**Section One Source Analysis**

**Unit 3 – Modern Nations in the 20th Century**

**Elective 1: Australia 1918–1955**

***1a. Compare and contrast the messages of Source 1 and Source 2***

As seen by the representation of a child, perceived to be the Country Party, disrupting a delicate game of chess, the message of S1 is that the Australian Country Party disrupted the intricacies of Australian politics. The message of S2, is that in withdrawing the support from Hughes’ Nationalist Party the Country Party determined “to be a very great deal of the policy that the Country Party stands for” and was thus justified to use its political power. The sources compare in that both messages highlight the impact of the Country Party on politics yet contrast as S1 sees the Country Party as an unsophisticated infant whilst S2 highlights its sophistication as a key player in politics.

Sample B

Source one’s message negatively characterises the shift of federal power to a Country Party government, while the message of Source two positively characterises the Country Party. The message of source one is that the Country Party is unexpectedly and annoyingly taking power in government – demonstrated through the caption ‘Drat that boy’ in reference to the boy with the hat ‘farmer’s party’ (representing the country party). The message of source two is that the country party was justified in revoking its support for Hughes’ Nationalist party. Both messages similarly represent frustration with politics. However, a clear difference with the key messages of the sources is that while source one is criticising the shift in the balance of power to the Country Party government, source two welcomes and justifies it.

***This response uses key words such as ‘however’, ‘difference’ ‘while’ to clearly indicate the contrasting aspects of the messages.***

***1b. Evaluate the usefulness, in terms of strength and weakness, of Source 1 and Source 2 regarding the political circumstances represented.***

Source one is a very useful primary source that represented political circumstances in 1920. As a primary source, it shows the immediate effects of the Country Party forming government – through the representation of political frustration (caption ‘Drat that boy’) it shows the political change was unexpected by a portion of the Australian politics. Another strength of the source is that it provides insight into the particular perspective that a shift in power to the ‘farmer party’ (Country Party) was frustrating and an annoyance in politics. However, a weakness of the source is that it exaggerates the perspective that the Country Party was just a ‘farmers party’ when it did form favourable policy for all Australians- promoting prosperity through ‘men, money and markets’. Source two is also especially useful as it is a political leader justifying a shift in support away from the ‘Nationalist government’. It provides justification for changing political circumstances and is from a key figure – Earle Page – a key party member. This is a strength of the source. However, a key weakness of the source is that it only encompasses the one perspective that condemns the nationalist party. Another weakness of the source is the bias in favour of Country Party policy. Together the sources are very useful in representing political circumstances though could be strengthened through a corroboration of evidence with other sources.

***The strength of this response lies in the fact that multiple strengths and weaknesses were identified for each source. The response is well structured and addresses all aspects of the question.***

***1c. Explain the historical context of Source 3. Include the relevant events, people and ideas depicted or represented in the source.***

Sample B

The focus of the source is Evatt’s discredit as a result of trusting communists. The shift of power to Menzies Liberal government in 1949 was largely a rejection of Ben Chifley’s socialist policies, of which Menzies ruthlessly pursues – calling him a communist. As communism spread throughout Europe with countries falling like dominos (domino theory), Australia was called to support its US allies from World War Two. A large part of Menzies policy was scrutinising communism – signing the ANZUS Treaty in 1951 and highlighting it through the Korean War (1950-1954). In 1954, the ‘Petrov Affair’ leaked various communists in the public service. When Evatt – the head of the Labor opposition – presented a statement in 1955 to parliament written by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, Menzies ruthlessly pursued him. By building on public fear of communism he had established through factors such as referendum of the Communist Party Dissolution Bill (1951), Evatt and the Labor party were discredited, embarrassed, and mid 1955 the Labor party split as a result. The two new parties were the ALP and DLP.

***This is a comprehensive response that really demonstrates the student’s strong understanding of the historical context and content of the course.***

***1d. Identify and account for the author’s perspective in Source 3 and Source 4 regarding the political circumstances represented.***

The author of S3 is Australian cartoonist T. Scourfield, who supports the perspective that Dr Evatt sacrificed and destroyed the unity of the Labor Party in favour of communist affiliations. The author’s perspective of S3 is informed by the social circumstances of the time; the Petrov Affair in 1954 had heightened communist suspicions and as the Bulletin is a fairly right-wing political paper, the author would be biased against Evatt, and thus support the perspective that Evatt was a traitor, and thus a danger to the nature of Australian politics, as seen by his depiction of an untrustworthy pirate. The perspective of S4, in contrast to S3, is that Evatt was not “the man who split and temporarily destroyed the Labor Party”. As the author takes a retrospective perspective towards Evatt’s involvement in political circumstances, he is biased towards adopting a more neutral and considered perspective, not influenced by the Communist frenzy of the time. Furthermore, the perspective of S4 is inferred by the context of the source by created outside the era of Australian fears of communism; as a social commentator, the author is less inclined to make political attacks focusing instead on the social benefits Evatt predicated with his work at the UN.

***This student has clearly identified the perspectives of each source and provided multiple factors that may account for the perspective.***

***1e. Evaluate the extent to which the four sources give an accurate insight into the significance of the changing political circumstances during your period of study.***

The theme of the source set refers to the changing political circumstances of Australian politics, discussing insight into the cause and implications of political party divisions. The sources discuss the political division of both the Nationalist Party in the 1920’s and the Labor Party in the 1950s. Comparatively, S1 and S2 give insight into the division of the Nationalist Party, assessing the role the Country Party in facilitating division within the Nationalists. As seen in S1, the introduction of the Farmers Party or Country Party in 1920 changed the dynamics of Australian politics. No longer was politics a bi-polar contest between Labor and the Nationalists, but the introduction of the Country Party provided the opportunity for a ‘split; in the balance of political power. One instance where the Country Party exercised this power to ‘split’ and control political power is the outing of Hughes as Prime Minister (S2). Threatening to withdraw support from the typical anti-Labor coalition, the Country Party demonstrated its influence on the changing political circumstances. Similarly, S3 and S4 discuss the political change in the split of the Labor Party in 1955. Whilst the sources contest, with S3 blaming political figure Dr Evatt for sacrificing the Labor Party to support communism, S4 defends his rights to defend Labor’s power in opposing Menzies’ Communist Dissolution Bill. Admittedly the source set fails to give insight into other political changes, such as the Second Labor split during the Great Depression, and also fails to explore the responses or causes of these splits such as the election of Bruce Page in regards to S1 and S2 or Evatt’s defence of the Communist Dissolution Bill in S3 and S4. Altogether, however, the sources are somewhat insightful into exploring the nature of two major influences of political division and change.

***This is a strong, well structured response that draws out the key themes effectively and avoids simply listing each source and explaining its effectiveness. The response highlights some events that could have been included but does not dwell on this point. It is a well structured answer, that begins strongly with the identification of key themes and then finishes with a concluding sentence that draws the response to a close.***

**Elective 1: Australia 1918–1955**

**Question 2**

*Q2. Assess the political, social and economic impact of immigration on Australian society post World War Two.*

Immigration in the post-1945 era to Australia reflected an immense change in political policy and social attitudes. New migrants to Australia represented policy change in the form of new emerging policies such as ‘populate or perish’ and had the impact of some change in social attitudes towards foreign immigrants not on assisted plans from Britain. The largest impacts of migrants, due to such numbers, were economic and security protections that Australia wouldn’t otherwise have.

The arrival of new migrants had an incredible impact in shifting political policy. Post 1945 Australia demanded a larger population, with the Chifley government applying the term ‘populate or perish’ to migration policy. While not a direct impact of migrant action, it was an impact of dwindling population following the Second World War. The presence of potential migrants from countries such as Italy and East Germany meant that immigration minister Calwell could take the front seat on his vision that “our days of isolation are over”. The presence of immigrants from worldwide had shifted Australia’s policy in an effort to protect economic security and the security of Australia as a whole.

The invitation to migrate to Australia was also very significant in promoting a change in social attitudes. Early agreements in 1901 to 1905 had established the White Australia Policy, though beyond 1945, the welcoming of non-strictly white immigrants weakened this policy. Between 1945 and 1953, Australia welcomed 170,000 displaced persons from regions across Europe-especially Eastern Europe. Although no blacks or Asians were allowed, there was still an immense shift from the early expectations that immigrants were preferred by the Australian government to be only labourers, as new migrants not from Britain alone brought new skills such as engineering into the Australian workforce and into Australian neighbourhoods.

Migrants from across Europe provided additional security to Australia’s economy. The impact of migrants can be emphasised by Australia’s unemployment being approximately 1% after 1945. When the nation faces economic buoyancy during 1945 to 1955, it was ‘riding on the sheep’s back’. The original population was “too small to hold this island continent by ourselves,” according to Calwell, so workers were sought from other European countries and places such as Greece. The workforce had built up and Australia was safely able to provide enough of a supply of wool at the value of a ‘pound for a pound’, largely as a result of active immigrants in their communities and farms, and despite not being on assisted plans still showed to be valuable to the policies laid out by the Chifley and later Menzies government.

The impact of migrants was also additional security to the Menzies government in the period 1949 to 1955. As a large portion of migrants were displaced persons – as a secondary source recounts “Calwell could have as many as he wanted” – they were aware of the threat of extremism on unstable nations. More than 70% of migrants from Europe supported the shift from Chifley to Menzies after he had labelled Chifley first as a communist, and later in 1949 as a fascist. Then, of the migrant population over 30%, out of fear of extremism in the form of communism, supported the Dissolution Referendum. The Menzies government was politically stronger for continuing the immigration policies of Chifley, bringing in approximately 200,000 migrants every year from 1948 to 1955.

The presence of migrants in Australian society had a large impact relative to their population during the period 1945-1955. Although they had increased political security of the Menzies government, accounted for a shift in attitudes from the racist White Australian policy and supported the Australian workforce throughout the economic boom, by 1947 post-war immigrants accounted only for 3% of the total Australian population. Furthermore, their impact is diluted through Calwell’s instructions that “immigrants will be easily assimilated” – meaning that any diverse social impacts were not prioritised or wanted by the Australian government. Migrants were still at the mercy of the government, and by 1955 5400 Asian migrants had been deported.

Migrants had a strong impact relative to their population of Australian society between 1945 and 1955 in post-war Australian society. However, although they strengthened the nation on political, economic and social levels, their impact can be taken out of proportion, as they only amassed approximately 3% of the total Australian population by 1947. Ultimately, much of the diversity in social and political opinions were encouraged outside of the period to 1955, although migrants were the backbone of Australia’s economic security in post-war world history.

***The introduction could have been improved with some more historical context about the immigration policies prior to WW2 and the reasons for the increase and expansion of immigration after the war. The candidate has incorporated a lot of statistics as evidence to support their response.***

***Q4. Examine the changing nature and scope of Australia’s involvement in World War Two.***

The nature of Australia’s involvement within World War Two is testimony to the change of political and cultural loyalties thus facilitating dynamics in the scope of Australian actions. At the beginning of World War Two (WW2), Australia again conferred to its colonial responsibilities, following the British Empire into a second global conflict. However, the naïve depending of Australia upon British militarism resulted in increased vulnerability underlying the involvement of Australian in the Battle for Singapore. The consequent surrender of Singapore resulted in a drastic change of policy thus altering Australia’s involvement in WW2. Now centred upon defending the home front, Australia’s involvement in war stifled to a more regional focus, working alongside the United States to restore influence in the South-East Asian region.

On September 3, 1939, Prime Minster of the time, Sir. Robert Menzies addressed a nation to announce that “Australia was, again, at war”. However, unlike the former celebrations delivered at the announcement of World War One in 1914, Menzies announcement was met with little of the same enthusiasm, highlighting the wearied attitude Australians had towards involvement in a second global conflict. Nevertheless, Australia gathered, that it was their cultural identity, as ‘South Britains’ to follow their colonial superiors into the forefront of another world war. Thus, the initial involvement of Australia into World War 2, was centred around the military whims of British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. Sent to North Africa and Greece, ironically again defending the passage into the Mediterranean, Australia’s initial involvement in World War 2 was exclusively European detached from the defence of the home front. This dependence upon Britain, would soon have adverse ramifications, as Australia’s wartime involvement was soon to change. Failing to develop its own foreign policy in ratifying the Westminster Statute in 1926, Australia’s dependency on Britain which had induced the nation’s involvement in WW2, left Australia increasingly vulnerable, facilitating a future change in the nature of Australia’s militarism.

Soon, the growing expansions of the Japanese Empire throughout the early 1940s signified a greater threat to Australia than its involvement in Europe at the time. As the ‘war in the Pacific’ began to intensify Australia found itself militaristically defenceless as their involvement in Europe and dependency upon Britain’s naval force, left the nation vulnerable to the interests of the Japanese. As a result, Australia began its increased involvement in the defence of Singapore, the final platform of military strength against the Japanese Imperial Army. With Menzies following Britain in to plead for the fortification of Singapore, Australia was finally enabled to become militarily invested sending over 15 000 troops in January 1942. Despite all efforts, the loss of the HMS Repulse and the Prince of Wales resulted in a further diminishment of military defence of Singapore. On the dawn of February 15, 1942, Singapore fell to the Japanese, resulting in all 15 000 men of the Australian battalion becoming Prisoners of War. This limited military fortification of Singapore. Thus, Australia’s involvement in WW2 experienced a dynamic change in response to the Fall of Singapore, despite Australia’s involvement, newly elected John Curtin implemented a new political strategy, thereby altering Australia’s involvement in the war. Finally ratifying the Westminster Statute of 1926, Curtin was enabled to abandon “all kinship to Britain”, thereby adopting a more region involvement in the WW2 conflict.

The ratification of the Westminster Statute, and consequent development of an independent Australian foreign policy, resulted in more regional involvement of Australia’s wartime efforts. Prompted by the fall of Singapore, leaving Australia vulnerable to a perceived Japanese invasion, Australia’s wartime efforts developed a greater morale to fortify the nation’s own national borders. Thus, following 1942, Australia’s wartime effort was more focused upon the home front in the defence of the nation. The involvement of Australian militarism into a more domestic conflict was reinforced by the fears of invasion, heightened by instances of conflict upon the Australian mainland. On February 19, 1942, the first bombing of Darwin occurred; the first instance of a direct attack on Australia. Verifying Australia’s involvement in the home front, the continuity of bombings in Northern Australia, alongside the discovery of submarines in Sydney Harbour signified the unprecedented threat Australia faced. No longer was war a matter of detached nationalism, but the reinforced ‘Fight for Australia’ publicised by the Curtin government signified and justified the change in the nature of Australia’s wartime involvement.

As a part of Curtin’s forward defence to protect political interest in the defence of Australia, the involvement of Australian militarism in the Asian region, highlighted the change in the nature of Australia’s wartime involvement, focused on the defence of the nation, Curtin aligned the nation with the American forces ousted from their sphere of influence within the Philippines. American involvement in WW2 began with the bombing of Pearl Harbour on December 7, 1941. The mutualism between Australia and American prompted a shift in the involvement of Australia’s military to reflect the directions of the American military, under the direction of General MacArthur. Thus, the military coalition between Australia and the United States manipulated the position of Australian troops as Australia’s military state was led by the direction of the United States. This powerful involvement in campaigns such as the Battle of the Coral Sea, the defence of Port Moresby and the campaign upon the Kokoda track. Despite the significance of those initial campaigns, as the Japanese began to retreat, MacArthur, seeking prestige without Australian influence directed Australia to become involved in conflicts Curtin viewed as ‘insignificant to the Battle of Australia’. Nevertheless, towards the conclusion of WW2, Australian involvement was centred around the directions of the United States facilitated by Curtin’s allowance with General MacArthur.

Consequently, the nature and scope of Australia’s military involvement during WW2, experienced a dynamic change from previous conflicts. As signified in the beginning of WW2, Australia’s initial involvement, followed the direction of Britain, following colonial responsibilities into an unforeseen position of national vulnerability. Attempting and failing to re-establish Britain dominance in the Asian region, Australia “looked towards the United States” for a renewed direction in a war in which Australia itself was threatened. Thus, reinforcing the importance of Australian freedoms, the home front involvement of Australia highlighted a renewal of domestic military involvement. Taking charge to defend the homeland, Australia’s nature and scope of military involvement reflected the desire of Australians to remain culturally free, thus utilising divergent external allies to support the retainment of Australia’s identity.

***Good use of quotes throughout the essay. The introduction sets the historical context for the essay and gives the reader a good indication of the direction of the essay. The candidate has outlined the events that reflect the changing nature of Australia’s involvement in World War 2 and has explained why Australia became involved in the different theatres during the period. The student has linked each paragraph back to the thesis to ensure that they have addressed the question rather than falling into the trap of writing a narrative. The conclusion draws the argument together and demonstrates the strong understanding of not just the content of the course but of how to structure a good essay.***