in 1958 made many immigrants fearful of Britain and their seemingly hostile nature. Source B demonstrates this clearly as illegible openly admits to wanting immigrants to leave Britain. Moreover, source C, although on the first glance seems positive, it was a very uncommon event and many still were denied jobs due to the fear and competition of the new workers in the workplace, and also the blame on many immigrants that they were the reason for the failing economy post war. Moreover, source E reiterates this once more, as the inequality in terms of employment is shown and the need for race relation acts and race relation organisation implies was not fully welcome of immigrants which suggest they were unable to fully contribute to society.

With MP’s such as Cyril Osborne and Enoch Powell using their power to wield political influence made it very hard for immigrants to fully participate in British society. Without a job of public acceptance, many skilled citizens who were not white could not make a valuable contribution to Britain.

In conclusion, to a large extent I do believe immigrants made a valuable contribution to Britain. In terms of the war effort, foreign help was much needed and helped towards Britain’s victory. In terms of public service, immigrants also helped in the NHS and public transport. Britain was provided with new food, new culture, new music and new clothes, all of which many Briton’s enjoyed and made good use of. Although some immigrants were denied the right to many things, and could not make such a noticed contribution, most of them being in Britain found acceptable to new cultures and become more willing to new things and new people. Therefore, to a large extent I do agree with the statement as not only did immigrants help change the attitudes of the British people, such as the passengers in source C, but also helped in rebuilding Britain’s economy due to their involvement in British employment.

**Response B – 13/16**

I agree with this statement to a great extent. Immigrants were valuable right from when the war ended when prisoners of war or ex-soldiers come back to Britain. Many immigrants were there to help rebuild Britain and in 1948 when the British Nationality Act was passed many came to Britain to receive citizenship. Britain was the mother land and most people wanted to help her get back on her feet. Many immigrants came to help the NHS start up in 1946-8 and from India especially many doctors came to help start.

Many schemes such as LT invited people over to gain workers. They were valued as they helped companies get back together after the war. Source C is also useful as it shows a man working on a bus in Bristol and helping the bus company in running it shows in the source that foreigners were treated well and we can infer this they were valued. Although it's nature is a newspaper and would be shown to help sell papers we understand that they were valued by this company.

Source D shows that people shouldn’t worry about racist authority figures such as Enoch Powell because he was believed to hate everyone.

However I agree with the statement to a little extent, this is because many people thought immigrants caused more problems being there than helping Britain. Especially in the notting hill riots, people believed that this caused international outrage but this could’ve been avoided by not letting immigrants come in. Source B shows how a Conservative MP is worried about the increase of immigration. The man uses quite outragerous language and saying things such as ‘India could lose 50 million people and scarcely miss them.’ show that immigrants aren’t useful of valuable because not even their home country will miss them. H had these views alongside many other people and was outragerous in the way he expressed them. But it showed how they were disliked and not valued. The commonwealth act of 1962 and then later 1968 show how many people were coming with nothing to give and Britain didn’t like this. They believed only those with a skill could come as they were the only useful ones. Source E shows how they weren’t valued because people were believed to deny them a job on the basis that they were black or coloured so believed they were unskilled.

Overall I agree with the statement to a great extent because I believe without the help of many immigrant services such as the NHS wouldn’t of been able to survive. Many were seen as unuseful but even without these many jobs many not have been taken and people wouldn’t of liked the how Britain wasn’t advancing as well as they’d of liked. They helped with it and even did much lower paid jobs because they were believed to be unvaluable but infact many of them were skilled so completed these jobs to the best of their ability which was a high standard.
Response C – 8/16

I agree with this statement to a certain extent. Immigration was a huge part of British history during 1939-1975. Many valuable contributions have been made by immigrants. Firstly, help in the war – many citizens of commonwealth countries under control of the British Empire were recruited to help in the war against Nazi Germany. In the war, the British and immigrants fought side by side and equally. There was mutual respect. This war lasted from 1939 to 1945, and the immigrants appreciated for their help. This is illustrated in Source A which shows images of West Indians working and laughing alongside the British, highlighting there for mutual gain. Their help was appreciated and contributed greatly.

Secondly, immigrants came in as needed help. After the war, Britain needed many more employees to fill in new jobs such as the transport for London scheme. Due to the fact that the US put a cap on immigration, immigrants from commonwealth countries were recruited as help for London. This is shown in Source C where an immigrant is shown to be working as a bus conductor, one of the many jobs Britain needed employees for.

Thirdly, the brought great change within people with the introduction of immigrants, many were originally hesitant however learned to appreciate there fellow, now, British citizens. This can be seen in Source C where an immigrant says “everyone is so helpful”.

However, a huge amount of negativity rose with the arrival of immigrants. Firstly, caused divides and debates. Many politicians and citizens were divided as whether or not to allow immigration, particularly coloured ones. Many were against it as shown in Source B where an MP is demanding the departure of immigrants.

Secondly, the masses of immigrants. Although it was only a small percentage of the British population, there were so many immigrants. Source B illustrates this as it states ‘last year 10,000 Jamaicans immigrated to this country’.

Thirdly, caused negative feedback. Many locals discriminated heavily against immigrants. This lead to many physical and violent confrontations such as in Nottingham in 1959, one black immigrant was stabbed to death by 6 white youths. This created an uproar. This discrimination is highlighted in Source E, where it shows they will not hire a man because he thought he was coloured.

Lastly, created inequality. Many facilities were not allowed to the immigrants and as a result it caused segregation of work. This is seen in source D where the photograph is trying to show equality.

In conclusion, many outcomes came out of immigration. Some have contributed to Britain, some made it worse. However, more negativity was highlighted in 1939 to 1975 due to Immigration, and as a resulted a less valuable contribution.

Response D – 5/16

I agree a lot with this interpretation. I think that between 1939 and 1975, immigrants did make a valuable contribution to Britain. Source A shows this from during the war, immigrants from the West Indies were heavily respected for their war efforts. It is also shown that it has helped Britain in the war and a new friendship is made. This shows that Immigrants in the Commonwealth had made a substantial contribution towards Britain and has helped them. This backs up the interpretation.

Many individuals also made a contribution towards Britain who were immigrants. Cybil Phyonix was a women who started off with nothing. She started a small orphanage and set up a group. Soon she was awarded a MBE for her efforts. This help shows that immigrants made a contribution. Anwar Perez is also another example where he started off with a corner shop. He was worth £130 million after. This shows that many immigrants prospered and made a contribution to British society.

Source C shows that many immigrants were now gaining jobs. This is shown from the “first coloured conductor”. This shows that many immigrants had jobs. This heavily raised the economy of the country from taxes. This shows that due to more jobs from immigrants, they made a valuable contribution by raising Britain’s economy.

Immigrants have also brought their new cultures to Britain. New music such as Reggae and Bollywood allowed a much more varied culture in Britain. There was also new food brought to Britain, new restaurants set up by immigrants also allowed Britain to have a varied culture. This shows that immigrants made a valuable contribution to Britain.
However, it can be seen that many people saw the immigrants as not making any contribution to Britain. This is shown from Source B, in this the MP shows he doesn’t want any immigrants in Britain and they won’t be any good for Britain. He says that jobs will be taken and needs to stop. This shows that many people saw immigrants to not make a contribution towards Britain.

Overall I agree a lot with this statement because of the amount of factors in which immigrants have helped Britain throughout 1939-1975. This helped the country as a whole and the people in Britain also.

**Response E – 4/16**

Source A agrees that they have contributed to Britain because it is saying they are fitting in well with the British community. It is saying that they have come over got jobs and a home and done Britain a huge favour by filling the jobs that people were not prepared to do. It is saying that when the war is over the immigrants should allowed to stay in Britain should they choose to because of the good work they done for us during the Second World War. Source C also agrees that immigrants had made a valuable contribution to Britain. It is saying that people such as Raghbir Singh had done Britain a huge favour by filling in job vacancies that were left after the war. It is saying that the immigrants are aiding the growth of Britain after the war. Source D is also agreeing with the statement. It is saying that both black and white workers are being treated badly by the government despite the hard work that they are doing. It is saying that both black and white workers are helping Britain regrow after the war but they are not getting any return from it.

On the other hand, Source B is disagreeing with the statement. It is saying that the immigrants were not helping Britain and instead they were making it harder for British people to get jobs. It also suggesting that immigrants coming to Britain is causing huge amounts of overcrowding and it is going ot get worse if they keep coming. Source E is showing that blacks were unable to contribute massively to Britain because employers were refusing to employ them because of the colour of their skin. This would mean blacks couldn’t do important jobs such as lawyers or bankers and were therefore unable to contribute massively to Britain.

Overall, the immigrants tried to contribute to Britain, however in some cases were unable to because of discrimination against them.
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