



---

A-level History 7042  
Guide to the source question on Component 2

V1.0

---

## **Introduction**

This Guide has been produced to show how the mark scheme for the Component 2 source question (Question 1), will be applied and to illustrate approaches to assessment to assist teachers in preparing students for the examination. Responses have been provided by schools and were written by students throughout the course of their studies, although not under timed examination conditions. Consequently, they are not intended to be viewed as 'model' answers, and in some cases are longer than could be reasonably expected in the one hour permitted in the exam. As such, the commentaries are based on the qualities demonstrated in the responses rather than their length. The generic mark scheme for the extract/ interpretation question is on the following page.

## **Assessment objectives and timing**

Question 1 on Component 2 targets A02: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

It is advised that students spend one hour answering this question.

## **Potential approaches**

In answering the source question (Question 1) on Component 2, students may choose to respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more holistic approach to common content and features of each source. This document contains examples that illustrate how both approaches are acceptable, though the recommended approach – as it is the most straightforward - is to evaluate each source in turn.

Unlike at AS, the source question does not require students to undertake a comparative assessment or evaluation, but to evaluate each source on its own merits as to how valuable the source is in relation to the question.

Regardless of which approach is adopted, students are expected to evaluate each of the three sources, considering, for example, the significance of the provenance, style and emphasis and the content of the sources to the question. Effective answers will combine secure knowledge of the historical context with careful assessment of the value of the sources (remembering that even sources that are judged 'inaccurate', for example, may still be valuable to a historian). The evaluation will be specific and focused and avoid generalised comments in relation, for example, to provenance or type of source. Evaluation must be focused on the question and general comments should be avoided.

## **Introductions/conclusions**

It is recognised that students like to, and are trained to, write introductions and conclusions, essential features when answering a 'traditional' essay question, as is found in Section B of the paper. Whilst neither is required in response to the source questions, we accept that students may wish to produce them. Such an approach will not be penalised by examiners – an answer with a conclusion which comments on some general issues associated with the interrogation of the sources might strengthen the answer. However, as shown in the examples below, very good answers without conclusions can be awarded full marks, and it may be most productive for students to begin the evaluation without an introduction. Substantiated judgement should, however, be provided in the evaluation of each source.

## Generic mark-scheme

*Target: AO2*

*Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.*

### Generic Mark Scheme for source based questions

<b>L5:</b>	Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.	<b>25-30</b>
<b>L4:</b>	Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context.	<b>19-24</b>
<b>L3:</b>	Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.	<b>13-18</b>
<b>L2:</b>	The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), <b>or</b> it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.	<b>7-12</b>
<b>L1:</b>	The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.	<b>1-6</b>
	Nothing worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>

## Level 5 responses

### Paper 2J (A-level) America: A Nation Divided, c1845-1877: Additional specimen question paper

#### Source A

Adapted from the *Seventh of March speech to the US Senate* (1850) by Daniel Webster, a leading Northern Senator. He gave this speech to the US Senate in favour of the Compromise.

Mr. President: I wish to speak today, not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a northern man, but as an American and a member of the Senate of the United States. It is fortunate that there is a Senate of the United States; a body not yet moved from its respectability, not lost to a just sense of its own dignity and its own high responsibilities and a body to which the country looks, with confidence, for wise, moderate, patriotic and healing counsels.

It is not to be denied that we live in the midst of strong agitations and are surrounded by very considerable dangers to our institutions and government. The imprisoned winds are let loose. The east, the north and the stormy south combine to throw the whole ocean into commotion, to toss its billows to the skies and disclose its profoundest depths. I do not affect to regard myself, as holding, or as fit to hold, the helm in this combat with the political elements.

#### Source B

Adapted from *The rise and fall of the Confederate Government volume one (of two)*, by Jefferson Davis, 1881.

While the compromise measures of 1850 were pending and the excitement concerning them was at its highest, I one day overtook Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, and Mr. Berrien, of Georgia, in the Capitol grounds. They were in earnest conversation. It was the 7th of March, the day on which Mr. Webster had delivered his great speech. Mr. Clay, addressing me in the friendly manner which he had always employed since I was a schoolboy, asked me what I thought of the speech. I liked it better than he did. He then suggested that I should "join the compromise men," saying that it was a measure which he thought would probably give peace to the country for thirty years. Then, turning to Mr. Berrien, he said, "You and I will be under ground before that time, but our young friend here may face trouble in the future." I somewhat impatiently declared my unwillingness to transfer to future generations a problem which they would be relatively less able to meet than we were.

**Source C**

Adapted from *The New York Herald*, September 8, 1850. The New York Herald was a Northern, popular and controversial newspaper.

Within the short space of two days, the House of Representatives has passed four of the most important measures connected with the slavery agitation, which grew out of the acquisition of new territory through the Mexican War. Leaving only the Fugitive Slave Bill and the bill for the abolition of slave traffic in the District of Columbia to be disposed of. The former was passed by the Senate and the latter being now under consideration in that body. The whole of this disagreeable subject will, therefore, be shortly wound up and a check put to the ultras and fanatics of different sections of the Union, who have exerted themselves to keep alive the slavery agitation and maintain an estrangement of feeling between the Northern and the Southern States. The subject, therefore, which has caused so much uneasiness to the friends of the Union everywhere, as well as to the admirers of our political institutions at home and abroad, is set at rest in a manner satisfactory to all.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the Compromise of 1850.

**[30 marks]**

**Student response**

Source A is a famous speech made by Daniel Webster in favour of the 1850 Compromise. The source is therefore useful to an historian as it highlights the arguments from a leading Northern Senator, which convinced many in the Senate to support the Compromise. Daniel Webster was a leading Northern Whig who would be able to broaden the appeal of the Compromise that had been proposed by the leading Southern Whig Henry Clay. This would be helpful to a historian as it shows that both Northern and Southern Whigs supported the Compromise. There was some surprise at Webster's support for the Compromise as he was seen as an opponent of slavery and the Compromise contained the controversial Fugitive Slave Act. Webster received a backlash in New England from abolitionists and has been accused of being inconsistent. The speech is therefore useful to historians as it shows that a leading figure was willing to put some of his beliefs to one side in order to find compromise over sectional issues. This highlights that the 1850 Compromise was a moment where leading political figures hoped that they could bring the USA together. The fact that Webster had his eye on high office most notably the Presidency is important when examining this extract. The speech could be seen as an attempt by Webster to gain support from Southern Whigs to bolster any future hopes he had for becoming President. The speech was made without much preparation and when Webster was suffering from ill health. All of this could be important to historians as it can be seen to show how close to failure the Compromise was. It could also however be used to suggest that Webster's speech was opportunist rather than showing a genuine desire for compromise.

The tone of Source A is designed to present Webster as a humble servant of the nation, he suggests he is not fit 'the helm' of the nation in the storm of the time. Historians may consider this to be false modesty or alternatively an indication of the severity of the crisis. He flatters the Senate 'a body the country looks, with confidence, for wise, moderate, patriotic and healing counsels'. This may help historians identify this as a speech aimed at persuading the Senate.

Webster stresses that he is speaking as 'an American' and Senator rather than a 'Massachusetts' or 'Northern' man showing that he is arguing that people needed to put aside sectional differences in favour of the national good. This is a good summary of the key argument for compromise and therefore useful to historians. There was real fear that sectionalism was becoming beyond control especially with talk of secession from the likes of Calhoun from the South. It was really important that Clay and Douglas who were driving the push for Compromise found voices that would support their position and Webster is clearly doing this in the extract.

Webster describes the potential threat to 'our institutions and government'. His argument would appeal to Senators given the uncertainty of what would happen if there was a failure to reach compromise. Many Senators feared the collapse of the existing system in which they held a key position. The fact that Webster is playing on these fears to promote compromise would be useful to historians as it shows the atmosphere in the Senate.

Webster states that he is willing to play his part in finding compromise but does not see himself as taking the lead in the move to compromise. This is useful as it shows Webster's willingness to back his potential rivals for high office in Clay and Douglas in order to achieve compromise.

Source B is from a book written by Jefferson Davis who was President of the Confederacy during the Civil War. It was published in 1881 so is looking back on the Compromise of 1850 with hindsight and the knowledge that ultimately compromise failed. Jefferson Davis is likely to have wanted to use his book to present himself and the decision to secede in a positive light and find others to blame for the Civil War. The extract will therefore be useful to historians giving them a good insight into a Confederate version of history. The usefulness of the extract may be seen as being limited by the fact that Davis is looking to publicly defend his own actions and so may distort what happened.

At the time of the 1850 Compromise Jefferson Davis was an up and coming figure in Southern politics. The key defender of Southern States rights at the time was Calhoun but he died not long after the Compromise, Davis was seen as potentially the man to take on his mantle. The extract is useful to historians in this respect as it gives the view of a politician who was at the start of his career rather than that of the likes of Clay, Webster or Calhoun who would not live long beyond the passing of the Compromise.

Davis' tone displays the level 'excitement' in March 1850 surrounding compromise and the fact that he did get caught up in this excitement. Many in the South in 1850 shared this feeling. They believed there was not enough in the Compromise for the South with many of the compromise points favouring the North.

Interesting Davis argues that Clay who proposed the Compromise 'liked' Webster's speech less than Davis did himself (as a strong supporter of slavery and the South). This is interesting to the historian as it suggests that there were divides between the big hitters in the Compromise group.

Davis makes a number of strong statements, firstly suggesting that he was asked to join the pro-compromise camp but declined showing attempts to woo Southern Senators by the compromise group. Davis argues that even Clay believed that 'our young friend here may face trouble in the future' suggesting that that the Union faced potential conflict in that the compromise had failed to prevent. This may be of limited use as it is possible that the author's hindsight that the Civil War happened is affecting his recollection of the events. Davis argues

that he never supported compromise and knew it would not succeed, though that this was the moment where genuine compromise should have been found as he 'impatiently declared my unwillingness to transfer to the future generations a problem which they would be less able to meet'. Here he seems to be transferring blame for the war from his generation to that of Clay and Webster.

Source C is from a newspaper report giving a popular positive view of the 1850 Compromise. The New York Herald is described as a controversial newspaper which suggests that it does not always agree with mainstream opinion in the North, particularly on slavery (it supported slavery, which was unusual for a Northern newspaper). Historians may therefore consider it limited in its usefulness to gather the opinion of the general population in the north. However it is important to consider that there were many in the north who were not hostile to slavery and welcomed the compromise. New York is arguably more likely to have some pro-Southern attitudes as a major port in which many jobs were reliant on the export of cotton.

The tone of the extract is highly positive with phrases such as 'most important measures' and 'a manner satisfactory to all'. Historians may consider that not all would share these sentiments but that many did. The language of the extract clearly demonstrates a strong dislike for those 'ultras and fanatics of different sections', this may well be referring to abolitionists. There was anger in the north about the Fugitive Slave Bill in particular in the north but this is not reflected in the emphasis of the extract, which limits its usefulness to a degree.

The extract highlights the gaining 'of territory through the Mexican war' as a cause of tension which was certainly true with the controversial Wilmot Proviso of 1846 and disagreement on the future of California which was settled by the 1850 Compromise along with agreements of the territory of New Mexico. Whilst this suggests the extract is useful and insightful the failure to mention any objections to the Fugitive slave Bill suggests otherwise. Many Americans did consider the whole debate over the extension of slavery and the sectional tension it caused a 'disagreeable subject' which is a useful point.

The end of the extract talks about the 'uneasiness to the friends of the Union everywhere' which was certainly the case and there was widespread relief when the Compromise passed especially in the north. The extract is calling for an end to 'agitation' and suggests that supporters of American political institutions 'home and abroad' would be relieved which was again true. The usefulness of this is however limited as there is no suggestion that there was still tension and that many were not happy with all aspects of the Compromise. Douglas had had to break the Compromise down into its constituent parts to get it through the Houses of Congress suggesting that many individual parts faced opposition in either the North (e.g. The Fugitive Slave Law) or South (e.g. California entering as a free state). The extract therefore is useful in giving an opinion from some in the North but not everyone.

### **Commentary – Level 5**

This is a full and effective answer which examines the significance of provenance, tone and argument in each source with appropriate deployment of knowledge of context, though it is worth noting that it is considerably longer than could be reasonably expected in the one hour permitted in the exam. It is very comprehensive in its assessment of Source A in particular and the assessment of Source C could be developed, but this is a Level 5 answer.

**Paper 2B (A-level) The Wars of the Roses, c1437-1487: Specimen question paper****Source A**

From an account by Domenico Mancini of the usurpation of the throne by Richard III. Mancini was an Italian who visited England in 1483–1485 and witnessed the usurpation of Richard III. It is unclear how Mancini acquired such detailed information.

In claiming the throne Richard was motivated not only by ambition but also by lust for power, for he also claimed that he was goaded by the ignoble family of the queen and the affronts of Edward's relatives by marriage. In 1478 the then Richard Duke of Gloucester was so overcome with grief for his brother's death that he was overheard to say he would one day get his revenge. From then on, he very rarely came to court, preferring to keep within his own lands and set out to acquire the loyalty of his people through favours and justice. All were afraid that if Richard then went on to take the throne and governed alone, that those who bore the blame for Clarence's death would suffer death or at least be ejected from their high estate. No sooner had the death of Edward IV become known, when Richard had established the attitude of everyone, and with the help of friends in the capital, Richard and the young King entered London with 500 soldiers. But, after Hastings was removed, all of the attendants that had waited on the King were denied access to him. The King and his brother were withdrawn into the inner apartments of the Tower and day by day began to be seen less, till at length they ceased to appear altogether.

**Source B**

From *The great chronicle of London*. The chronicle was written, shortly after the events described, by a London merchant.

The Sunday following the execution of Lord Hastings at Paul's Cross, and in the presence of the Lord Protector and the Duke of Buckingham, it was declared by the brother of the mayor that the children of King Edward were not the rightful inheritors of the Crown, and that King Edward was not the legitimate son of the Duke of York, as the Lord Protector was. By this declaration and many other reports and allegations, he then alleged that the Lord Protector was worthy to be king and no other. The following Tuesday, at the Guildhall and in the presence of a multitude of citizens, the Duke of Buckingham gave a speech in which he talked of the excellency of the lord protector and the rightful claim he had to the crown. The following Thursday the Lord Protector himself went to the Great Hall at Westminster where he was set in the king's seat and called before him all of the judges of the kingdom and demanded that they should administer his laws justly to which they all agreed. He then went to the Abbey where he prayed at the shrine. Following this a hasty arrangement was made for the new king's coronation.



**Source C**

From the *History of the English kings* written by John Rous, sometime in the early years of the reign of Henry VII. Rous was a churchman who had written very positive accounts of Richard III during his reign.

Richard of Gloucester imprisoned King Edward V, king indeed but not crowned, with his brother Richard, taken from Westminster under promise of safety, so that it was afterwards known to very few by what death they were martyred. Then he ascended to the throne of the dead princes, whose protector he had been, the tyrant King Richard who was in his mother's womb for two years and emerged with teeth and hair down to his shoulder. Like a scorpion he had a stinging tail. He received Edward V blandly, with embraces and kisses, yet within three months he had killed him and also his brother. And Lady Anne, his queen, daughter of the Earl of Warwick, he poisoned. And what was most detestable to God and to all Englishmen, indeed to all nations to whom it became known, he caused others to kill the holy man King Henry VI, or as many think, did so by his own hands. He was small of stature with a short face and unequal shoulders, the right higher and the left lower.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the usurpation of Richard III.

**[30 marks]**

**Student response**

Source A presents several arguments that are of value to an historian studying the usurpation of Richard III. Mancini was present in England at the time of Richard's usurpation and was therefore in a position to write about the events that happened in that year. He presents the view that one of Richard's motivations was his fear of the Woodville family. Indeed the tone presented is a rancorous one of mutual suspicion. Fear and anger are common themes in his account. The reference to his 'brother's death' refers to Richard's brother George, Duke of Clarence, was executed in 1478. Mancini suggested that Richard was 'overcome with grief' at this development. There is an argument that the Woodvilles, and especially the queen, Elizabeth Woodville, had played the leading role in arranging for this. Given that Clarence had challenged Edward IV's legitimacy as well as the legitimacy of his half-Woodville children this is quite plausible. In the context of 1483 it is reasonable, as the source contends, that Richard may have feared the power of the Woodville family. Edward IV had made his wife's family particularly powerful. Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers, had custody of the king's son and heir, the future Edward V. He ruled over Wales from Ludlow in the boy's name. Elizabeth Woodville's elder son from her first marriage, Thomas Grey, was the Marquess of Dorset and was very powerful in south-west England. Furthermore Edward IV had married Elizabeth's many sisters to the most powerful nobles in England. Source A also suggests that the Woodvilles 'were afraid' of what would happen to them if Richard seized the throne because of their treatment of Clarence. This fear would certainly account for their swift actions after Edward IV's unexpected death. The queen pushed for a rapid coronation in an attempt to limit Richard of Gloucester's power as protector so in this sense the source is valuable in explaining these actions. Furthermore, Mancini acknowledges that Richard was at least partially motivated by 'ambition' and 'lust for power' and given that he was replacing his nephew on the throne and that as Mancini acknowledges Edward IV's sons soon 'ceased to appear altogether' Richard would have needed both to take the actions that he did in 1483.

However, there are limitations to the value of Source A. There are real questions as to the reliability of Dominic Mancini. He was in England only for a relatively short period of time. He seems to have spoken no English and this would, undoubtedly, have made it difficult for him to gain a clear account of events. Furthermore, despite his reference to events before 1483, especially the death of Clarence in 1478, there is no evidence that he had any interaction with England before 1483 and the source for his assertions prior to this date are unknown. Mancini's reading of the Woodvilles may well have been influenced by the narrative that Richard presented after the usurpation rather than reflecting the real cause. There is little evidence for major antipathy between Richard and the Woodvilles. He had profited more than most by the death of his brother Clarence through the inheritance of former Neville lands. Anthony Woodville had also agreed to delay his entry into London with Edward V and meet Richard at Stony Stratford. If he had suspected that Richard meant him harm due to a longstanding grudge he surely would not have done so.

Source B is valuable with regard to the reasons given by Richard for the usurpation of 1483. The main arguments presented by the Great Chronicle of London are that the legitimacy of Edward IV's claim to the throne as well as the popularity of Richard of Gloucester were of major importance. The source is rather matter-of-fact and even in tone. It presents the events as they occurred in a measured manner. Given that the chronicle's purpose was to record events that occurred in London and that the key events of the usurpation happened in the city it has much of value to add to an historian's understanding of events. Furthermore, it was written shortly after the events described. This is important because it means that it was not influenced by Richard's death or later attempts of the Tudors to undermine his reputation. Source B claims that there was a direct challenge to the legitimacy of Edward IV. This is a reference to allegations that Edward was the offspring of an adulterous affair of his mother Cecily Neville. One possible alleged father was the archer known as Blaybourne. This rumour had previously surfaced after the king's unpopular marriage to Elizabeth Woodville in 1464 and Clarence is also said to have spread it before his own execution in 1478. The chronicle is valuable in this regard as it shows that this rumour was still in wide circulation even though most accounts of the usurpation claim that the main question was over Edward's children and not over the former king himself. In this context Richard is presented as somebody who took up the responsibility of kingship out of duty necessitated by the situation. Source B is also valuable for its depiction of the centrality of the Duke of Buckingham to the usurpation as it claims that he 'gave a speech' which talked of Richard's 'rightful claim'. Henry Stafford was a prince of the blood with a claim to descent from Edward III himself. His support was important to Richard and again reinforces the view that it was other people that wanted Richard to be king rather than it purely being his own ambition.

However, source B has some significant limitations that challenge its value. Firstly neither the identity of writer themselves nor the person who declared that Edward IV's children 'were not the rightful inheritors of the Crown' are clear. This does lead to questions as to its reliability. The chronicle is focused rather narrowly on London itself and therefore misses the importance of Richard's northern power. Neither opposition nor popular reactions are considered and only the reference to a 'hasty arrangement' for a coronation indicates any dissent.

Source C's principal value to the historian is in demonstrating the hostility that Richard's usurpation in 1483 stirred up. Rous portrays Richard as a villain. He is directly blamed for the secret murder of Edward V and his brother Richard when it claims that few knew 'by what death they were martyred' but that 'within three months he had killed him and his brother Richard' and

it directly asserts that Edward V was the rightful king. Richard's murder of his nephews is presented as especially vile in 'he ascended to the throne of the dead princes, whose protector he had been'. Richard is labelled as a 'tyrant' which relates to the impact of his usurpation on government during his reign. Richard's character is impugned in that the alleged certainty of his murderous acts during the usurpation are compared to his claimed previous involvement in the death of Henry VI and his future poisoning of Anne Neville, his wife and queen. The source also demonstrates that attempts were made to equate Richard's supposed physical deformities with deformities in his character. Although, Richard's deformity is clearly exaggerated recent archaeological evidence suggests that Richard did suffer from scoliosis and thus the source's portrayal cannot be entirely disregarded.

However, there are very many problems with the value of source C. John Rous was clearly unreliable. His account was written during the reign of Henry VII who had overthrown Richard III and his account was designed to contribute to Tudor propaganda that justified Henry's slaying of Richard. It is openly partisan, emotive and exaggerated in its tone. The fact that Rous had previously written positive accounts of Richard III during his reign only reiterates this point. There is no evidence to support the argument that Richard had any long term plans to usurp the throne and the reference to his alleged murder of Henry VI is especially misleading. If Richard had been involved in the former king's death in 1471 it was certainly on the orders of his brother Edward IV. There is also no evidence that Anne Neville was poisoned by Richard. Overall this source is useful only in presenting Tudor views of the usurpation rather than the events of the usurpation itself.

### Commentary – Level 5

This is an exemplary answer, though it is considerably longer than could be reasonably expected in the one hour permitted in the exam. It is particularly strong in that it offers a balanced assessment of each source, considering in each case how they are and are not valuable to an historian. Knowledge of context is carefully selected and deployed effectively. This careful and incisive answer is clearly a top Level 5 answer.

### Paper 2H (A-level) France in Revolution, 1774-1815: Specimen question paper

#### Source A

Adapted from *Declaration of the king addressed to all the French about his flight from Paris*, 21 June 1791. Louis XVI left behind this proclamation to be read to the people of France following his flight from Paris.

As long as the King could hope to see the kingdom's order and happiness restored by the means employed by the National Assembly, no personal sacrifice mattered to him. If this hope had been fulfilled, he would not even have complained about the loss of his liberty caused by the refusal to give him an absolute veto – an action which has made him totally powerless. But today, when the sole gain of so many sacrifices is to see the kingdom destroyed, all powers disregarded, all property violated, personal safety endangered everywhere, crimes unpunished, and complete anarchy establishing itself above the law, the King believes it his duty to place before the eyes of the French and of all the universe the picture of his conduct, and that of the government which has been established in the kingdom. Frenchmen, is it for this that you sent your representatives to the National Assembly?

**Source B**

Adapted from a petition sent by the Jacobin Club to the Legislative Assembly by Pétion, Mayor of Paris, 3 August 1792.

Enemy armies threaten our territory. Two foreign tyrants have issued a manifesto, as insolent as it is absurd, attacking the French nation. Murdering Frenchmen, led by the King's brothers, his relatives, his allies, are getting ready to tear open the heart of the Fatherland. Already, the enemy, on every front, lets loose his tormentors against our warriors.

The first link in this chain of counter-revolution is the leader of the executive Louis XVI is always invoking the Constitution; we, too, invoke it and we demand his removal.

Once this important step has been taken, we demand the election – for it is unlikely that the nation can trust its present royal-house – of solid and reliable ministers. Selected by the National Assembly but independent of it, bound by the constitution and its laws. Elected by the vote, loudly proclaimed, of free men, they will carry out the functions of the executive until such time – as soon as national security permits it – as the sovereign will of the people, shall be declared through a national convention.

**Source C**

Extract from the interrogation of Louis XVI at his trial, 11 December 1792.

**The President:** Louis, the French people accuse you of having committed a multitude of crimes to establish your tyranny by destroying its liberty. You have, on 20 June 1789, attacked the sovereignty of the people by suspending the assemblies and by expelling them while they were still sitting. The proof of this is in the report addressed to the Tennis Court at Versailles by the members of the Constituent Assembly. On 23 June you wished to dictate the Nation's laws, you surrounded its representatives by troops, you presented to them two royal declarations subversive to all freedom, and you ordered them to disperse. What have you to say in reply?

**Louis:** There exists no law to impeach me.

**The President.** You despatched an army against the citizens of Paris. Your followers shed the blood of several of them, and you did not remove this army until after the taking of the Bastille. What have you to say in reply?

**Louis:** I was the master empowered to despatch troops at that time.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the failure of constitutional monarchy.

**[30 marks]**

**Student response**

Source A is mostly very valuable regarding the failure of constitutional monarchy because it relates to one of the most important events leading to its fall: the Flight to Varennes in June 1791.

The source is valuable regarding its provenance. It is an extract from the proclamation Louis left behind in which he criticised the new constitutional arrangements as unworkable. As a personally written Proclamation - meant to be read when Louis was safely over the frontier - it is an accurate representation of Louis' personal opinion of the constitution. Louis, as 'King of the French', was the most significant individual within the constitutional monarchy and, as he is clearly very hostile to the proposed constitution, it is valuable in understanding its inherent instability and ultimate failure.

In the source Louis identifies many of his chief criticisms of developments since 1789. These include his sense of imprisonment ('loss of liberty') under the watch of radical Parisian sans-culottes since the 'October Days' in 1789. Similarly Louis' complains about the suspensive veto which he says leaves him powerless. On the other hand the source does not mention some of Louis' main criticisms relating to the nationalisation of Church land, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the loss of privilege by the First and Second Estates. Overall, however, the content is helpful because it helps us to understand Louis' own perception of the flaws in the constitution. Louis' hostility, however, is not objective. Louis was clearly hostile to the constitution and his Proclamation represents this opinion rather than any inherent flaws. Overall, therefore the content's value relates to Louis perception and the consequent likelihood of the constitution working rather than his precise criticisms.

The source is also valuable because it is clear that Louis is seeking to reach over the heads of the Assembly to what Louis considers to be the moderate majority of Frenchmen. He uses emotive phrases such as 'powerless' and 'the kingdom destroyed' and identifies the revolution as bringing anarchy – such as the attack on the Bastille, the Great Fear and October Days – as well as 'all property violated' through the August Decrees and the nationalisation of church lands. Louis clearly believed that millions of Frenchmen shared his belief that the revolution was dangerous and that radical revolutionaries were unrepresentative. In this way Louis was clearly seeking to attract popular support leading to a renegotiation of the Constitution. In some ways this is valuable because it suggests a gulf between Louis' perception of developments and reality. Bourgeois opinion was still generally positive about developments since 1789 while sans-culotte opinion in Paris, stirred by Marat and the Political Clubs, was already increasingly hostile. On the other hand Louis was not completely out of touch with, for example, Catholic opinion which shared his distaste for the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. While the source does, to some extent, suggest that Louis was out-of-touch this is not completely true. Significantly, however, the most hostile elements in France held most power through the Assembly and the clubs and streets of Paris and Louis' failure to understand the reality of power as shown by the source helps to explain the failure of the constitutional monarchy.

Overall, the source is very valuable because the Flight had such a negative impact on the constitutional monarchy. It was one of the most significant events in the downfall of the

monarchy: Louis' flight was represented by radicals in the Jacobin and Cordeliers Clubs – as well as Marat in *L'Ami du Peuple* – as treason and the event, which led to demonstrations culminating in the Massacre of the Champs de Mars, was a negative turning point regarding Louis' popularity. Louis' perception of opinion and own condemnation of the revolution and its constitutional arrangements made it hard to see how he could have continued as king without tremendous difficulties especially in the context of radicalised Parisian opinion. This more than Louis' precise criticisms of the constitution make the source so valuable.

Source B is also valuable regarding the fall of the constitutional monarchy because it shows the hostility of radicals and sans-culottes towards Louis in the period just before the attack on the Tuileries on 10 August.

The content is particularly valuable because it identifies many of the major concerns of the Jacobin Club and their sans-culotte associates. Firstly, it refers to the impact of war on France and the feelings of fear and betrayal that French defeats had brought. Revolutionaries explained the early defeats with reference to emigre traitors - 'murdering Frenchmen' - and the so-called 'Austrian Committee' which was believed to be helping France's enemies. Louis' use of the suspensive power to veto laws against emigres and refractory priests - who were considered counter-revolutionaries - was seen as a betrayal and incompatible with Louis' role as king. This sense of royal betrayal was exacerbated by the Brunswick Manifesto where Paris was threatened with exemplary punishment if Louis were threatened: Louis was believed guilty of treason because he was supported by France's enemies. Finally the content is useful in explaining the failure of constitutional monarchy because it suggests the growing gap between the Jacobins and their sans-culotte allies and moderate opinion in the Assembly and the provinces. The extract, for example, extols Rousseau's 'sovereign will of the people' and demands new elections to a Convention in which passive as well as active citizens would vote. On the other hand the content does not directly identify another reason for the fall of the constitutional monarchy: that it had become central to the power-struggle between Jacobins and moderates including, by July 1792, Girondins, who belatedly wished to secure the monarchy to stop the slide towards Jacobin and sans-culotte rule. The source, inevitably focusses on the perceived wrongs of the monarchy rather than the Jacobins' political ambitions. Finally, again demonstrating its lack of objectivity, the extract glosses over the fact that Louis had a constitutional right to exercise his veto and the attack of 'invoking the constitution' suggests that by this stage radical revolutionaries considered it a nuisance. In that context, however, constitutional monarchy could have little future.

In some ways the provenance of the source has limitations in that it does not represent the opinion of the majority of the deputies elected to the Legislative Assembly in 1791. Conservative Catholic opinion as well as the Feuillants and, by this stage, even the Girondins, wished to maintain the constitutional monarchy. On the other hand, however, its provenance is clearly valuable because it is an extract from the Petition sent to the Assembly by 47 of the 48 Paris Sections on 3 August which called for a republic. The Petition represents the opinion of the elements which caused Louis' overthrow on 10 August: the Jacobins and the sans-culottes in the Paris Sections. It was essentially their action which toppled the monarchy so their rationale is clearly valuable. The tone of the source clearly demonstrates the anger against Louis felt by sans-culottes and Jacobins. The purpose of the source is also valuable. It clearly aims to persuade its readers that France should become a republic but, though it was presented to the Assembly, it was more designed to persuade sans-culottes to take action than deputies to become republicans.

Ultimately the source is valuable because it represents the opinions and methods of the most powerful voices in France. Whereas conservative opinion was stronger outside Paris and moderates in the Assembly had escaped to the provinces, Parisian radical and sans-culotte opinion had grown even more powerful due to the war, the economy and the impact of the political clubs. Overall, therefore, the source is valuable because it represents these groups and links with the events a week later in which the constitutional monarchy was toppled.

The final source is also valuable in some ways regarding the failure of the constitutional monarchy.

There is value in its content because it shows the continuing resentment of revolutionaries against Louis going back to 1789 (if not before). The President refers to a number of events in the summer of 1789 including the declaration of a National Assembly, the lock-out on 20 June which led to the Tennis Court Oath and the Séance Royale on 23 June where Louis rejected the National Assembly and its demands. Finally the President refers to the troop build-up which was believed – probably rightly – to be precursor to the dissolution of the Estates-General and the imposition of military rule. In all of these events Louis was seen as obstructing the course of the revolution and, therefore, they became some of the many charges at his trial. On the other hand there are limitations regarding the value of this content in explaining the failure of the constitutional monarchy because over the next two or so years the Constituent Assembly led an optimistic consensus that such events could be put behind them. At times Louis was genuinely popular, for example at the Fête de la Fédération in 1790 where Louis swore loyalty to the constitution and last, perhaps, when he declared war on Austria in April 1791.

The source is also useful because it demonstrates the gulf that had developed between Louis and ‘the people’ – as represented in the Convention – by the time of his trial. In the extract Louis’ actions in mid-1789 are stated to be tyrannical and all his actions from that date are stated as being harmful to liberty. Revolutionaries also had in mind subsequent events including Louis’ opposition to the August Decrees, his hostility to the Civil Constitution, his vetoes and his purported responsibility for the bloodshed at the Tuileries on 10 August.

Louis’ response is that the trial is contrary to the 1791 constitution which safeguarded him as head of state and also that he cannot be guilty of offences when he had established powers at the time (such as the build-up of troops in July 1789). These responses not only demonstrate the gulf between Louis and the Convention by December 1792 but also show how far France’s representatives had come in that they reject the constitutional protection afforded to Louis in the 1791 constitution.

Regarding the provenance the source is clearly useful in demonstrating the changes brought against Louis and his response and the anger felt by his opponents by late 1792. The tone of the accusations is very hostile and loaded phrases such as ‘tyranny’, ‘destroying its liberty’, ‘attacked the sovereignty of the people’, ‘subversive to all freedom’, ‘shed the blood’ of Parisians demonstrate the impossibility of Louis having any role in government. On the other hand, by this time Louis had been suspended as monarch and republic declared so it is more reliable as evidence for the radical opinion in the Convention at that time and how republicans justified their actions than evidence for the failure of the monarchy.

Overall the sources are useful in explaining the failure of the constitutional monarchy. Source A demonstrates how Louis himself was hostile to its restrictions which made it inherently unstable while the events of Source A, the Flight to Varennes, had a massive negative impact on the sort

of opinions represented in sources B and C. In some ways a limitation of the sources is that they do not represent moderate opinion but overall this is not so much a limitation as a reflection of reality. Between source A in 1791 and source C 1793 France became bitterly polarised and moderate constitutional opinion represented by the Feuillants and even the Girondins diminished in support and influence as radical republicanism and the sans-culottes' strength grew. The hostility of these latter groups are crucial to understand the failure of the constitutional monarchy meaning that the sources are all valuable.

### **Commentary – Level 5**

This is an excellent answer, though it is considerably longer than could be reasonably expected in the one hour permitted in the exam. It is controlled, relevant and consistently evaluative and accurately and appropriately deploys knowledge of context to consider provenance, tone and content of each source. Answers need not be 'perfect' to be awarded top marks and this answer is clearly in the category of a very strong Level 5 mark.

### **Level 4 responses**

### **Paper 2T (A-level) The Crisis of Communism: The USSR and the Soviet Empire, 1953-2000: Specimen Question Paper**

#### **Source A**

Adapted from an article by Mikhail Gorbachev, printed in *Izvestiya* in January 1987. *Izvestiya* was a daily paper published by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and was used to educate the people on Soviet government policies.

To put an end to all the rumours and speculations that abound in the West about socialism, I would like to point out once again that we are conducting all our reforms in accordance with the socialist choice. We are looking within socialism, rather than outside it, for the answers to all the questions that arise. We assess our successes and errors alike by socialist standards. Those who hope that we shall move away from the socialist path will be greatly disappointed. Every part of our programme of perestroika – is fully based on the principle of more socialism and more democracy. We are saying this honestly, without trying to fool our own people or the world. Any hopes that we will begin to build a different, non-socialist society and go over to the other camp are unrealistic and futile. It's my conviction that the human race has entered a stage where we are all dependent on each other. That's what our communist vocabulary calls internationalism and it means promoting universal human values.



### Source B

Adapted from a speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, 28 June 1988 at the opening of the Soviet Party Conference.

Comrade delegates, the basic question facing us is how to further the perestroika (revolutionary restructuring) launched in our country on the initiative and under the leadership of the Party and make it irreversible. That calls for radical solutions and vigorous and imaginative action. Representation of working people in the top layer of government should be extended considerably. The new deputies, elected for a five year term, would comprise a new representative supreme government body – the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies. The economy is gradually gaining pace, but for how long are we to revolve around the vicious circle of outdated notions and formulas, such as production for the sake of production and following the plan for the sake of following the plan? Perestroika has brought the question of people's political rights into sharp focus. We have no right to permit perestroika to flounder.

### Source C

Adapted from, *Gorbachev and glasnost – a new social order?* by Thomas M Magstadt. This was published in the US Journal, *Policy Analysis* in March 1989. Magstadt was chairman of the political science department at Kearney State College, USA.

Gorbachev is no doubt sincere about economic restructuring and reform, because without these, the Soviet Union faces a period of decline. Glasnost (openness) is the price Gorbachev must pay to get Soviet workers behind perestroika (which entails risks and sacrifices, especially in the short run). Democratization has been superficial up to this point, although some signs, such as the occasional dissenting votes cast in the Supreme Soviet, hint at new possibilities. The elections scheduled for 1989 will reveal whether Gorbachev is at all serious about creating a more democratic society. Meanwhile, without political restructuring which means democratization, glasnost could end as abruptly as it began.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these sources to an historian studying Gorbachev's reforms within the USSR.

**[30 marks]**

### Student response

With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these sources to an historian studying Gorbachev's reforms within the USSR

Source A is of value to a historian studying Gorbachev's reforms within the USSR as it comes from Gorbachev himself. Not only this, it was also printed in 1987 at the time when he was beginning his reform programme (having come to power in 1985) and is published in a prestigious party newspaper, *Izvestia*. The fact that it is a published source could limit the honesty of Gorbachev's words (despite the comment that 'we are saying this honestly'), since it would be trying to convince its audience, which would be the population of the Soviet Union who, because of censorship, would have little choice but to read official party papers. It would also need to be written in a way not to offend other party members and with a view to political advantage.

However, for a first hand account of the situation at a crucial time of change in the USSR, its value would be hard to match.

The tone adopted in the source is defensive. Gorbachev wants to 'put an end to rumours and speculations' and this would corroborate what is known of the turmoil created by Gorbachev's ideas of 'Glasnost' -allowing discussion and criticism and 'perestroika' -seeking reconstruction of the state and its economy. It is also argumentative but intended to be reassuring to the party faithful, as in 'those who hope that we shall move away from our socialist path will be greatly disappointed'. Gorbachev is clear and assertive about what communism stands for and the future -as in 'it's my conviction that the human race.....' and 'it means promoting universal human values'. The overall emphasis here is on the maintenance of communism -generally referred to as 'socialism' and this is stressed to combat all suggestions, such as spreading in the West, to the contrary.

The content of the source is valuable for the historian in appreciating the context in which Gorbachev was trying to carry through change and in understanding his own convictions. He sees communism as fully compatible with 'more democracy' and 'promoting human values' (which would be contrary to western ideas) and, perhaps naively thinks that it is possible to carry through a programme of perestroika and establish such principles 'within socialism'. In view of the break-up of the USSR in 1991 - just 4 years later, a historian can assess how Gorbachev proved unable to handle his own reforms and actually failed in his declared ambitions. This, however, is to take his words at face-value. If they were merely meant to lull the fears of his opponents, then they would be subject to a rather different interpretation. This could only be assessed through the study of further source material.

Source B also comes directly from Gorbachev and has consequent value as a speech from the Soviet leader whose reforms are being studied. Since it was given at the opening of the Soviet party Conference, however, it is likely to have been much influenced by the need to both reassure and convince the audience of important party members, which must have included those with traditionalist views - whose attention may have been jolted by the reference to 'outdated notions and formulas'. The date, in the middle of 1988 helps the historian to see how far Gorbachev's confidence and ideas have progressed since 1987 (represented by Source A) and, coming 3 years before the collapse of the USSR it shows just how much change perestroika was bringing at this stage.

The tone is confident and determined. Gorbachev is not afraid to speak out and challenge his audience. He talks of 'radical solutions' and 'vigorous and imaginative action'. Past practices are described as a 'vicious circle' and he ends with a direct call to action -'we have no right to permit perestroika to flounder'. The emphasis in this speech is on action to bring about the type of reforms Gorbachev believes in. He is both exhorting his comrades to support him and making veiled threats about the future if they do not. As such it conveys the mood of the leader at the time very clearly.

The historian would learn from this source of Gorbachev's commitment to more democracy within the USSR -through the representation of workers in the highest level of government. He sees this as essential to enable economic restructuring to take place. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of these words. Gorbachev failed to take his party with him in his economic reforms and knew the only way to bring about change from the centralised planned economy was to get the workers on-side in central government.

Source C is rather different from the previous two sources in that this is an outsider's view. Whilst it is clearly the work of an 'expert' (Chair of the political science department at Kearney State College USA) who would, no doubt, have gone to some lengths to examine what was happening in the USSR under Gorbachev, it is not of the same direct value as the words of Gorbachev himself.

No doubt Magstadt wrote to inform the American public -and it is likely, most particularly aimed his work at US academics and the American government, all of whom, at the end of 40 years of 'Cold War' were most concerned about developments in the USSR. However, this is in itself a limitation. The American writer and audience have learnt to be distrustful of the USSR -as seen in 'democratisation has been superficial up to this point' and the reference to 'whether Gorbachev is serious'. This is therefore not a truly balanced account.

The tone of the source is guarded when it comes to an assessment of Gorbachev's reforms. Whilst the author is prepared to admit 'Gorbachev is no doubt sincere', it is also sceptical about his ability to achieve change and, rather gloomily suggests 'glasnost could end as abruptly as it began'. The author has his own opinions and is prepared to state them quite unconditionally, as in 'Gorbachev must get the Soviet workers behind perestroika'. As an American academic he is in no doubt as to the value of democracy but the overall emphasis of the source is on the difficulties still ahead if Gorbachev is to effect his reform programme and there is an underlying feeling that this might well all prove too much.

In terms of the content, the source provides the historian with additional evidence of the failure of democratisation and perestroika before the 1989 elections, although it does offer a glimmer of hope in mentioning that 'occasional dissenting voices' have been cast in the Supreme Soviet. The source would be of particular value when compared with the picture post-elections, which would indeed confirm Gorbachev's commitment and 'honesty' although it offers limited material for an 'understanding of Gorbachev's reforms' as such.

#### **Commentary - Level 4**

The answer is very strong in its assessment of the provenance and tone of each source and how these link to the value of the sources. Comments are generally perceptive and thoughtful. It is much less convincing an answer when assessing the content of each source and how this affects value and there is limited deployment of contextual knowledge to challenge or corroborate the content. It is, then, an unbalanced answer, strong in two areas but lacking in the third which limits the response to Level 4. It is also worth noting that it is longer than could be reasonably expected in the one hour permitted in the exam.

**Paper 2A (A-level) Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154-1216: Specimen question paper****Source A**

From William FitzStephen's account of the beginning of the dispute between Henry II and Thomas Becket, 1162–1163. FitzStephen was a clerk in Becket's household and, later, one of Henry II's sheriffs.

It was Satan and the traps he laid that encouraged hatred towards Thomas, taking away the King's goodwill. The King now thought it a personal insult that the man whom he had raised to office should resign the chancellorship and oppose him on so many things. The nobles, seeking royal favour, slandered the Archbishop without cause, while many bishops, fearing to lose their wealth, failed to give him counsel and help. The King was angered by the Archbishop's attempt to recover the lands of Tonbridge, formerly belonging to Canterbury but now held by Roger of Clare. Almost all the English nobility were related to this earl and the King had been in love with his sister. Also, the Archbishop appointed his clerk, Laurence, to the church at Eynsford, but the lord there objected and expelled him and was excommunicated by the Archbishop. The King demanded that he be absolved, but Thomas replied that the King had no right to order this. The King argued that it was part of his royal prerogative that none of his tenants in chief should be excommunicated without his permission.

**Source B**

Herbert of Bosham's eyewitness account of the Council of Westminster, October 1163. Herbert of Bosham was a member of Becket's household and subsequently went into exile with Becket.

The King demanded that clerks convicted of major crimes should be deprived of benefit of clergy and handed over to his officers to suffer more severe penalties than those inflicted by the Church. This procedure, he said, was sanctioned by Canon law, which stated that such clerks should 'be handed over to the court' for punishment which he interpreted as being the royal justice. The Archbishop made a convincing argument for the privileges of the clergy, asking the King not to introduce a new procedure that was against the law of God. The King would not take this into account. As the royal customs had been observed by the prelates in the time of his grandfather, so he would not give them up and demanded that those present should, without qualification, promise to observe them now. The Archbishop replied that their oaths of fealty covered only earthly things and that this was a different matter. The next day, the King demanded the surrender of the castles and lands, which the Archbishop had held as chancellor.

**Source C**

From an account by Roger of Pontigny, written in 1176, of the discussion following the Council of Westminster, October 1163. Roger was a monk at the monastery in which Becket took refuge in France.

The King summoned the Archbishop to see if he could force him to submit. When they were alone he said: "I raised you from nothing to the height of honour and rank and even put your interests before my own. How is it that the benefits and proofs of my love for you have been so easily forgotten? Why are you so ungrateful and determined to oppose me on everything?"

The Archbishop replied: "It is God who has given me these things through you and I do not act against your will unless it opposes the will of God. You are my liege lord but St Peter wrote that we should obey God rather than man."

The King replied: "He died for his lord."

The Archbishop answered: "And I will die for my Lord when the time comes. Nevertheless, I am willing to obey you, saving my order."

The King vehemently insisted that he should omit this phrase, but the Archbishop stubbornly persisted in his opinion and so they parted.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas Becket.

**[30 marks]**

**Student response**

All three sources are valuable to an historian studying the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas Becket, but source B has the greatest value. This is because it is the most accurate of the three sources, while also having the most balanced tone, with the least focus on God or Satan's influence on the quarrel.

All of the sources have strengths and limitations of provenance. Source A is a hagiography and therefore its purpose is not to give the reader an accurate account of events, but to emphasise the saintly aspects of Becket's character in order to impart moral messages to the reader. This can be seen clearly in the suggestion that "It was Satan and the traps he laid that encouraged hatred towards Thomas". Because of this, any claims made by the source are called into doubt as an historian could not know whether they were true or invented to give a moral teaching without checking to see if they are corroborated by other sources. This reduces the value of the source to an historian studying the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas Becket. Source C also has hagiographical features: most notably the suggestion that Becket had foreseen that he would die in defence of his cause ("And I will die for my Lord when the time comes"). As the author of the source, was not present at the Council of Westminster, and wrote the source thirteen years after it, he could not have known this was said, and any second-hand information that might have led him to believe it was said is also unlikely to be accurate, due to the passage of time diminishing the reliability of the memories of those who were present at the Council of Westminster. Therefore, the most likely explanation is that Becket did not say this, and Roger of Pontigny invented it in order to make Becket appear more saintly. As with source A, this willingness to include untruths lessens the value of the source to an historian studying the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas Becket. This also means both sources take a religious tone, focusing on Satan and God, and how the two influenced events.

This is to be expected, as both sources were written by monks, and does not cause the value of the two sources to be lessened greatly, as it is possible to read around the religious imagery. Both sources also were written by men who knew Thomas. Although it is uncertain how close they might have been to him, both had at least met him, and would therefore have had some knowledge of his character. However, while source C was written by a monk at the monastery which gave refuge to Thomas, and therefore may have some bias towards him, source A was written by a man who worked for both Becket and Henry II. This would suggest that the source should have a level of impartiality, or that if there is any bias it is warranted, because the author had experience of both men. Source A, therefore, would have more value to an historian studying the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas Becket from this perspective.

With regard to content, all sources have strengths and weaknesses as evidence for an historian studying the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas Becket. Source C is primarily made up of dialogue between The King and the Archbishop. If accurate, this dialogue would give an historian an image of how the two men interacted, making it valuable to an historian studying the quarrel between the two men. The source claims Thomas said he was willing to obey the King, "saving my order". Other accounts of the Council of Westminster tell us that all save one of the Bishops present offered to obey the king, saving their order, indicating that although the exact words the source claims were spoken are unlikely to be accurate (for reasons due to provenance, discussed earlier), the general meaning of the dialogue is based in fact. Therefore, this increases the value of the source to an historian studying the quarrel between the King and the Archbishop. However, because the valuable information that can be taken from the source has to be interpreted from the invented dialogue, and is not outrightly stated by the author, the value of the source is decreased. Its range is also limited: it has little value to an historian studying how the personalities of the two men might have influenced the quarrel, because it is made mostly of invented dialogue; it has little value to an historian studying the cause of the quarrel or its development, because it does not mention the issue of criminous clerks, or any action taken by the King or the Archbishop; its value mainly comes from the mention of the phrase "saving my order". Source A begins by suggesting that Satan was the cause of the quarrel between the two men, which is a suggestion of little value to an historian studying the quarrel. However, it then goes on to suggest other reasons for the quarrel, such as the king taking Becket's resignation as Chancellor as a personal insult. The source also describes a number of events that occurred during the course of the dispute, such as Becket excommunicating the lord of Eynsford. While it is true that Becket made a number of excommunications which angered the king and nobility, and the reasons that the source gives for the quarrel between the two men, it fails to mention both the Council of Westminster, and the issue of criminous clerks, which were the root of the quarrel. Therefore, this lack of range greatly reduces the value of the source to an historian studying the quarrel. Source B, like Source C, describes the Council of Westminster. Unlike both other sources, it mentions that the Council was called to resolve the issue of whether state or Church would have that right to inflict penalties on "clerks convicted of major crimes." It also discusses the implications of Canon law on this, and describes briefly Becket's response to the King's demands. The source is accurate in its claim that the king would not take Becket's request to not introduce a new procedure into account, as the king demanded that the Bishops present promise to observe the new procedures. The source, therefore, gives an accurate summary of the cause of the quarrel. It does not discuss any later part of the quarrel, which limits its value to an historian studying the quarrel, but it is important for any historian studying the quarrel to have an understanding of its cause, increasing the value of the source.

To summarise, Source A is limited by its failure to mention the Council of Westminster, despite its strength in provenance due to being written by a man who had worked for both men, and Source C is limited by its lack of range and hagiographical tendencies. Source B has the greatest value as it gives an accurate description of the cause of the quarrel with a balanced tone.

#### **Commentary – Level 4**

It is important to stress that this exercise does not require comparative evaluation and whilst students may wish to offer an opinion as to which source is the most valuable, this is not required. The answer does seek to evaluate the significance of provenance, tone and content on each source when assessing the value to an historian. Comment is often linked to knowledge of context, although this could be developed further. Reference to what is omitted in each source is supported by contextual knowledge. A problem with the response is that the judgements on A and C especially may be seen as somewhat exaggerated or even misunderstood, but it is an effective attempt overall. This is a low Level 4 response.

#### **Paper 2P (A-level) The Transformation of China: Additional specimen question paper**

##### **Source A**

From *The United States position on China*, 5th August 1949.

Dean Acheson was US Secretary of State and had been asked to produce a paper explaining the US failure to prevent the spread of communism in Eastern Asia, despite US funding to the GMD.

The reasons for the failures of the Chinese National Government do not stem from any inadequacy of American aid. Our military observers on the spot have reported that the Nationalist armies did not lose a single battle during the crucial year of 1948 through lack of arms or ammunition. The fact was that the decay which our observers had detected in Chungking early in the war had fatally sapped the powers of resistance of the Guomindang. Its leaders had proved incapable of meeting the crisis confronting them, its troops had lost the will to fight and its government had lost popular support. The Communists, on the other hand, through a ruthless discipline and fanatical zeal, attempted to sell themselves as guardians and liberators of the people. The Nationalist armies did not have to be defeated; they disintegrated. History has proved again and again that a regime without faith in itself and an army without morale cannot survive the test of battle.

**Source B**

The causes of the victory of the Chinese Communist Party over Jiang Jieshi and the CCP's perspectives.

This was a report on the Chinese Situation to the Third World Congress of the Fourth International, 1951. The Fourth International is the international communist organisation.

Jiang's government was extremely afraid of and hostile to the people. It oppressed and sustained itself on the exploitation of the masses by the most barbaric methods. If the CCP had called upon the workers in the cities to rise in rebellion and overthrow the regime, it would have been as easy as knocking down rotten wood. But Mao merely gave orders to the people to quietly wait for their liberation by the PLA. At the same time, since by its very nature Jiang's regime represented the bourgeoisie, Jiang's regime could only support itself with the imperialist powers. However, the U.S. was compelled to abandon its aid to Jiang's government and adopt a wait-and-see attitude toward the CCP, pending a more favourable opportunity to assert its influence. This final decision by American imperialism came as a death-blow to Jiang's regime, which was expressed in the atmosphere of dejection and despair hovering around Jiang's group when the news reached China of Truman's victory in the 1948 election and his refusal of aid to Jiang.

**Source C**

A speech given by Jiang Jieshi to his party, June 1947.

Regardless of what aspect we discuss, we hold an absolute superiority; in terms of the troops' equipment, battle techniques and experience, the Communists are not our equal. We are also ten times richer than the communist army in terms of military-supply replacements, such as food, fodder and ammunition. With regard to material, we have very good equipment and excellent weapons; one could say that we possess all the conditions necessary for victory. But most of our officers don't use their brains and are unwilling to study. Regardless of what problem, they are invariably careless and do not seek a thorough understanding. In administration, they are even more superficial and do not attempt to be thorough. Now, the brains of most of our soldiers are actually asleep. It is only because everything in China is backward and there is a shortage of talent that the officers, with limited abilities, bear such heavy responsibilities.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons for the defeat of the Nationalists in the Chinese Civil War.

**[30 marks]**



**Student response**

In 1949, the Chinese Civil War came to end with the defeat of the Nationalists and the triumph of the Communists under Mao Zedong. Sources A, B and C give different reasons to explain this result; however, none of them are completely valuable to the historian.

Source A and B both point to the inadequacies of the GMD to explain why the nationalists lost the civil war. However, they are very different in tone and emphasis. Source A is a report by Dean Acheson on the reasons for the GMD failures. As Dean Acheson is Secretary of State, at the heart of foreign affairs, and as this is a government report, it has value for giving us the US perception of the situation in China at this time. However, it is also clear that Dean Acheson is having to defend the US's position in having abandoned aid to the GMD when it was on the point of defeat; given the US's concern about communism in 1949 following the events in Europe where Stalin had exerted control over eastern Europe, and given the US's policy of containment following the Truman Doctrine, this is a serious matter. Thus Acheson is very quick to stress that there was no 'inadequacy of American aid' and to stress the 'decay' of the GMD. The language is very strong in its condemnation of the 'inadequacy' of the GMD and Acheson uses such as expressions as 'fatally sapped the powers of resistance...its leaders proved incapable...'. Conversely he stresses that the Communists had 'ruthless discipline and fanatical zeal'. He does not show any admiration for the Communists as this would clearly be unacceptable given the anti Communist feelings within US; however he makes it clear that the Communists and not the GMD came across as 'the guardians and liberators of the people'. Acheson even brings in lessons of history to support his case that the collapse of the GMD was inevitable and that the US could have done nothing to stop it. However, while the defensive tone makes one question the value of this source, it is true that the GMD were indeed inadequate and that their leaders had been corrupt, and that the CCP under Mao had carried out a ruthless policy of indoctrinating peasants wherever they had control. In addition, the US aid had been substantial amounting to \$3 billion dollars; the US had also supplied weapons and helped transport Nationalist troops to the north of China at the end of the war. The value of this source is perhaps greatest in the fact that Acheson is still prepared in 1949 to say that the Communist victory was inevitable; once McCarthyism took hold in the US, this idea became unacceptable and indeed, Acheson would end up changing his assessment of the situation.

Source B also blames the inadequacies of the GMD. However, as this is a report by the CCP to the Fourth International, it is even more damning of the GMD and also of America as 'an imperialist power'. As its purpose is to glorify Communism and reinforce the success of the CCP, it stresses Mao's superior tactics and the imperialistic nature of American tactics. This means that its value is limited as an accurate picture of what happened; the language is full of Communist terminology and exaggerated language: 'death blow', 'atmosphere of dejection and despair' for example. The facts given in the source also do not stand up to the evidence in places. For example, to say that 'Jiang's regime represented the bourgeoisie' is very generalized; in fact much of the GMD's middle class support had evaporated away by 1945 and the support of the GMD depended for its survival on wealthy businessmen and landlords and the secret police in removing political opposition. In other areas the assertions are very generalized and lack evidence. For example it is true that GMD used 'barbaric methods', for instance their reprisal tactics on peasants, who had accepted the CCP and land reform when they regained villages, but there is no detail to develop this. This source has value for showing the communist interpretation of what happened in China, but lacks value to the historian for showing the actual reasons for the defeat of the nationalists, despite the fact that the date of 1951 should have allowed a clearer evaluation of what had happened.

Source C contrasts greatly to Sources A and B. While both A and B focus on the failures of the political leadership of the GMD, Source C focuses on the failure of the leadership of the army. This can be explained by the fact that it is a speech by Jiang Jieshi himself in 1947. At this point the GMD was starting to suffer defeats with the CCP launching full-scale assaults on GMD positions, and Jiang is looking blame failures on the leadership of the army who he sees as 'careless' and uneducated. He points out all of the advantages of the GMD such as superiority of troops, food and weapons. As a motivating speech to his party, it was necessary to highlight the strengths of the GMD and the tone is confident and assertive in an attempt to raise morale, but in fact by this stage in the civil war, much of these boasts were unfounded; the government was in debt and GMD controlled areas suffered high inflation.

In conclusion, all three sources are problematic in terms of their value to a historian as all are motivated by a need to justify a particular position. Source A probably has most value as, despite the need to justify the reasons for the CCP victory, the explanation of the CCP victory is mainly accurate. Conversely Sources B and C are generalised, and in places inaccurate, in terms of explaining the reasons for the GMD defeat.

#### **Commentary – Level 4**

The answer provides an effective assessment of the value of Sources A and B, commenting appropriately and fully on provenance, tone and content in each case with effective deployment of knowledge of context. Occasionally, conclusions as to value, linked to the comments made, could be more explicit. The assessment of Source C is less developed and effective and does not fully seem to appreciate the significance and purpose of the criticisms made by Jiang. It needs to be noted, also, that as this is not a comparative exercise, the conclusion is unnecessary. It is a good Level 4 answer.

#### **Level 3 responses**

#### **Paper 2F (A-level) The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643-1715: Specimen question paper**

##### **Source A**

An extract from the 'memoires' of Primi Visconti, an Italian guest at the French court 1673– 1683. This extract refers to 1673.

The King does what he can to demonstrate that he is not at all dominated by his ministers, and no prince was ever less dominated. He wants to know everything. In addition, his life is much regulated. He always gets up at eight o'clock, stays in his council meeting from ten to half past noon, when he always goes to Mass. Thanks to this intense desire to preside over all affairs of government, he has become a skilful ruler. In addition, the King has destroyed the chieftains and their factions and abolished the practice of patronage. The least positions at court and in the kingdom are now at his disposal. There are no intermediaries. If you want something, you have to go directly to him and not to anybody else. The King wants his ministers to bring all requests before the council because he wants the government to function in perfect harmony. The King has an extraordinary memory and he expects that every appeal, no matter what it is, will be reported to him so that he can issue a pardon or do justice. A simple glance from the King that they are imprecise is a reproach that leaves the ministers devastated.

**Source B**

An extract from a letter written by Bishop Fenelon in 1694 and addressed to Louis, although the letter was not intended to be read by him. Fenelon had been appointed as tutor to Louis' grandson in 1689, but was critical of the theory of the Divine Right of Kings.

Your people, whom you ought to love as your children, and who hitherto have been so devoted to you, are starving to death. Agriculture is all but abandoned; all trade is at an end. You have thus destroyed half of the real strengths within your State in order to make and to defend vain conquests outside it. Instead of extracting money from the poor people, the people should be given alms and food. The whole of France is desolate and unprovided for. You have brought all these difficulties upon yourself. So flourishes this great kingdom under a king every day held out to be the people's joy, and who would indeed be so had he not been poisoned by flattering counsels. The very people which so adored and trusted you begins to lose its love, its trust and even its respect for you. Little by little the flame of sedition is everywhere arising. Popular uprisings, for so long unknown, are becoming commonplace. The magistrates are obliged to tolerate the insolence of the insurgents and to bribe them into submission. You are reduced to a shameful extremity; either to leave sedition unpunished or inhumanely put down peoples whom you bring to despair by tearing from them, through your taxes for this war, the bread which they try to earn by the sweat of their brow.

**Source C**

An extract from Louis' recommendations to his own son on how he should rule France. He is recollecting the nature of France at the start of his personal rule in 1661, compared with the situation in the 1670s and 1680s. Parts of the *Memoires for the instruction of the dauphin* were probably penned by various ministers and then checked by Louis.

Disorder reigned everywhere. The finances were so exhausted that there hardly seemed to be any recourse left. Many of the necessary expenses for my house or my own person were supported solely through credit. Affluence prevailed, meanwhile, among the financiers, who covered their irregularities by all kinds of artifices. The least of the defects in the order of the nobility was the infinite number of usurpers in its midst, without any title or having a title acquired by purchase rather than service. The tyranny that it exercised over its vassals and its neighbours in some of my provinces could neither be tolerated nor could it be suppressed without examples of severity and rigour.

All these evils fell primarily upon the lower class, burdened, moreover, with taxes and pressed by extreme poverty. Two things were necessary for me, a great deal of work on my part and a careful choice of persons who were to support me in it. I resolved, above all, not to have a prime minister. For this purpose it was absolutely necessary to divide my confidence and the execution of my orders without entirely trusting it to anyone, assigning these various persons to various functions in keeping with their various talents. I could undoubtedly have cast my eyes on persons of higher standing, but on none with greater qualifications. But to be perfectly honest with you, it was not in my interest to select individuals of greater eminence.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Louis XIV's monarchy.

**[30 marks]**

**Student response**

For an historian studying Louis XIV's monarchy all three sources would have some value. They comprise an extract from an Italian guest at the French court -so offering the views of an educated outsider, a letter sent by a Bishop, critical of Louis XIV, offering the perspective of an opponent and an extract from Louis' own recommendation to his son which gives the King's own views on monarchy. As a set they could hardly be bettered. All come from the time in question, all are written by influential and literate upper-class people and we have both positive and negatives views of the monarchy. A historian studying Louis XIV would obviously need to find further evidence on which to base his judgements, but as a starting point these sources give a well-rounded picture.

One observation that emerges from the three sources is that Louis XIV's has seen the King emerge as a powerful central figure in government. In his instructions to his son (Source C) he makes it clear that, on taking personal control of government, he chose not to appoint a prime minister. This is highly significant for an understanding of Louis' reign. He even admits that he did not even seek individuals of 'greater eminence'.

His words are confirmed by the observations of the Italian guest in Source A. Here, he observes that the King is 'not at all dominated by his ministers'. Source A gives us an even fuller picture of Louis' centralisation of government. He 'wants to know everything'... 'there are no intermediaries'....'he expects that every appeal ...be reported to him'. The impression we get is of a king who keeps a firm rein on all matters of government and this behaviour is perhaps explained by the picture he gives of the state of France in the 1670s and 1680s when, 'disorder reigned everywhere' in Source C.

Even Source B testifies to the King's control, despite its unflattering tone. It talks of Louis defending his conquests, imposing taxes and being held out as 'the people's joy. Whilst the Bishop is no friend of the King, he is clearly aware of the absolutist nature of Louis' reign and simply wishes to make it work better. Although we are told that he was critical of the Divine Right of Kings, he does seem to suggest that only Louis can make his kingdom function effectively and, conversely, that Louis is responsible for all its ills.

As well as learning about the nature of the monarchy, these three sources tell the historian quite a lot about Louis himself. He is seen as hard-working and orderly. He likes to run his day to a pattern (Source A), always rising at the same hour, attending meetings and going to Mass. He obviously spends much time with his advisers -the 'flattering counsels' of Source B but this was work, not pleasure. In Source C he talks directly of 'a great deal of work on my part' and the very fact he chooses to write an instruction manual for his son suggests he is a conscientious ruler - as well as a skilful one (Source A).

It is also hinted that Louis is rather a remote figure. Source B, in particular emphasises Louis' ignorance of the actual conditions in his country where agriculture and trade are stagnating under the heavy taxes demanded for Louis' wars. The picture in Source A also is of a king who spends every moment at court, supervising matters of state and ensuring that he uses his 'extraordinary memory' to coordinate the work of his ministers and reproach them for misdeeds.

In Source C he appears to know quite a lot of what went on before his personal rule but, of course, this might well have been reported to him. However, his resolution to rule alone and devote his time to watching his ministers again confirms a king that largely cut himself off from the wider state.

The limitation of these sources lies in their contradictions. Whilst the picture of Visconti in Source A is quite positive, if not entirely praising, that of Fenelon in Source B is certainly negative, suggesting that Louis has wilfully allowed France to become 'desolate and unprovided for'. Louis has, according to this source, lost the people's affection and there are uprisings and plots in abundance which he is ignoring. This dismal picture does not sit well with Source C, where Louis gives the impression he has overcome all the disorder that he inherited and is now in a position to advise his son how to maintain control. It would be necessary to investigate further to resolve these conflicts. Bishop Fenelon obviously has a particular grudge, even though he was appointed tutor to Louis' grandson and maybe his view should not be weighted too highly. On the other hand, he is Frenchman and he both mixes in royal circles and, himself, shows an awareness of the outside world referring to matters that Visconti might not be aware of and which Louis himself almost certainly would not want to comment on.

In conclusion, these are interesting and thought-provoking sources which would certainly be of use to an historian studying Louis XIV's monarchy and particularly if that historian wanted to gain more insight into Louis XIV himself and his centralising tendencies. For an historian to be sure of the veracity of the sources and to know more about other aspects of the reign, he would need to turn elsewhere.

### **Commentary – Level 3**

Answers to Question 1 require detailed consideration of each source and an assessment of the value of each by considering provenance, tone, argument and content. There is no prescribed approach, although a source-by-source assessment is probably the most straightforward, but this answer adopts a different approach. The introduction does indicate some considerations that need to be made: who, when and in what context the sources were written. The points, of course, being in an introduction, are not developed and the value of such introductions is questionable. The answer then identifies what the sources have in common in relation to views on Louis and how they differ and there are some brief references to provenance. The penultimate paragraph then considers the limitations of the sources collectively. The answer suggests an attempt that is intelligent and thoughtful and it is fluent, but, fundamentally, it does not meet the requirements of the question. Much is descriptive of what is said and assessment of value in each case is occasionally tangential and never fully developed. It flatters to deceive and is Level 3 at best.

**Paper 2N Revolution and Dictatorship: Russia, 1917-1953 (A-level): Specimen question paper**

**Source A**

Adapted from Lenin's *Theses for peace*, published in the official Communist newspaper *Pravda* in February 1918.

1. The condition of the Russian Revolution at the present moment is such that practically all the workers and a large majority of the peasants are on the side of the Soviet Government and the social revolution. In that respect the success of the Socialist Revolution in Russia seems assured.
2. At the same time the civil war which was caused by the furious resistance of the propertied classes has not reached its highest point. In the end the Soviet Government will win the fight, but it will take much time and a good deal of energy, and a certain period of disorganisation and chaos incidental to every war and especially civil war is inevitable before the bourgeoisie is finally crushed.
3. Furthermore, the resistance of the bourgeoisie in its less active and non-military forms such as sabotage, bribing tramps and other hirelings of the bourgeoisie to join the Socialist ranks with the purpose of undermining their cause, has proved to be so obstinate and capable of assuming such varying forms that it will take time, several months perhaps, to put it down.

**Source B**

Adapted from Bessie Beatty's book, *The red heart of Russia*, written in 1918. Beatty was an American journalist who lived in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution. She later defended the Bolsheviks in front of a US Senate Committee in 1921.

...Yakov Peters [One of the founders of the Cheka] told me that one day he was riding on a street car, when the man sitting beside him engaged him in conversation. He offered to sell him twelve hundred bags of flour at two hundred and fifty roubles each, six thousand pounds of sugar, and some butter. Peters got him to write down his name and address and within the hour, he had been arrested and his supplies had been seized.

Despite all efforts to unearth the offenders, a few men waxed hideously rich upon the hunger of the many. All provocation notwithstanding, the guillotine remained simply a name. Wherever the death penalty was inflicted, it was done by mobs having no official sanction, by mobs aroused to an uncontrolled fury, and momentarily conscious of no other passion than that of reprisal. Considering the unsettled condition of government, such instances of violence were not so frequent as to change the character of the Revolution into that of a Reign of Terror.

### Source C

Adapted from *Kronstadt Izvestia*, the main publication of the Kronstadt rebels, March 1921.

Our country is enduring a difficult moment. Hunger, cold and economic ruin have held us in an iron vice these three years already. The Communist Party, which rules the country, has become separated from the masses and shown itself unable to lead her from her state of general ruin. It has not faced the reality of the disturbances which in recent times have occurred in Petrograd and Moscow. This unrest shows clearly enough that the party has lost the faith of the working masses. Neither has it recognised the demands presented by the workers. It considers them plots of the counterrevolution. It is deeply mistaken.

This unrest, these demands, are the voice of the people in its entirety, of all labourers. All workers, sailors and soldiers see clearly at the present moment that only through common effort, by the common will of the labourers, is it possible to give the country bread, wood and coal, to dress the barefoot and naked, and to lead the Republic out of this dead end.

**01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the Bolshevik Revolution between 1917 and 1921.

**[30 marks]**

### Student response

Source A is an adaptation from Lenin's 'Theses for Peace', and comes directly from Lenin. This earns the source is valuable as Lenin was the leader of the Bolshevik Revolution, and thus offers a firsthand view into Bolshevik activity at the time. However, the adaptation has been printed in an official Communist newspaper, meaning it is likely to be a one-sided view and focus predominantly, or even solely, on positives regarding the Bolsheviks.

Regarding the content of the source, it argues that the Soviet Government has the support of the workers and peasants, legitimising the Bolshevik takeover and proving the success of the Socialist revolution. The source also argues that despite fighting and chaos, the Civil War will eventually be won by the Bolsheviks. Finally, the source also argues that the bourgeoisie, who posed resistance to the Bolsheviks, would be dealt with and removed. The value of the source is increased here as its sources' promises and arguments are supported, apart from the fact, as the Bolsheviks faced opposition from the Greens. However, they went on to win the Civil War, and the use of the Cheka was effective in removing the bourgeoisie opposition.

The tone is an authoritative one, yet has little reason to be. Regarding the first argument, the Bolsheviks only received 20% of the vote in January 1918, a month before this thesis was written, thus disproving the claim the Bolsheviks had the support of the workers and peasants, limiting the source's value. That they had little support from the said groups can be deduced from the fact that the middle class (bourgeoisie) only made up a small proportion of the electorate.

In conclusion, this source is slightly valuable as it shows a Bolshevik view of Russian society at the direct time of writing. However, the source is claiming the Bolsheviks have legitimacy (perhaps down to the one-sided provenance) whilst in reality they don't.

Source B is written by an American journalist, Bessie Beatty, and is an extract from her book 'The Red Heart of Russia'. Beatty wrote the book in 1918 when she was living in Russia. The source has limited value as she is foreign, and unlikely to be able to converse with the bourgeoisie or peasants/workers about their feelings about the Bolsheviks. Furthermore, Beatty defended the Bolsheviks in front of a US Senate Committee, so the source is likely to be biased in favour of the Bolsheviks. This limits the source as a balanced view of the Bolsheviks cannot be built from it.

The source states that the Bolsheviks have a problem with corruption in Russian society – the Cheka were having to deal with plenty of black market activity - and that the economy is not working, proven by the fact people are offering flour to passers-by – indicative of food shortages. The source also portrays a chaotic and slightly anarchistic aura of Russia, with mobs running riot and inflicting the death penalty as they pleased. This suggests that the government had little control over proceedings. This is supported further by the fact the Cheka were holding mass murders, as part of a slightly desperate reign of terror. The source also tells of gross inequity, as 'a few men waxed hideously rich upon the hunger of many'.

The tone of the source places emphasis on the success on the Bolsheviks in dealing with the problems that they faced. The source is quite subjective and uses emotive wording, limiting the value of the source as some factual detail may be missed. The source holds a partisan view towards Russian society.

In conclusion, the source is of limited value as even though it provides an interesting and useful account of proceedings in Russia, eg the economy and mob superiority, it is subjective towards the Bolsheviks and highlights their successes in dealing with problems, ignoring the likely failures that happened.

The final source is an adaptation from the main publication of the Kronstadt rebels, the Kronstadt Izvestia. Regarding the provenance, it is a contemporary source. The sailors originally backed the October revolution in 1917, and had fought alongside the Bolsheviks to ensure the revolution occurred. However, the continuation of War Communism after the Civil War annoyed the Kronstadt as they considered the Bolsheviks to be using War Communism to set up a political dictatorship.

The content and argument of the source is that the Bolshevik government is not working effectively. The communist party has failed as a government by failing to address the hunger problems in society, and the economic distress which led to black market activity. Additionally, it argues that the Bolsheviks have turned their back on the promise they made - 'all power to the Soviets' - and therefore betraying the revolution they initiated.

The tone of the source is very emotive and critical of the Bolsheviks. The source is strongly disillusioned with the Bolshevik, and appears angry as they consider the Bolsheviks to be counter-revolutionary. The Kronstadt sailors are claiming to be a more authentic and legitimate representation of labourers.

In conclusion, the source is valuable to the historian as it shows an albeit biased, but accurate, representation of Russian society at the time of writing. It proves that despite Lenin's Theses for Peace, in which he claimed popularity across the electorate, the Bolsheviks were not fully popular and faced serious opposition, especially as the Kronstadt sailors uprose (albeit unsuccessfully) in March, the same month that this newspaper was published.



### **Commentary – Level 3**

Expression and meaning are not always clear, but the answer does attempt to assess provenance, tone and content in each case. There is lack of precision; what for example, was the election of January 1918 which is referred to? It is also assertive in places, referring frequently to tone without providing any examples to support the judgments. Some of the inferences made, especially in relation to Source B, are unconvincing and unsupported. It is a Level 3 answer.