



BOARD OF STUDIES
NEW SOUTH WALES

2011

HIGHER SCHOOL CERTIFICATE
EXAMINATION

WRITING BOOKLET

Examination

Year 12 History Extension

Section	Part	Question Number
<i>II</i>		<i>Q.2</i>

Date

3rd of November

Number of booklets
used for this question

1/2

Instructions

- Write your Centre Number and Student Number at the top of this page.
- In the boxes provided write the name and date of this examination, and the number(s) of the question(s) attempted in this booklet.
- If you have not attempted the question, you must still hand in the Writing Booklet, with the words 'NOT ATTEMPTED' written clearly on the front cover.
- Write using black or blue pen. (Black pen is recommended.)
- You may ask for an extra Writing Booklet if you need more space.
- **You may NOT take any Writing Booklets, used or unused, from the examination room.**

Start here.

In today's society we are not too sure on what is the truth or what is false, we just rely on the teachings and documentation of ~~the~~ that the historians and the people of the past have left us with. The area of debate that I have chosen ~~to~~ for this debate is "Elizabeth I".

As the first Queen to rule England in 1559 without a male monarch by her side; many historians have differing views of the way the Queen ruled. All we have in today's society, generation are documentaries and books written by some famous historians such as ~~Greg~~ John Guy, Peter Lake, William Camden, Jones, Susan Bassnett, Chris Heigh and David Starkey. Although as "Simon Schama" says in the statement "we are left forever chasing shadows; painfully aware of our inability to reconstruct"; we historians just have to use the sources given to us by our fellow historians.

William Camden saw Elizabeth as a "woman of her own free will" while others such as Chris Heigh believes that "Elizabeth was a weak and a bully" → was this because she was a female ruler / monarch; was this ~~was~~ the reason for ~~some~~ some historians not to like her. "She manipulated the court and her people" - Chris Heigh: We are unsure if this was Elizabeth's true nature. We only judge the events of the past from the teachings and writings of the past.

On the other hand we are given some really positive comments and views of Elizabeth I from the feminist perspective and other male historians. Susan Bassnett believed that "Her gender did not fail her"; David Starkey in his documentary "Elizabeth I" said that it was "tradition, mystery and symbolism" that made her Queen. Starkey also goes on to praise the Queen by saying that...

Additional writing space on back page.

"She was a daughter any father would be proud of". Similarly to Starkey Jones thought that Elizabeth ~~was~~ showed her self just as she was by saying "Queen Elizabeth was as protestant as a Jewel, Gridian or Cox" where as on the other hand another view of Elizabeth I political and religious view emerges. Both Peter Lake and John Guy think that the Queen was not protestant enough and that she failed in ~~the~~ her duties. This is evident in the following quote "She failed to settle religion in England and that she did not maintain protestism."

Keeping in mind the quote from John Guy and Peter Lake we are witness to the Queen ~~the~~ her self saying in the documentary by David Starkey that "it ^{is} was non of ~~her~~ ^{my} business to make windows in the souls of men" and that every man had the right to choose ~~which~~ or practice which ever

You may ask for an extra Writing Booklet if you need more space.

Start here.

religion they wanted to. Once again
^{Historians} ~~we~~ are torn between 2 different views
of the past and we are completely
aware ~~that~~ "of the inability to reconstruct
a dead world in its completeness" - Schama.
We (historians) are left to pick which
ever view ~~best~~ suits their view or image
of the Queen.

Once again taking into account the
comment Chris Heigh made about the
Queen - The Queen her self in both the
movie in "Elizabeth 1995" and the documentary
by Starkey says that "I might have
a body of a weak and fable woman
but I have a heart and stomach
of a man".

Rowe believes that the Elizabethan period
was a time of "energy and opportunity".
However Chris Heigh believed that Rowe
only wrote history the way he wanted
it to be seen and omitted or did
not see that parts which did not
suit him, the parts that he did

not like during his time. ~~the~~ Chris High also comments and says that the way Rowes portrays the Elizabethan age was like a "horror story changed to a fairytale".

One again we are brought back to Simon Schama's statement from (Afterword, Dead Certainties, 1991), "Historians are forever left chasing shadows, painfully aware of their inability ever to reconstruct a dead world." The historians of the present are not too sure whether if what they are reading is good history, or falsehood, ~~so~~ they only can count on the documentation that the historians have left behind. Whether it was written during the historians or after the events have passed.

Additional writing space on back page.