

MODERN HISTORY ASSESSMENT TASK 4

TOPIC: THE WORLD AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY

DATE: Friday 28^h August (Week 6)

OUTCOMES TO BE ASSESSED:

- P2.1 identify forces and ideas and explain their significance in contributing to change and continuity from the eighteenth century to the present
- P3.1 ask relevant historical questions
- P3.2 locate, select and organise relevant information from different types of sources
- P3.3 comprehend and analyse sources for their usefulness and reliability
- P3.4 identify and account for differing perspectives and interpretations of the past

Area of Assessment:	Source Analysis
Course Component:	Core Study
Weighting:	20%

THE TASK

Section 1: (10 Marks)

You are to write 200-250 words on each of the attached four sources, discussing the **usefulness** of the source for a historian. In determining usefulness, you should make particular note of the *perspective* and *reliability* of each source, however, you may also want to consider the following in your thinking about each source:

- * Origin
- * Motive
- * Content
- * Limitations
- * Audience

Section 2:

Using at least one of the sources below plus your own knowledge, explain how the nature of European society was changing around the beginning of the 20th Century. (800 Words) (10 Marks)

Assessment criteria

You will be assessed on how well you:

- identify forces and ideas and explain their significance in contributing to change and continuity from the eighteenth century to the present
- locate, select and organise relevant information from different types of sources
- comprehend and analyse source material for their usefulness and reliability

Marking Criteria – Section 1

CRITERIA	STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT		
	High	Substantial	Needs Attention
<i>locate, select and organise information from different types of sources</i>	Organises the information from the sources into a logical and coherent.	Organises the information from the sources in a structured manner	Struggles to organize the information gained from the sources into a relevant answer.
<i>Comprehend and analyse sources for their usefulness and reliability .</i>	Carefully analyses the source and shows a sophisticated understanding of how it would be relevant to a historian.	Analyses the source and shows a sound understanding of how it would be relevant to a historian.	Shows some knowledge of the source but has a limited understanding of its relevance.

Marking Criteria – Section 2

<i>identify forces and ideas and explain their significance in contributing to change and continuity from the eighteenth century to the present</i>	Is able to clearly identify the way in which European society was changing around the beginning of the 20 th century and can identify the forces and ideas that were bringing this change.	Shows some understanding of the way that European society was changing around the beginning of the 20 th century and identifies at least one force or idea that helped bring about that change.	Shows a limited understanding of the way that European society was changing around the beginning of the 20 th century and fails to identify clearly any forces or ideas that helped bring about that change.

Source A - Socialism

To my mind, the so-called 'socialist society' is not anything immutable. Like all other social formations, it should be conceived in a state of constant flux and change. It's crucial difference from the present order consists naturally in production organized on the basis of common ownership by the nation of all means of production. Not to begin this reorganization tomorrow, but performing it gradually, seems to me quite feasible. That our workers are capable of it is borne out by their many producer and consumer cooperatives which, whenever they're not deliberately ruined by the police, are equally well and far more honestly run than the bourgeois stock companies.

Friedrich Engels, [Letter to Otto Von Boenigk](#) (1890)
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/subject/quotes/index.htm>

- Immutable: A an object that is unable to be altered or changed in any way.

Source B – Working Conditions

Working Conditions in Factories (Issue)

[Gale Encyclopedia of U.S. Economic History](#) | 2000

During the late nineteenth century the U.S. economy underwent a spectacular increase in industrial growth. Abundant resources, an expanding labor force, government policy, and skilled entrepreneurs facilitated this shift to the large-scale production of manufactured goods. For many U.S. citizens industrialization resulted in an unprecedented prosperity but others did not benefit as greatly from the process. The expansion of manufacturing created a need for large numbers of factory workers. Although the average standard of living for workers increased steadily during the last decades of the nineteenth century, many workers struggled to make ends meet. At the turn of the century it took an annual income of at least \$600 to live comfortably but the average worker made between \$400 and \$500 per year.

Factory workers had to face long hours, poor working conditions, and job instability. During economic recessions many workers lost their jobs or faced sharp pay cuts. New employees found the discipline and regulation of factory work to be very different from other types of work. Work was often monotonous because workers performed one task over and over. It was also strictly regulated. Working hours were long averaging at least ten hours a day and six days a week for most workers, even longer for others. For men and women from agricultural backgrounds these new conditions proved challenging because farm work tended to be more flexible and offered a variety of work tasks. Factory work was also different for skilled artisans, who had once hand-crafted goods on their own schedule.

Factory conditions were also poor and, in some cases, deplorable. Lack of effective government regulation led to unsafe and unhealthy work sites. In the late nineteenth century more industrial accidents occurred in the United States than in any other industrial country. Rarely did an employer offer payment if a worker was hurt or killed on the job. As industries consolidated at the turn of the century factories grew larger and more dangerous. By 1900 industrial accidents killed thirty-five thousand workers each year and maimed five hundred thousand others, and the numbers continued to rise. The general public became concerned with industrial accidents only when scores of workers were killed in a single widely reported incident, such as the many coal-mine explosions or the tragic Triangle Shirtwaist Company fire in 1911. In one year alone 195 workers in steel and iron mills were killed in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

In order to save money many employers hired women and children to work in factories because these workers would work for lower wages than men. Some women were paid as little as six dollars per week, a sum much lower than a male would have received. Most female workers performed unskilled or semi-skilled machine work but some worked in industries that demanded heavy labor. Some women, for instance, worked on railroads, while others were employed as machinists.

<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3406401046.html>

Source C – The Outbreak of WW1

28 October 1908

The *Daily Telegraph* Affair

The interview of the Emperor Wilhelm II on October 28, 1908.

London Daily Telegraph, October 28, 1908.

. . . "You English," he said, "are mad, mad, mad as March hares. What has come over you that you are so completely given over to suspicions quite unworthy of a great nation? What more can I do than I have done? I declared with all the emphasis at my command, in my speech at Guildhall, that my heart is set upon peace, and that it is one of my dearest wishes to live on the best of terms with England. Have I ever been false to my word ? Falsehood and prevarication are alien to my nature. My actions ought to speak for themselves, but you listen not to them but to those who misinterpret and distort them. That is a personal insult which I feel and resent. To be forever misjudged, to have my repeated offers of friendship weighed and scrutinized with jealous, mistrustful eyes, taxes my patience severely. I have said time after time that I am a friend of England, and your press --, at least, a considerable section of it -- bids the people of England refuse my proffered hand and insinuates that the other holds a dagger. How can I convince a nation against its will ?

"I repeat," continued His Majesty, "that I am a friend of England, but you make things difficult for me. My task is not of the easiest. The prevailing sentiment among large sections of the middle and lower classes of my own people is not friendly to England. I am, therefore so to speak, in a minority in my own land, but it is a minority of the best elements as it is in England with respect to Germany. That is another reason why I resent your refusal to accept my pledged word that I am the friend of England. I strive without ceasing to improve relations, and you retort that I am your archenemy. You make it hard for me. Why is it?" . . .

http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Daily_Telegraph_Affair

Source D – The Outbreak of WW1

PUNCH, OR THE LONDON CHARIVARI.—APRIL 12, 1911.



PAX GERMANICA; OR, THE TEUTON DOVECOTE.

GERMAN EAGLE (to Arbitration Bird). "NO FOREIGN DOVES REQUIRED; WE HATCH OUR OWN, THANKYOU."