

Candidates must complete this page and then give this cover and their final version of the extended essay to their supervisor.

Candidate session number

Candidate name

School number

School name

Examination session (May or November)

May

Year

2012

Diploma Programme subject in which this extended essay is registered: History

(For an extended essay in the area of languages, state the language and whether it is group 1 or group 2.)

Title of the extended essay: The Justification of the Sinking of
the Lusitania

Candidate's declaration

This declaration must be signed by the candidate; otherwise a grade may not be issued.

The extended essay I am submitting is my own work (apart from guidance allowed by the International Baccalaureate).

I have acknowledged each use of the words, graphics or ideas of another person, whether written, oral or visual.

I am aware that the word limit for all extended essays is 4000 words and that examiners are not required to read beyond this limit.

This is the final version of my extended essay.

Candidate's signature: _____

Date: 7/16/2012

Supervisor's report and declaration

The supervisor must complete this report, sign the declaration and then give the final version of the extended essay, with this cover attached, to the Diploma Programme coordinator.

Name of supervisor (CAPITAL letters) _____

Please comment, as appropriate, on the candidate's performance, the context in which the candidate undertook the research for the extended essay, any difficulties encountered and how these were overcome (see page 13 of the extended essay guide). The concluding interview (viva voce) may provide useful information. These comments can help the examiner award a level for criterion K (holistic judgment). Do not comment on any adverse personal circumstances that may have affected the candidate. If the amount of time spent with the candidate was zero, you must explain this, in particular how it was then possible to authenticate the essay as the candidate's own work. You may attach an additional sheet if there is insufficient space here.

The candidate excelled in all aspects of the writing process of this extended essay. The candidate writes with a sense of conviction, voice, and clarity. The essay demonstrates thorough research and an excellent knowledge of the subject. The candidate consulted exemplary sources and skillfully integrated direct quotes from these sources to support his conclusions. ✓

Seen

This declaration must be signed by the supervisor; otherwise a grade may not be issued.

I have read the final version of the extended essay that will be submitted to the examiner.

To the best of my knowledge, the extended essay is the authentic work of the candidate.

I spent hours with the candidate discussing the progress of the extended essay.

Supervisor's signature _____

Date: 2/20/2012

Assessment form (for examiner use only)

Candidate session number



Achievement level

Criteria	Examiner 1	maximum	Examiner 2	maximum	Examiner 3
A research question	2 ✓	2	2 ✓	2	
B introduction	2 ✓	2	1 ✓	2	
C investigation	3 ✓	4	3 ✓	4	
D knowledge and understanding	3 ✓	4	3 ✓	4	
E reasoned argument	3 ✓	4	3 ✓	4	
F analysis and evaluation	3 ✓	4	3 ✓	4	
G use of subject language	2 ✓	4	2 ✓	4	
H conclusion	2 ✓	2	2 ✓	2	
I formal presentation	2 ✓	4	2 ✓	4	
J abstract	1 ✓	2	1 ✓	2	
K holistic judgment	2 ✓	4	2 ✓	4	

- Synopses = not sufficiently developed

just

because 112

just

Total out of 36 25 ✓ 24 ✓

Name of examiner 1: _____
(CAPITAL letters)

Name of examiner 2: _____
(CAPITAL letters)

Name of examiner 3: _____
(CAPITAL letters)



Examiner number: _____

Examiner number: _____

Examiner number: _____

IB Cardiff use only: B:

IB Cardiff use only: A: 99018

Date: 24-5-12

International Baccalaureate

Extended Essay in History

The Justification of the Sinking of the *Lusitania*

Research Question: Was the sinking of the *Lusitania* justified when observed through the scope of the First World War? ✓

Word Count: 3,307

70
killed
too stark?

Antwarndly
phases

Abstract:

The sinking of the British passenger liner *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, though met with anger and violence, was a justified attack. Research was undertaken in order to investigate the circumstances of the sinking, as well as prior British and German actions in the wartime mentality that if viewed by an objective outsider might determine whether the attack was justified. Britain transgressed against Germany multiple times, through its initial blockade, the tightening of that blockade (which resulted in the deaths of scores of German civilians by starvation), and through Britain's hypocritical interpretations of international law governing maritime and merchant warfare. The attack on the *Lusitania* may have been a case of mistaken identity; regardless, it was warranted because of the cargo on board and the subterfuge of the British. Blame for the massive loss of life is attributed to the war, rather than to either belligerent power.

Concl?
 ✓

Success =
indications
the scope of
the war
methodical

// ± RA

[Concl?]

// Concl?

Word Count: 151

Too short for purposes.

3 essential requirements partly clear only. $I = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) /$

RQ - Could be better + more precisely/convincingly articulated

SC - Needs better set out - list points

Concl - restate findings at beginning and end of abstract

Blockade vlt - Base for (1) - general

Table of Contents

Topic.....	Page Number
Title Page.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Blockades and Counter-Blockades.....	4-5
British Subterfuge.....	5
Submarine Weaknesses.....	6
Other Dishonest British Tactics.....	6-7
Armaments on Board.....	7-9
German Warning.....	9
German Knowledge before the Sinking.....	9-10
The Sinking of the <i>Lusitania</i>	10-11
Defense of Germany's Actions.....	11-12
Conclusion.....	12
Works Cited.....	13

None of
the
subterfuge
mentioned in
the
conclusion
BG !!

A = (2/2) R/R feasible for a CE &
clearly presented on
letter page

Where did they (not) ...
4

Introduction?

... eye not been ...

The sinking of the passenger ship *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, resulted in the deaths of over 1,000 civilians and incited worldwide outrage against Imperial Germany, eventually leading to America's entrance into World War One. In the eyes of the Allies, this act of war was unprovoked, disgraceful, and bloodthirsty; in the eyes of the Central Powers, the sinking was a mistake warranted in principle (albeit one that triggered unwelcome diplomatic complications). Despite the enormous loss of life and human tragedy centered around *Lusitania's* sinking, in light of the continuing war and the "eye for an eye" mindset of both sides, the torpedoing of *Lusitania* was an entirely justified attack. This is due to the British blockade of Germany, the British misinformation and deception campaign, and the historically noted presence of armaments and other war materials aboard.

(delay of 2 years?)

... At what

There should have been a ...

... before ... ?

At the outset of war, the British blockaded the entire North Sea, an action for which Imperial Germany was woefully unprepared. The Germans had only planned for a close Royal Navy blockade of Germany's coast; they were in effect helpless and cut off from many suppliers (Ballard). German civilians suffered greatly from the "Hunger Blockade," not only because of a lack of food shipments but also a shortage of essential agricultural fertilizer. According to The UK National Archives, almost 763,000 German civilians died of starvation as a direct result of this barricade, which most likely also played a role in the influenza outbreak of 1918 that claimed 150,000 more lives. Germany was "[a]ware that her only hope of victory was by attrition" (Hoehling 5); only through submarine warfare could the Germans turn the tables on the British and simultaneously break the British blockade of the North Sea.

in ...

PP

... ?

at what point?

The attempted German blockade of Britain began with the sinking of the British steamship *Glitra* on October 20, 1914 by the submarine U-17 (short for Unterseeboot 17, or Undersea Boat 17). This sinking represented the early trend of German submarine warfare: submarine captains used gunfire, not torpedoes, and followed the so-called cruiser rules, the global code of naval merchant warfare (Hough). These rules stipulated that a submarine (or warship) may stop, board, and search any merchant vessel for contraband, and if said contraband was indeed discovered, give the crew time to evacuate the ship

PP

B = (2/2) ... fairly adequately indicated a "significance" ...
"Wuthen" of R/R indicated satisfactorily too.

before sinking it. A submarine could not sink an unescorted merchant ship without warning solely on supposition of banned materials (Ramsay)

However, during the winter of 1914, both the Germans and the British began "shifting away from the concept of cruiser rules and, in essence, Germany was adopting a policy of unrestricted submarine warfare" (Ramsay 43), and escalating their blockade of the British Isles. This shift away from gentlemanly conduct was caused by the British: the British increased the strain on Imperial Germany by declaring the North Sea a war zone entered by neutral vessels at their own risk. Furthermore, Winston Churchill "believed that attack was the best method of defence and... he issued a series of aggressive instructions...[that required] masters to disregard any [German] instruction to heave to[,]...authoris[ed] them to attack or ram U-boats[,] told [captains] to paint out their [ship] names[,] and...permitted [them] to fly a neutral flag" (43). Ramsay calls such instructions "a clear breach...of cruiser rules" (43); according to Colin Simpson, these inflammatory instructions were widely distributed in the German navy, so U-Boat crews would be aware of British deceit. One such ship admonished by the U.S. for flying the Stars and Stripes was the *Lusitania*; it was thus well known to both the United States and Imperial Germany (and in turn, U-Boat captains) that British ships were flying neutral flags in order to avoid the blockade (Simpson). Additionally, according to Robert Ballard, *Lusitania* had her name painted over on each side, along with her trademark Cunard smokestacks. In other words, the British knowingly accelerated the rate of starvation of German citizens by fortifying their blockade (thus eliciting an angry response) and began to employ dirty and underhanded tactics; these acts of subterfuge resulted in the Germans escalating their blockade of Britain, which was accomplished by the declaration of a war zone around the British Isles within which enemy and neutral shipping alike could fall victim to unrestricted submarine warfare (Hough). However, this escalation required the U-Boats to scrutinize the allegiance of vessels before sinking them: "such investigations, ... conducted at close range on the surface, deprived the submarine of most of its defensive secrecy" (Grant 21).

precise chronology needed to justify statement

Not presented by 15 he?

When was this declared?

Contract

(R) P?

"How serious was this by 1915"

judicially neutral language

When?

B - all these things = NA = don't think surprise but to get round the blockade.

Some instructions of a-kind checks, prohibitions adopted would make it hard to argue.

* *Authentic need to be introduced if not sustained by mass
in fact*

The submarine of World War One was a thin-skinned, slow moving vessel very susceptible to ramming. This was demonstrated by the 1914 ramming of U-15 by the cruiser *Birmingham*; the submarine's periscope had been spotted by the captain of the *Birmingham* and he had rammed the unfortunate (and potentially disabled) submarine before it could dive. All of U-15's crew perished in the incident (Hough). Ergo, investigating the identity of a ship in the German-declared war zone around the British Isles was not a generally viable concept, as it put the submarine and the crew in potentially mortal peril. According to A.A. Hoehling, over 7,000 German sailors perished in submarine accidents during the First World War; the surviving sailors and captains would have recognized the inherent dangers of serving on a submersible and thus would not have desired to jeopardize themselves further by surfacing to determine the identity of a potentially armed merchant ship.

Other dishonest tactics used against the U-Boats included the exploitation of the United States by the British and the arming of passenger and merchant ships. The British exploited a corrupt U.S. government, shipping war cargo through pro-Ally diplomatic channels and advocating the freedom of the seas for U.S. citizens when it had in fact been the first belligerent power to implement a blockade. Britain was using U.S. citizens and other passengers as a shield against submarine attacks on its merchant and passenger ships supplying Britain with crucial supplies. Additionally, certain merchant ships were armed with guns capable of sinking a U-Boat; this created a two-fold risk for a U-Boat attempting to impose a stop and search order (or even inquiring about the allegiance of a vessel): there was a risk of being rammed and a risk of the ship carrying arms that could send the submarine to the bottom. One such ship that was listed as armed in two British proclamations was the *Lusitania*. These periodicals, *Jane's Fighting Ships 1914* and *The Naval Annual 1914*, "standard issue...[on] each U-Boat" (Simpson 72), listed *Lusitania* as an auxiliary cruiser and a weapons-fortified merchant ship, respectively. It is important to note that these publications were released by the British and clearly designated *Lusitania* as an armed target, thus warning any attacking submarine against surfacing and searching her,

Shield of

? judgemental. same

? 100

Vague? Diplomatic

2-2

proof?

Ref

✓ 4

or even venturing too far near her (in case lookouts sighted the submarine's periscope). In fact, Admiral Lord Fisher once told a woman attempting to book passage to New York "to be sure that she travelled either on the *Lusitania* or the *Olympic* as both carried a concealed armament" (Simpson 234). Author David Ramsay claims the *Lusitania* was unarmed, but did have a reinforced deck to hold the weight of any weaponry hidden there. To question if *Lusitania* was armed on her last voyage serves no purpose; the answer is immaterial. Ultimately, U-Boat captains would assume *Lusitania* and other British merchant ships were armed, and even if they were unsure, it would be too dangerous to investigate further due to misleading flags, possible hidden armaments, and the well-known, publicized instructions issued by Winston Churchill ordering ships to ram attacking U-Boats (Simpson).

Furthering the argument in favor of Imperial Germany is the historically noted presence of armaments and other contraband aboard the *Lusitania* on her final voyage. For example, "[t]he most obvious military cargo consisted of 4,200 cases of rifle ammunition[,]... 1,248 cases of 3-inch shrapnel shells[,]... 18 cases of fuses[,]... some 50 barrels and 94 cases of aluminum powder, extensively used in the production of...explosives, and 400 cases of machine tools and components...almost certainly destined for the munitions effort" (Ramsay 56). These items, considered contraband under terms of the blockade, were legally allowed on passenger vessels under U.S. law; however, suppliers of other goods found ways to avoid American shipping laws: cargo manifests listed barrels of oysters that were almost certainly not barrels of oysters because of their commercial unviability, caused by shipping techniques/durations of the time, although what these oysters may have been is anyone's guess (Ramsay). The cargo manifest also lists suspiciously wrapped packages of cheese, which Colin Simpson claims are most likely packages of gun-cotton (pyroxyline) from the Du Pont Powder Company. Simpson claims some 600 tons of gun cotton were transported to the Cunard docks; he notes an account of a conversation between Captain Guy Gaunt and Dr. Ritter von Rettegh on April 26, 1915. This conversation, on file in the Department of Justice, includes Gaunt clearly questioning the effect of sea

water mixing with gun cotton (whether or not the gun cotton would explode). Gaunt was the Royal Navy representative in the United States helping the British to secure much needed supplies, many of which would be technically illegal to ship to Britain aboard passenger liners. In addition to listing contraband as innocent-looking foodstuffs, it was common practice to list illegal cargo under a second manifest, submitted to port officials after ships had left New York Harbor. This second manifest was intended only as a contingency for additional foodstuffs and other supplies necessary for the passengers; on *Lusitania's* final voyage, her second manifest was much longer than the first (Simpson). After her sinking, the issue of contraband cargo was avoided through a letter written by Dudley Field Malone (collector for the Port of New York), stating "I have to state that all of the articles specified in the manifest of the *Lusitania* are permitted to be shipped on passenger vessels under the laws of the United States" (Ramsay 128). However, this letter only alluded to the "first one-page manifest, not the twenty-four page supplementary" (Simpson 196). It is likely that *Lusitania* was indeed carrying contraband if her extra manifest was twenty-four times as long as her original: normally the original manifest is much longer, suggesting that there were prohibited items among her cargo (Simpson). Indeed, "[v]irtually all *Lusitania's* cargo carried on her last voyage, including a large quantity of foodstuffs, was contraband within the strict terms of the law" (Ramsay 56). Furthermore, the German community of New York City was aware of the contraband carried by *Lusitania*: George Vierick, a German-American writer, in an interview with Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, "pointed out to him that on all but one of her wartime voyages the *Lusitania* had carried munitions. He produced copies of her supplementary manifests which were open to public inspection...[and] informed Bryan...[of] the six million rounds of ammunition...due to be shipped on the *Lusitania*[, that] could be seen at that moment being loaded on Pier 54" (Simpson 98). Thus, Imperial Germany and U-Boat captains knew *Lusitania* was ferrying war supplies from the U.S. to Britain, because the German community was in contact with German agents, who undoubtedly passed this information on to Berlin. Even *Lusitania's* Captain David Dow refused to

Proof? Sources?

110

Lusitania

Numbered Source Division 14 to page 97

110

indict

carry both passengers and munitions; he was duly replaced for this refusal in March 1915, approximately two months before the sinking. *Sources?*

Moreover, German-American citizens issued an advertisement in the name of the Imperial German Embassy, warning potential passengers against booking transatlantic passage due to the war zone around the British Isles. This caution stated:

NOTICE! TRAVELLERS intending to embark on the Atlantic voyage are reminded that a state of war exists between Germany and her allies and Great Britain and her allies; that the zone of war includes waters adjacent to the British Isles; that, in accordance with formal notice given by the Imperial German Government, vessels flying the flag of Great Britain, or any of her allies, are liable to destruction in those waters and that travellers sailing in the war zone on ships of Great Britain or her allies do so at their own risk.

Imperial German Embassy

Washington, D.C., April 22, 1915. (Chidsey 10-11)

Thus, potential passengers were informed of the war zone, and as there was no mention of neutral vessels in the advertisement, given an implied opportunity to make the transatlantic voyage on U.S. or other neutral ships. However, the United States government advocated for freedom of the seas for its citizens, regardless of the allegiance of the vessel (Ramsay). *(PP) P??*

It has been established that before the *Lusitania* left port on May 1, 1915, the Germans surmised that *Lusitania* was armed; they knew the instructions issued to British merchant ships that placed submarines obeying the cruiser rules in mortal danger; they issued warnings to passengers against sailing on British ships through the war zone; they knew that British ships could be flying the colors of any neutral nation and that they had blacked out the names of their ships so as to make it more difficult to identify them; and they knew that *Lusitania* was carrying munitions and other war material considered contraband under the German submarine blockade of Great Britain. Imperial

Germany also knew that *Lusitania* and other passenger ships had carried Canadian troops on past voyages: according to Vice-Admiral Oliver, "It happen[ed] sometimes that large numbers of Canadian troops c[a]me in ordinary passenger ships or that valuable heavy guns or mountings c[a]me in merchant ships...It also frequently happen[ed] that the ship ha[d] sailed before it [wa]s known that troops or valuable government warlike stores [we]re on board" (Simpson 70). Thus, U-20 (the submarine that torpedoed *Lusitania* without warning) had reason to disobey international law and sink *Lusitania*, regardless of the passengers on board. On the day of departure, three stowaways were discovered in a pantry with a camera; it has been speculated that these stowaways were German agents looking for concrete evidence that *Lusitania* was armed. However, the stowaways were locked in the brig when the ship was torpedoed and did not survive to testify as to their intentions aboard *Lusitania*. Yet their presence aboard the ship provides additional evidence that Imperial Germany strongly suspected there were fortifications aboard *Lusitania*, and that Britain did nothing to dispel these suspicions (Ramsay).

On May 7, 1915, Walther Schwieger, captain of U-20, spotted a four-funneled steamship, and after receiving confirmation from his pilot that the ship was either *Lusitania* or *Mauretania*, "both armed cruisers used for trooping" (Simpson 147), dived, maneuvered into position, and torpedoed the unfortunate passenger liner. As the U-20 closed in on the sinking ship, the pilot said, "By God, it's the *Lusitania*" (150). Such a statement suggests that the leadership of the U-20 thought the ship was more apt to be the *Mauretania* (which was used to carry troops); if this was indeed the case, the U-20 could not have been at fault for its actions, because if Winston Churchill had not issued instructions requiring ship names to be painted over, perhaps U-20 would have recognized the passenger nature of *Lusitania* (Simpson). Schwieger was no insensitive monster: after observing "'great confusion' on board the Cunarder...[h]e thought only briefly of sending another torpedo into her, noting that it would have been 'impossible' for him to fire a second torpedo at 'this crowd of people struggling to save their lives'" (Ballard 90). At any rate, the sheer amount of contraband aboard *Lusitania* would have been illegal

So?
change
argument?

according to the terms of the blockade, and Schwieger's sense of self-preservation would have prevented him from attempting to impose a search upon the vessel.

A total of 1,198 civilians perished when *Lusitania* sank- men, women, and children. The tragedy aboard the doomed vessel is almost beyond comprehension, with heartbreaking stories of men last seen giving their life belts to young children and strangers, valiant crew members struggling to lower lifeboats despite the ship's list to starboard, and desperate struggles to stay afloat and alive once the ship had disappeared (Chidsey). These civilians are the forsaken victims of the tragedy; while their tales of horror wrench the heart and the mind, it must be remembered that the sinking was justified. Imperial Germany's message sent to the United States in response to American protests over the sinking (and the loss of 124 American civilians aboard *Lusitania*) made six arguments:

1. The *Lusitania* was an auxiliary of the British Navy.
2. It was armed.
3. The British Government had authorized the use of the U.S. flag as a 'ruse de guerre'.
4. British merchant vessels were instructed to ram or otherwise destroy German submarines in the event of a surface challenge.
5. The *Lusitania* carried munitions and contraband.
6. It had been used and was being used for the passage of Canadian troops. (Simpson 193)

These arguments are all valid, in spite of the dispute over whether or not *Lusitania* was armed and the fact that there were no Canadian troops on board during her final voyage. *Lusitania* was indeed under Admiralty control (in fact, her cargo duty was her only reason for not retiring for the duration of the war), she was listed as armed by the British Navy, and Churchill's instructions permitted the flying of neutral flags and commanded captains to destroy U-Boats operating fairly. Finally, she was indeed carrying contraband (this contraband being public knowledge at the time) and had been used to ferry Canadian troops to Europe in the past. Imperial Germany warned ships of the dangers of sailing in the war zone (*Lusitania*, as a British ship, was not even considered neutral), which was only declared in response to the British declaration of the North Sea war zone. According to Admiral Sir Percy Scott,

'Such a proclamation [of the war zone around the British Isles] would...be perfectly in order, and once it had been made, if any British or neutral ships disregarded it, they could not be held to be engaged in peaceful avocations...and if they were sunk in the attempt it could not be described as a relapse into savagery or piracy in its blackest form.' (Simpson 81)

This defense of unrestricted submarine warfare by a British admiral suggests its legality: Germany warned neutral nations of the consequences of entering the war zone, which was not directed against neutral shipping but rather against the British war effort (Simpson). The outrage against Imperial Germany at the massive loss of life aboard the *Lusitania* would have been better directed against Cunard and the Royal Navy: *Lusitania's* crew was unprepared for the tragedy and the Royal Navy did not issue Captain Turner with precise/concise instructions and updates regarding U-Boat activity in the area leading up to the sinking (Ramsay).

In conclusion, the sinking of the *Lusitania* was warranted by British actions and mandates. The tightening of the blockade of Germany caused widespread starvation and elicited Germany's proclamation of a war zone around the British Isles. Instituting a blockade as reprisal for the isolation of one's nation does not seem an unreasonable retaliation. Additionally, the comparison of statistics speaks for itself: 1,198 civilians died on the *Lusitania*, while 763,000 German civilians died of starvation due to the British blockade. Thus, the counter-blockade was justified. Britain then changed the rules of the game once more, through dishonest tactics of war that made it more difficult to identify British ships that may or may not have been armed; the effect of this was to make submarine captains more cautious and less likely to obey the cruiser rules. These tactics were combined with the transport of war cargo on passenger liners, thus blurring the distinction between warships/contraband-carrying merchant vessels and off-limits passenger ships. Britain's hypocritical actions contributed to the reprisal that was the tragic sinking of RMS *Lusitania* that fateful day in 1915. Blame for the human tragedy does not lie with the British or the Germans; rather, it lies with World War One.

What evidence of this in 1915?

Pr high by contributions comparison

Concluding

not yet the case.

But there is a difference between this and the other case of...
but...
by 1915??

judicial exp.

!?!?

The Conclusion is consistent with the argument advanced a relevant to RP; on the whole.

H = 3 / 2

PVO-

Works Cited

- ✓ Ballard, Robert D., Spencer Dunmore, Eric Sauder, and Ken Marschall. *Exploring the Lusitania: Probing the Mysteries of the Sinking That Changed History*. New York: Warner/Madison, 1995. Print.
- ✓ Chidsey, Donald Barr. *The Day They Sank the Lusitania*. New York: Award, 1967. Print.
- 7 "Exhibitions & Learning Online | First World War | Spotlights on History." The National Archives. Web. 06 Sept. 2011.
<<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/firstworldwar/spotlights/blockade.htm>>
- ✓ Grant, Robert M. *U-boats Destroyed; the Effect of Anti-submarine Warfare, 1914-1918*. London: Putnam, 1964. Print.
- ✓ Hoehling, A. A. *The Great War at Sea: a History of Naval Action, 1914-18*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1978. Print.
- ✓ Hough, Richard. *The Great War at Sea, 1914-1918*. New York: Oxford UP, 1983. Print.
- ✓ Ramsay, David. *Lusitania: Saga and Myth*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2002. Print.
- ✓ Simpson, Colin. *Lusitania*. London: Longman, 1972. Print. ✓

Sources well-presented but in references index, page numbers ~~too~~ frequently missing + inconsistent ~~for~~ format. All except 1 source effectively cited in EE.

Page no omitted in many of ref. format

C = $\frac{3}{4}$ Satisfactory number of appropriate sources selected & clearly used (even if uncritically) with a fair degree of planning too.

D = $\frac{3}{4}$ Some detailed K +, generally, satisfactory understanding of the material relevant to RQ, (notwithstanding some contentious claims) & definite awareness of an academic context too, even if failed to introduce historians cited appropriately.

E = $\frac{3}{4}$ A clear argument developed overall, despite occasional lapse of support for claims.

F = $\frac{3}{4}$ Analytical & evaluative skills demonstrated well with the exception of critical evaluation of the sources employed.

G = $\frac{2}{4}$ Mostly satisfactory but some weaknesses (of the language suggesting bias, in places).

I = $\frac{2}{4}$ Various shortcomings, such as frequent absence of page numbers in references.

K = $\frac{2}{4}$ A solid EE with some in-depth research & knowledge displayed. Good.