APE EUROPEAN HISTORY [FRYE]
TEST 6 (Q edition)

SHORT ANSWER. In your responses, be sure to address all parts of the questions you answer. Use complete sentences; an outline or bulleted list alone is not acceptable. [6 each = 24]

1. Answer (a), (b), and (c) regarding the Russian Revolution.
   a. Describe one of Lenin’s critiques of the Russian monarchy.
   b. Describe one effect of Lenin’s critique on Russian politics.
   c. Explain how Stalin’s policies departed from Lenin’s policies.

2. Answer (a), (b), and (c): Use the passages below from historians to answer all parts of the question that follows.
   “The First World War was a tragic and unnecessary conflict. Unnecessary because the train of events that led to its outbreak might have been broken at any point during the five weeks of crisis that preceded the first clash of arms, had prudence or common goodwill found a voice; tragic because the [war] ended the lives of ten million human beings, tortured the emotional lives of millions more, destroyed the benevolent and optimistic culture of the European continent and left...a legacy of political rancor and racial hatred.... The Second World War...was the direct outcome of the First.” John Keegan, The First World War, published in 1998.

   “The First World War solved some problems and created others; in doing so it was little different from any other war.... [Since the late 1920s] one interpretation of the war [as unnecessary and tragic] has increasingly dominated over all others. This has created a barrier between our understanding of the war and that of those who fought in it....Many of the ideologies which had given the war meaning became loaded with later connotations....But there is no inevitability linking the Treaty of Versailles...to the outbreak of the Second World War. The First World War broke empires, triggered the Russian Revolution, forced a reluctant United States on to the world stage, and revivified liberalism....It was emphatically not a war without meaning or purpose.” Hew Strachan, The First World War, published in 2003.

   a. Explain ONE major difference between Keegan’s and Strachan’s interpretations of the role of the First World War in European history.
   b. Provide ONE piece of evidence from the period between the First and the Second World Wars that supports Keegan’s interpretation (Source 1) and explain HOW it supports the interpretation.
   c. Provide ONE piece of evidence from the period between the First and the Second World Wars that supports Strachan’s interpretation (Source 2) and explain HOW it supports the interpretation.
3. Answer (a), (b), and (c): Use the passage below from historian Orlando Figes to answer all parts of the question that follows. “It was the weakness of Russia’s democratic culture which enabled Bolshevism to take root. . . . The Russian people were trapped by the tyranny of their own history. . . . For while the people could destroy the old system, they could not build a new one of their own. . . . By 1921, if not earlier, the revolution had come full circle, and a new autocracy had been imposed on Russia which in many ways resembled the old.” O. Figes, A People’s Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891-1924, published in 1997.

a) Describe one piece of evidence that would support the author’s characterization of Russia’s political culture prior to the Bolshevik Revolution.

b) Describe one piece of evidence that would support the author’s interpretation of Russia’s “new autocracy” in the 1920s and 1930s.

c) Describe one piece of evidence that would undermine the author’s argument in the passage that the “new autocracy” in Russia resembled the old.

4. Answer (a), (b), and (c): Use the passage below from historian Daniel Headrick to answer all parts of the question that follows. “Imperialism in the mid-century was predominantly a matter of British tentacles reaching out from India toward Burma, China, Malaya, Afghanistan, Mesopotamia, and the Red Sea. Territorially, at least, a much more impressive demonstration of the new imperialism was the scramble for Africa in the last decades of the century. Historians generally agree that from a profit-making point of view, the scramble was a dubious [doubtful] undertaking. Here also, technology helps explain events. . . Many of the innovations that proved useful to imperialists of the scramble first had an impact in the two decades from 1860 to 1880. These were the years in which quinine . . . made Africa safer for Europeans; quick-firing breechloaders (a modern rifle) replaced muzzleloaders (an older musket) among the forces stationed on imperial frontiers; and the compound engine, the Suez Canal, and the submarine cable all made steamships competitive with sailing ships, not only on government-subsidized mail routes, but for ordinary freight to distant seas as well. Europeans who set out to conquer new lands in 1880 had far more power over nature and over the people they encountered than their predecessors twenty years earlier had.” Daniel Headrick, The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century, published in 1981.

a) Identify one piece of evidence the author uses to support his argument regarding how technology facilitated the rapid conquest of Africa.

b) Identify one factor in addition to the changes mentioned by the author that enabled the European colonization of Africa in the late nineteenth century.

c) Explain one way in which the technological developments described by the author affected Europeans within Europe during the late nineteenth century.
LEQ - choose ONE to answer [25 points]

- Respond to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
- Describe a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
- Support an argument in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence.
- Use historical reasoning (e.g., comparison, causation, continuity or change) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt.
- Use evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the prompt.

A. Analyze the ways in which the formation of overseas colonial empires both benefited and harmed the interests of European states in the period 1850 to 1914.

B. Contrast the impact of nationalism in Germany and the Austrian Empire from 1848 to 1914.

C. Compare and contrast how TWO of the following states attempted to hold together their empires in the period circa 1850 to 1914.

- Austria-Hungary
- Russia
- Ottoman Empire

49 points total