**Paper 2: Writers’ viewpoints and perspectives (non-fiction)**

**Section A: Reading**

Answer all questions in this section.

You are advised to spend about 45 minutes on this section.

1. Read again **Source A**, from **Lines 12 to 22** (Paragraph 2).

Choose **four** statements below which are TRUE.

* Shade the boxes of the ones that you think are true.
* Choose a maximum of four statements. **[4 marks] AO1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A | The Nazis and Fascists were Christian patriots saving Spain from a Russian dictatorship.  |  |
| B | The Fascists claimed that there were daily massacres in Government Spain. |  |
| C | There was a huge Russian army in Spain.  |  |
| D | Followers of General Franco believed in the presence of the Russian army.  |  |
| E | There were a few Russian technicians in Spain.  |  |
| F | Many foreigners fought in Spain. |  |
| G | Franco propagandists spent a lot of time in Government Spain.  |  |

1. You need to refer to **Source A** and **Source B** for this question:

Use details from **both** Sources. Write a summary of the differences between the writer’s enemy in each of the two articles (the Fascists and Nazis in Source A; the Russians in Source B).

**[8 marks] AO1**

1. You now need to refer **only** to **Source B**, the Times article.

How does the journalist use language to try to influence British readers? **[12 marks] AO2**

1. For this question, you need to refer to the **whole of Source A** together with **Source B,** **Lines 11 to 47**. (‘They swept proudly past’ to end)

Compare how the two writers convey their different attitudes to war.

In your answer, you should:

* compare their different attitudes
* compare the methods they use to convey their attitudes
* support your ideas with quotations from both texts. **[16 marks] AO3**

**Section B: Writing**

You are advised to spend about 45 minutes on this section.

Write in full sentences.

You are reminded of the need to plan your answer.

You should leave enough time to check your work at the end.

1. ‘There is no such thing as “the truth”. There are only opinions.’

Write a magazine article for ‘The Orwell Youth Prize’ in which you explain your point of view on these statements.  **[40 marks] AO5, 6**

**INSERT – Paper 2: Writers’ viewpoints and perspectives (non-fiction)**

**Source A: from George Orwell, ‘Looking back on the Spanish War’**

**George Orwell went to the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s to fight on the side of the Government of Spain against the Fascists who were led by General Franco and supported by Nazis. Both Fascists and Nazis were extremist parties which promoted war and national superiority.**

Early in life I have noticed that no event is ever correctly reported in a newspaper, but in Spain, for the first time, I saw newspaper reports which did not bear any relation to the facts, not even the relationship which is implied in an ordinary lie. I saw great battles reported where there had been no fighting, and complete silence where hundreds of men had been killed. I saw troops who had fought bravely denounced as cowards and traitors, and others who had never seen a shot fired hailed as the heroes of imaginary victories; and I saw newspapers in London retailing these lies […]. But the broad picture of the war which the Spanish Government presented to the world was not untruthful. The main issues were what it said they were. But as for the Fascists and their backers, how could they come even as near to the truth as that? How could they possibly mention their real aims? Their version of the war was pure fantasy, and in the circumstances it could not have been otherwise.

The only propaganda line open to the Nazis and Fascists was to represent themselves as Christian patriots saving Spain from a Russian dictatorship. This involved pretending that life in Government Spain[[1]](#footnote-1) was just one long massacre […] and it involved immensely exaggerating the scale of Russian intervention. Out of the huge pyramid of lies which the Catholic and reactionary press all over the world built up, let me take just one point — the presence in Spain of a Russian army. Devout Franco partisans all believed in this; estimates of its strength went as high as half a million. Now, there was no Russian army in Spain. There may have been a handful of airmen and other technicians, a few hundred at the most, but an army there was not. Some thousands of foreigners who fought in Spain, not to mention millions of Spaniards, were witnesses of this. Well, their testimony made no impression at all upon the Franco propagandists[[2]](#footnote-2), not one of whom had set foot in Government Spain.

This kind of thing is frightening to me, because it often gives me the feeling that the very concept of objective truth is fading out of the world. After all, the chances are that those lies, or at any rate similar lies, will pass into history. […]

I know it is the fashion to say that most of recorded history is lies anyway. I am willing to believe that history is for the most part inaccurate and biased, but what is peculiar to our own age is the abandonment of the idea that history *could* be truthfully written. In the past people deliberately lied, or they unconsciously coloured what they wrote, or they struggled after the truth, well knowing that they must make many mistakes; but in each case they believed that ‘facts’ existed and were more or less discoverable. […] A British and a German historian would disagree deeply on many things, even on fundamentals, but there would still be that body of, as it were, neutral fact on which neither would seriously challenge the other. It is just this common basis of agreement, with its implication that human beings are all one species of animal, that totalitarianism[[3]](#footnote-3) destroys. Nazi theory indeed specifically denies that such a thing as ‘the truth’ exists. There is, for instance, no such thing as ‘Science’. There is only ‘German Science’, ‘Jewish Science’, etc. The implied objective of this line of thought is a nightmare world in which the Leader, or some ruling clique, controls not only the future but *the past*. If the Leader says of such and such an event, ‘It never happened’ — well, it never happened. If he says that two and two are five — well, two and two are five. This prospect frightens me much more than bombs.

**Source B: from The Times**

**A journalist for the Times newspaper, William Howard Russell, wrote this from the Crimean War in 1854. It describes one of Britain’s greatest military disasters which came to be known as ‘The Charge of the Light Brigade’. British cavalry were ordered to charge Russian cannon; nearly all the cavalrymen were killed, without military gain.**

If the exhibition of the most brilliant valour, of the excess of courage, and of a daring which would have reflected lustre on the best days of chivalry can afford full consolation for the disaster of today, we can have no reason to regret the melancholy loss which we sustained in a contest with a savage and barbarian enemy.

I shall proceed to describe, to the best of my power, what occurred under my own eyes, and to state the facts which I have heard from men whose veracity is unimpeachable[[4]](#footnote-4), reserving to myself the right of private judgement in making public and in suppressing the details of what occurred on this memorable day [...]

At 11:00 our Light Cavalry Brigade rushed to the front [...]. The Russians opened on them with guns from the redoubts on the right, with volleys of musketry and rifles.

They swept proudly past, glittering in the morning sun in all the pride and splendour of war. We could hardly believe the evidence of our senses. Surely that handful of men were not going to charge an army in position? Alas! It was but too true -- their desperate valour knew no bounds, and far indeed was it removed from its so-called better part -- discretion. They advanced in two lines, quickening the pace as they closed towards the enemy. A more fearful spectacle was never witnessed than by those who, without the power to aid, beheld their heroic countrymen rushing to the arms of sudden death. At the distance of 1200 yards the whole line of the enemy belched forth, from thirty iron mouths, a flood of smoke and flame through which hissed the deadly balls. Their flight was marked by instant gaps in our ranks, the dead men and horses, by steeds flying wounded or riderless across the plain. The first line was broken -- it was joined by the second, they never halted or checked their speed an instant. With diminished ranks, thinned by those thirty guns, which the Russians had laid with the most deadly accuracy, with a halo of flashing steel above their heads, and with a cheer which was many a noble fellow's death cry, they flew into the smoke of the batteries; but ere[[5]](#footnote-5) they were lost from view, the plain was strewed with their bodies and with the carcasses of horses. They were exposed to an oblique fire from the batteries on the hills on both sides, as well as to a direct fire of musketry.

Through the clouds of smoke we could see their sabres flashing as they rode up to the guns and dashed between them, cutting down the gunners as they stood. The blaze of their steel, like an officer standing near me said, "was like the turn of a shoal of mackerel." We saw them riding through the guns, as I have said; to our delight, we saw them returning, after breaking through a column of Russian infantry and scattering them like chaff[[6]](#footnote-6), when the flank fire of the battery on the hill swept them down, scattered and broken as they were. Wounded men and dismounted troopers flying towards us told the sad tale -- demigods could not have done what they had failed to do. At the very moment when they were about to retreat, a regiment of lancers was hurled upon their flank[[7]](#footnote-7). Colonel Shewell, of the 8th Hussars, saw the danger and rode his men straight at them, cutting his way through with fearful loss. The other regiments turned and engaged in a desperate encounter. With courage too great almost for credence, they were breaking their way through the columns which enveloped them, where there took place an act of atrocity without parallel in modern warfare of civilized nations. The Russian gunners, when the storm of cavalry passed, returned to their guns. They saw their own cavalry mingled with the troopers who had just ridden over them, and to the eternal disgrace of the Russian name, the miscreants poured a murderous volley of grape and canister on the mass of struggling men and horses, mingling friend and foe in one common ruin. It was as much as our Heavy Cavalry Brigade could do to cover the retreat of the miserable remnants of that band of heroes as they returned to the place they had so lately quitted in all the pride of life.

1. Government Spain was the part of Spain still controlled by the government, not the Fascists [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. ‘Franco propagandists’ spread biased information (propaganda) supporting General Franco [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Totalitarianism is a system in which the government dictates all aspects of life to the people. Fascists were totalitarian. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. ‘Whose veracity is unimpeachable’ means ‘whose truthfulness cannot be questioned’ [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. ‘Ere’ means ‘before’ [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. ‘Chaff’ is the worthless part of corn [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. ‘Regiment of lancers was hurled upon their flank’ means ‘a group of enemy cavalrymen attacked them from the side’. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)