BrightRED PUBLISHING

ADVANCED Higher HISTORY

BrightRED Study Guide

CfE ADVANCED Higher

HISTORY

NEW AND UP-TO-DATE • WITH SQA CHANGES •

BrightRED DIGITAL ZONE

Don't forget to check out the BrightRED Digital Zone

INTRODUCTION TO ADVANCED HIGHER HISTORY

THE ADVANCED HIGHER HISTORY COURSE

STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE

There are two units in the Advanced Higher History course which you will complete.

Advanced Higher History

Historical Study
For this part of the course, you will study one period in history, considering a variety of historical issues and controversies through the use of a wide range of sources. This will be tested in the written exam. There are ten fields of study that can be chosen from. Unlike Higher History, where three topics are learned, only one will be selected for the Advanced Higher course. The options are as follows:

1. Northern Britain from the Iron Age to AD 1034
2. Scotland: Independence and Kingship, 1249–1334
3. Scotland: From the Treaty of Union to the Enlightenment, 1707–1815
4. USA: "A House Divided", 1850–1865
5. Japan: The Modernisation of a Nation, 1840–1920
6. Germany: From Democracy to Dictatorship, 1918–1939
7. South Africa: Race and Power, 1902–1984
8. Russia: From Tsarism to Stalinism, 1914–1945
9. Spain: The Civil War – Causes, Conflict and Consequences, 1923–1945
10. Britain: At War and Peace, 1938–1951

Historical Research
For this part of the course, you will plan, research and present on a historical issue of your choice, within your field of study. This will be examined through submission of a dissertation.

ONLINE

The SQA Advanced Higher History website lists the content included in each of the Fields of Study. Open the "Course and Unit Support Notes" and scroll down to the table that relates to your specific field of study. The Key Issues give you the topic headings that you will study, and these are detailed further in the Description of Content. Find the link at www.brightredbooks.net/subjects

DON'T FORGET

The source-handling questions will only examine the *italicised* illustrative examples within your fields of study. Check the SQA Course and Unit Support Notes for this.

OPTIONAL UNIT ASSESSMENT

There are two unit assessments that can be sat independently. The first focuses on extended response and source-handling skills. The second will examine the research and writing process of your dissertation. Passing Unit Assessments is no longer a requirement to gain a Course Award (Grade A–D). They can now be achieved instead of obtaining a full course award.

HOW THE COURSE IS GRADED

The grade you receive will be determined solely by your performance in the written exam and the dissertation. Combined, these two components are worth 140 marks. If successful, you will be awarded Grade A, B, C or D.

The written exam

The duration of the written exam is three hours, and it is worth 90 marks. All marks are distributed to questions specifically linked to your chosen field of study. The exam has two parts:

contd

1. Part 1 (Historical Issues) is worth 50 marks. You will complete two essays, worth 25 marks each. There will be five essay questions for you to choose from in your field of study.
2. Part 2 (Historical Sources) is worth 40 marks. There will be four sources specific to your field of study for you to consider, which could be written or pictorial. You will complete three source-handling questions: one "Evaluate the usefulness …" question, worth 12 marks; one "How fully …?" question, worth 12 marks; and one "Interpretation of Two Sources" question, worth 16 marks.

It is important to realise that while Part 1 could examine any section of the Key Issues or Description of Content in your field of study, Part 2 is more selective. In the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) Course and Unit Support Notes, you will find that there are *italicised* and non-italicised parts of the Description of Content. Only the *italicised* content will be examined in Part 2, i.e. the source-handling questions.

The dissertation

Sometimes referred to as the Added Value Unit or AVU, or the Assignment, the dissertation is worth 50 marks. The title of your dissertation will be chosen by you, from a set list of titles within your field of study produced by the SQA. It can be seen as a larger version of the essays you will be writing in preparation for the final exam, and has a limit of 4,000 words.

The dissertation will allow you to research more deeply into an issue within your field of study and formally present your findings. It is a piece of coursework which you plan, research and write independently of work completed for the exam. You are expected to read widely from a number of authors and sources and to present your findings in a coherent manner. The final version of your dissertation will be sent to the SQA to be graded.

THINGS TO DO AND THINK ABOUT

To be successful in this course, you need to be organised and motivated. It is essential that you regularly condense your class and reading notes into more manageable revision summaries. You also need to read over these regularly in order to effectively memorise key information. Finally, it is important that you spread the reading and writing of your dissertation throughout the year to provide yourself with time to rectify any problems that may arise in your research.

THE QUESTION PAPER, PART 1 – ESSAY QUESTIONS

STRUCTURE CRITERIA – INTRODUCTIONS

The Introduction is part of the Structure criteria which helps you to gain marks for your answer. The Introduction should give an indication of how you intend to answer the question. You should set the Historical Issue in context. You should also identify the different ways that historians interpret the issue, including any interpretation mentioned in the question. You should then briefly consider the strengths and weaknesses of these interpretations. Having prioritised these, you should then indicate what line of argument you will adopt, and why.

WRITING FRAME

Below is a sample structure that you could use. Remember that this is only one way that your Introduction may be structured. You may want to use it until you become more confident.

1) Contextualise the Historical Issue
2) Acknowledge any viewpoint presented in the question and explain this, including relevant Historical Interpretations
3) Present all other arguments including relevant Historical Interpretations
4) Indicate which interpretation / factor you will support
5) Explain briefly why it is more convincing than other views / factors.

Example:

Essay Question:
To what extent did the promise of raiding opportunities attract the Vikings to Northern Britain?

Sample Introduction:

The Vikings arrived in Britain as raiders, plundering remote monasteries, attacking Lindisfarne off the east coast in AD 793, while raiding Iona in the west two years later. A century later in AD 870, they laid siege to Dumbarton Rock under the leadership of Ivar the Boneless. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the Irish Annals and Alcuin of York all lamented the violence of these invaders who seemed fixated on slaughter, looting and destruction. Both Downham and Walker suggest that the opportunity to raid did indeed attract the Vikings to Northern Britain, at least initially.

However, by the end of the ninth century, many Vikings had settled in Northern Britain, with the Western and Orkney Isles remaining under Scandinavian control well into the Medieval period.

contd

In order to determine how significant the opportunities for raiding were in attracting the Vikings, we must also examine the possibility that it was a lack of land in Scandinavia, combined with the availability of arable farmland, in a more favourable climate, that encouraged migration. Ritchie discusses the importance of a desire for new land as being significant. Hence, it is possible to argue that although they may have initially sought out new places to plunder, it was the availability of land which became the main attraction for successive generations of Vikings.

Essay Question:
To what extent was the policy of a *Volksgemeinschaft* realised by the Nazis by 1939?
Sample Introduction:

After coming to power in 1933, the Nazis set about attempting to create a racially pure state whereby all German citizens would support the xenophobic and racist policies of the regime. They attempted to foster a productive and dedicated workforce, while protecting farmers and small businesses.

Moreover, they looked to promote traditional roles for women and exclude all 'non-Germans' from society. Meanwhile, they aimed to indoctrinate the youth of Germany with these ideas.

It could be argued that the Nazis were partially successful in achieving a *Volksgemeinschaft*, with both Evans and Kershaw highlighting that a racially pure state was achieved. However, others such as Stephenson are of the opinion that they were only partially successful. Kirk argues that support was coerced through fear, rather than given willingly.

Hence, it appears that a true Volksgemeinschaft was not realised by 1939.

THINGS TO DO AND THINK ABOUT

There is a reason that each essay question is asked; it is alluding to an area of historical debate. In the introduction to your answer, it is your task to present this debate to the reader. A good way to approach this is to assume that the reader does not know the different arguments presented by historians, and to outline these briefly, before indicating why you have chosen to support one of these interpretations of the Historical Issue over another.

DON'T FORGET

It is essential that you include reference to Historical Works in your essay. The Introduction gives you an excellent opportunity to do this. Linking historians and schools of thought to the main interpretations will ensure that you surpass this expectation. Be mindful that you should include more Historical Sources and Interpretations in the main body of your essay.

ONLINE

For further advice on writing effective introductions, refer to the Harvard Writing Centre by clicking on the link at our Digital Zone – www.brightredbook.net/subjects

ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURES FOR THE "INTERPRETATION OF TWO SOURCES" QUESTION

A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

There is no particular way that you are expected to structure your answer: below are some examples of alternative ways that you can do this. Each will allow you to gain full marks. Making an extended point can gain you four marks in the following way:

Interpretation of Source	Select information from the source and relate it to the issue of the question.
Contextual Development (Further Development of interpretation)	Develop the ideas in the Interpretation further using your own knowledge.
Wider Contextual Development (Omissions)	Give further information that the source doesn't mention.
Historical Interpretations	Provide details of historians' opinions / schools of thought which directly relate to the interpretation.

This structure allows you to further develop each source separately and could be used if the sources provide widely different views which could be discussed in isolation:

- **Interpretation of 1st Source**
- **Contextual Development (Further Development of Points from Source)**
- **Interpretation of 1st Source**
- **Contextual Development (Further Development of Points from Source)**
- **Wider Contextual Development (Omissions) (Alternative Historical Interpretations)**
- **Historical Interpretations**

This more complex structure allows you to develop the Interpretations with WCD on a point-by-point basis. This is useful if the sources are full of distinct points that can be developed in their own right. If you choose this, there is no need to develop every Interpretation in this way.

- **1st Interpretation of Source 1**
- **Contextual Development (Further Development of Interpretation)**
- **2nd Interpretation of Source 1**
- **Contextual Development (Further Development of Interpretation)**
- **3rd Interpretation of Source 1**
- **Contextual Development (Further Development of Interpretation)**

As above, for Source 2

- **Wider Contextual Development (Omissions) (Alternative Historical Interpretations)**
- **Historical Interpretations**

SAMPLE QUESTION

Source A from *History of the Roman Empire, III,14* by Herodian (c. 240).

Severus was becoming disturbed by the lifestyle of his sons and their enthusiasm for public spectacles, when the governor of Britain sent word to him that the barbarians were in revolt and that they were overrunning the country, looting it and causing widespread havoc. He therefore requested additional forces to protect the place or a visitation by the Emperor. Severus was pleased to hear this, for besides being a natural lover of glory, he wanted to raise some victory-trophies at the expense of the Britons to add to the victories and titles won in the east and north. Then again, he wanted to get his sons away from Rome so that they might come to their senses amidst the disciplined life of the army, once they were away from the luxury and high life of Rome. And so, although he was now well advanced in years and crippled with arthritis, Severus announced his expedition to Britain.

Source B from *The Romans Who Shaped Britain* by Sam Moorhead and David Stuttard (2012).

Antoninus Pius was a man with a reputation for shunning warfare unless absolutely necessary. Yet, with an army to keep occupied and generals to placate, it was occasionally politic even for a man of peace to engineer necessities for war. After all, there would be those in Rome who remembered all too well men like the British governor Trebellius whose inaction had prompted his troops to mutiny.

Lollius Urbicus arrived in Britain ... to push back the northern boundaries once more beyond Hadrian's Wall ... It may be that the Emperor saw the need to keep the British troops engaged – there were so many of them, after all.
Or he wished to prove his military worth – what better theatre for a spectacular campaign than Britain's frontier, with its notoriously fierce tribes? It was a theatre, moreover, sufficiently far from Rome that news of his legions'

contd

victories could be embellished in their telling. Indeed, at the campaign's conclusion some three years later, Antoninus Pius was hailed imperator, an event he marked at Rome with victory coins.

How much do **Sources A** and **B** reveal about differing interpretations of the reasons why the Romans invaded Northern Britain? **16**

EXAMPLE ANSWER

Source A proposes that the Romans invaded Northern Britain to deal with unrest within the empire and to gain military glory.

The source explains that "the governor of Britain sent word to him that the barbarians were in revolt and that they were overrunning the country, looting it and causing widespread havoc". The governor asked Severus to either come to Britain himself or at least send additional troops. This suggests that Severus led an invasion force into Northern Britain in order to subdue unruly natives. [One mark for Interpretation] The view that Roman invasions into Northern Britain were launched to subdue the natives is supported by Guy de la Bedoyere, who states that Antoninus Pius faced trouble in Britain at the start of his reign. [One mark for Historical Interpretations] The source also shows that Severus wanted to put an end to the controversy and tension in the capital caused by his sons, as it states that he was "disturbed by their lifestyle" and "enthusiasm for public spectacles". He thought that giving them military experience would make them mature and hardened, increasing their respect among the ruling class. [One mark for Interpretation] Source A also describes how Severus was happy to be asked because he welcomed the chance to gain military glory, implying that some Roman invasions were motivated by personal impulses. [One mark for Interpretation] However, the source does not fully explain how military glory had motivated emperors. According to Tacitus, the emperor had given instructions to seek out glory by advancing north into unconquered territories. [One mark for WCD] Moreover, the source fails to mention that the pursuit of military glory was built into the Roman psyche and hence Roman emperors and generals would always want to push the frontier forward. This can be seen in Caesar's invasion of southern Britain in 55–54 BC. Correspondence between one of his legionary commanders and Cicero in Rome reveals the excitement with which news of Caesar's invasion was received [Two mark for WCD]. This interpretation of the Roman mindset is put forward by Kamm, who suggests that expansion of the empire would not cease, such was their obsession with war and conquest. [One mark for Historical Interpretations]

On the other hand, Source B suggests that the Romans invaded to ensure the Emperor furthered his reputation.

The source points to problems that previous rulers had with controlling unruly and unoccupied legions and how a previous British governor, Trebellius, had suffered mutiny. It explains that Antoninus was peaceful, but "it was occasionally politic even for a man of peace to engineer necessities for war." This supports the view that Northern Britain was invaded by the Romans in order to allow Antoninus Pius to tighten his control over the army and strengthen his position as emperor. [One mark for Interpretation] Furthermore, the source details how the Emperor used war in Britain to prove his military worth, as it was a place with a reputation for fierce warriors and far enough from Rome to manipulate reports of what was achieved. This affirms the possibility that the Romans invaded Northern Britain as a guaranteed way for the new emperor, Antoninus Pius, to tie himself to military success. [One mark for Interpretation] The view is furthered by the source when it describes that "at the campaign's conclusion some three years later, Antoninus Pius was hailed imperator, an event he marked at Rome with victory coins". [One mark for Interpretation] The view that invasion was used as a tool by certain Roman emperors is supported by the historian Bettany Hughes, who suggests that both Claudius and Antoninus Pius used victory in Britain as propaganda to shore up support in Rome and with the legions. [One mark for WCD – provision of more than two Historical Interpretations]

However, the sources do not mention that the Romans may have invaded Northern Britain in an attempt to protect the peaceful province to the south. Once Agricola had subdued the Welsh tribes, most of Southern Britain was at peace. However, the tribes from the Brigantes northwards were a threat to this peace. Hence, Agricola launched his invasion of what is now Scotland in AD 79 partly in order to secure the gains made in the south. [One mark for WCD] This view, that the aim of invasion was to protect lands already under control, may go some way to explaining why, after a series of roads and forts were built along the Gask Ridge and the Forth-Clyde line, the Romans did not launch another major campaign into the north until the time of Antoninus Pius in AD 139. [One mark for WCD] David Breeze states that they were willing to "interfere in the affairs of adjacent states if they perceived their own interests to be threatened", showing that invasion was intended to protect the empire. [One mark for WCD – provision of more than two Historical Interpretations] This could explain the anger that Severus felt after his first campaign into Northern Britain, that led him to order a genocide against the Caledones and Maeatae. He had made peace with the northern tribes, only for them to have broken the agreement and renewed hostilities. [One mark for WCD]

FIELD OF STUDY 1 – NORTHERN BRITAIN FROM THE IRON AGE TO AD 1034

PURPOSE OF THE ROMAN FRONTIERS

There is disagreement over the purposes of the Gask Ridge, Hadrian's Wall and the Antonine Wall. Many historians believe they were built as a symbol of power, while others think that they were intended to mark out the borders of the empire. Meanwhile, some believe they were used as active borders for social and economic control.

Breeze points to the fact that enemies outside the empire needed to be driven back. He believes Hadrian's Wall was intended to separate the Roman world from the barbarian world, helping to reduce attacks. This is supported by **Lynch** and **Clarkson**, and by **Laing**, who sees the Wall as a symbolic end to the empire. Similarly, **Shotter** points to the frontiers established as indications of permanent occupation and dominance.

Although **Hanson & Maxwell** suggest that frontier walls were intended to intimidate those to the north, they were also useful for bolstering an emperor's reputation. **Breeze** also believes emperors often needed to shore up support with impressive advances and structures. **Moorhead & Stuttard** see Hadrian's Wall in this light, while suggesting that the Antonine Wall was constructed to keep troops active as well as to increase the popularity of Pius in Rome, where news of achievements could be embellished. This is supported by **Keppie**.

Meanwhile, **Breeze** thinks that there was a frontier zone which was also utilised for economic gain through taxation, which is supported by **Johnson**, who points to the fact that traders moving large amounts of goods would not have been able to avoid the frontiers. Further, **Maxwell** believes that the Antonine Wall was built to control agricultural land to the south with a strong military barrier. **Hanson & Maxwell** believe the aim was to achieve Romanisation between the walls. Similarly, **Fraser** sees the main purpose of the frontiers being to control and monitor movement. This is supported by **Clarkson**, who also sees it functioning as a method of population control in times of peace. Similarly, **Ritchie & Breeze** see the Antonine Wall as bureaucratic in nature, as does **Oliver**. Meanwhile, **Woolliscroft** is of the opinion that the Gask Ridge was constructed in order to control access in central Scotland. **Breeze** agrees that it would have functioned to regulate movement. **Watson**, on the other hand, sees it functioning to protect lowland Scotland.

Roman methods of control

It appears that the Romans employed various methods to keep the northern tribes subdued, including military might, economic persuasion and the taking of hostages.

Shotter, however, sees violence being used in tandem with bribery. **Breeze** supports this, as does **Kamm**, who believes that the Romans attempted to control the north through negotiation and bribery, citing peace treaties that were agreed with the taking of hostages. This is supported by **Southern**, **Watson** and **Oliver**.

On the other hand, **Moorhead & Stuttard** see the use of military might as a way of controlling the natives. In agreement, **Moffat** suggests the violent crushing of rebellion was commonplace, especially under Severus. He cites the genocide order as evidence of this, as does **Elliot**, who also sees the use of the Classis Britannica as key to Severus's achievements, using the navy for both transport and military manoeuvres.

contd

Meanwhile, **Breeze** also points to the building of military infrastructure, with installations combining frontier walls with signalling towers and forts spread throughout the province and located in "enemy" territory. **Keppie** explains that these were used, abandoned and then re-used when necessary. In agreement, **Elliot** describes how Severus and Caracalla recommissioned much of the military infrastructure around the Forth-Clyde isthmus and the Gask Ridge, while building transport links in an attempt to provide ways to ensure permanent pacification.

Success of the Roman invasions

Another area of contention is whether the invasions were successful or not.

Smyth determines that all three invasions resulted in failure. Further, **Watson** believes Scotland was never really part of the Roman Empire. Meanwhile, **Clarkson** sees opportunities being lost by Agricola in pursuit of the enemy after Mons Graupius.

On the other hand, **Kamm** believes Agricola's account of Flavian glory is accurate, while **Hind** is of the opinion that tribes of Northern Britain were crushed by Agricola. Additionally, **Fields** views the Antonine invasions as providing a buffer between "barbarian" lands and Romano-Britain proper. Further, **Breeze** points to the fact that Severus's invasion resulted in peace throughout the third century AD.

Reasons for Roman failure

There is conjecture over why the Romans failed to conquer the north. Some historians believe there was too much opposition from the natives. Others believe that geographical factors and indigenous social structures played a part. There is also the view that there was a lack of drive to conquer Northern Britain.

Both **Breeze** and **Dobson** think that the Northern British tribes could have been conquered if the will was there, but it was not. This is supported by **Clarkson**, and by **Maxwell**, who believes Britain was on the periphery of Roman concerns. **Elliot** also suggests lack of political will as a reason, stating that certainly after the Flavian conquest, the empire lost interest. Further, **Woolliscroft** sees a lack of economic incentive to conquer Northern Britain. **Breeze** also believes that problems elsewhere in the empire averted focus from Northern Britain. Further, **Clarkson** believes that jealousy of Agricola's achievements on the part of the emperor stopped him achieving more.

Alternatively, **Richmond** takes the view that northern tribes were just too strong. In the same vein, **Oliver** and **MacQuarrie** believe that successive Roman invasions failed to deal with the guerrilla tactics and persistence of the natives.

Meanwhile, **Woolliscroft**, **Mattingly** and **James** believe that lack of social structures prevented the Romans from conquering Northern Britain. **Lynch** tends to agree that the North was politically divided but also accentuates the geographical barriers encountered by the Romans. Conversely, **Oliver** believes that geographical difficulties were just a convenient excuse for failure.

ONLINE

The Roman Gask Project is a long-running archaeological research project led by Dr D. J. Woolliscroft and Dr B. Hoffmann. It details research being carried out on and around the Gask Ridge and provides a number of academic papers on the subject of Roman Scotland. It can be found by clicking the link on our Digital Zone – www.brightredbooks.net/subjects

DON'T FORGET

It is essential to include historiography in each essay in order for that essay to receive more than 12 out of 25 marks.

THINGS TO DO AND THINK ABOUT

Try to incorporate historical opinion into your revision notes, being mindful to acknowledge points of disagreement among historians. You should link prominent historians to the main interpretations of each issue in your topic, for use in essay introductions and other areas.

Meanwhile, well-known phrases from established historians, or indeed more traditional academics, may be used in Essay Questions as prompts. It would be helpful if you were able to identify the authorship while discussing that view.

BrightRED Study Guides

CfE ADVANCED Higher

HISTORY

Ross MacLachlan

This BrightRED Study Guide is the ultimate companion to your CfE Advanced Higher History studies! Written by our trusted author and experienced History teacher, Ross MacLachlan, this book is full-colour and packed with clear and accessible information, excellent examples, activities and advice. Inside, you will find:

- **Full of essential course information and fully up-to-date with SQA course changes,** arranged in easily digestible double-page topic spreads.
- **Detailed full-colour diagrams, illustrations and data boxes** to make sure all that study sticks!
- ***Don't forget*** pointers offering advice on the key facts to remember, and on how to avoid common mistakes.
- ***Things to do and think about*** sections encouraging the regular review of key points covered.
- ***Digital Zone* activities and tests** to supercharge your learning efforts online!
- **An index of key terms** to help when revising.

Your future's bright with BrightRED Study Guides!

NEW AND UP-TO-DATE WITH SQA CHANGES

Check out the **BrightRED Digital Zone** – for a world of tests, activities, links and more at www.brightredbooks.net!

BrightRED DIGITAL ZONE

Twice winner of the IPG Education Publisher of the Year award.

BrightRED PUBLISHING

BE BRIGHT BE READY

Bright Red Publishing's easy to use, high-quality educational resources are trusted by teachers and custom designed to improve students' study experience to help them to achieve their potential.

To see more of what we do and stay up to date with all things Bright Red:

- follow us on Twitter @_BrightRed
- like us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/brightredbooks
- follow us on Instagram @bright_red_publishing
- visit us at **www.brightredpublishing.co.uk**
- or call us on 0131 220 5804 – we'd be delighted to hear from you!

www.brightredpublishing.co.uk

BrightRED

ISBN 978-1-84948-310-0

9 781849 483100