



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

## History

## HS03

## Course Essays

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

---

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

**AS UNIT 3 : COURSE ESSAYS**

*General Guidance for Examiners*

---



**A: INTRODUCTION**

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options or alternatives offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Sections B and C) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

All of the Unit 3 Course Essays will be marked by reference to a common level of response mark scheme for AS for questions requiring an extended response without (explicit) reference to documents or sources. Details are provided on the following pages.

## UNIT 3

## COURSE ESSAYS

**In marking Coursework Essays all examiners must, to decide on levels and placing of a response within a level, refer to:**

- **the generic essay mark scheme and its descriptors for AS**
- **the exemplification of AS level descriptors**
- **the indicative content designated by the Principal Examiner**
- **additional content (i.e. not in the indicative content) which is relevant and targeted**
- **guidance on discriminating within a level.**

**B: Levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response *without* explicit reference to documents or sources.**

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

*Or*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-9**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **10-14**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **15-17**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **18-20**

**C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS****Level 1: 1-4 Marks (Middle = 3)**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating, with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

**Level 2: 5-9 Marks (Middle = 7)*****Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant, but outline only, description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions

- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

**Level 3: 10-14 Marks (Middle = 12)**

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but be limited grammatically.

**Level 4: 15-17 Marks (Middle = 16)**

Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question, and provides a balanced explanation.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

**Level 5: 18-20 Marks (Middle = 19)**

As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts

- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well-directed prose.

**D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where that level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills**:
  - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
  - well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark *positively*, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

***Important Note***

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from that lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism*****A: The Military Orders in the Latin East in the Twelfth Century**

How important was the rivalry between the Knights Templar and Hospitaller in the near collapse of the Crusader states in the 1180s?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Analysis will focus on the contribution of the military orders within the context of the geographical and manpower problems faced by the Crusader states. Answers should show knowledge and understanding of the situation in the Crusader states in the 1180s and their near collapse in the aftermath of the battle of Hattin in 1187.

Most responses are likely to focus on the issues of the 1180s which present alternative explanations to the importance of the rivalry between the Military orders; the divisions within the leadership of the kingdom due to succession difficulties, the problems of the reign of King Baldwin IV (1174-1185) the ‘leper king’, the rivalry between Count Raymond of Tripoli, Guy of Lusignan and Reynald of Chatillon; Guy’s reasons and responsibility for the fateful decision to fight at Hattin in 1187.

It may be argued that the main reason for collapse was the growth of Muslim unity under Saladin; from 1174 he began to unite Egypt and Syria, Fatimid and Abbasid, Sunni and Shi’ite. The unity of Jihad against the isolated Crusader kingdom made victory inevitable.

Collapse may be seen as inevitable given the long-term structural weaknesses of the Crusader states in terms of both geography and manpower; a numerical weakness which even the 600 elite, dedicated knights of the Military orders could not offset; geographical and strategic isolation which even their castles like Belvoir and Krak des chevaliers could not mitigate. Given that this topic is focused on the Military orders, credit should be given for answers



which argue the positive contribution of the Orders, that the survival of Crusader states was partly due to the martial spirit and numerical contribution of the Templars and Hospitallers.

Although most historians make general reference to rivalry between the two military orders few give precise examples; Riley-Smith simply notes of them that ‘they were competitive, sometimes selfish, occasionally quarrelsome’. Their rivalry was a key factor in the failure of King Amalric’s campaign to capture Egypt in 1168: the Templars refused to participate alongside the Hospitallers. The long-term consequence of this was the unification of Egypt and N. Syria under the leadership of Saladin, leaving the Crusader states in the 1180s isolated and surrounded by a united Islamic world.

By the 1180s the rivalry between the two orders was reflected in the links between the Hospitallers, Count Raymond of Tripoli and the ‘doves’, the peace party, which sought accommodation with the Muslims, while the Templars were more militant, siding with Reynald of Chatillon and the ‘hawks’, those who sought continual warfare.

In September 1186 the military orders were divided over the succession to the throne; Gerald de Ridefort was a key supporter of the claim to the throne of Sybilla and her husband Guy of Lusignan, while Roger of Moulins, Master of the Hospital supported Raymond of Tripoli’s claim as regent. Indeed Roger refused to hand over his key to the treasury where the crown was kept.

Regarding the Orders, it may be argued that Gerard de Ridefort’s was a personal impact, he was to blame not divisions between the orders.

In May 1187 Gerard de Rideford actually taunted his Hospitaller counterpart with cowardice. The subsequent battle at the Springs of Cresson and the loss of 140 elite troops from the Military orders, including Roger of Moulins, Master of the Hospital, played a key role in the subsequent defeat at the Horns of Hattin in July 1187.

Candidates may argue against the implications of the question; in 1184 the two orders co-operated in seeking aid from the west, the two Masters, Roger of Moulins for the Hospitallers, and Arnold of Torroja for the Temple, set out on a diplomatic tour of western Christendom. They could argue that the Crusader states only lasted as long as they did because of the orders’ commitment, castles and numerical contribution.

Judgement may refer to context, for example in the aftermath of the near collapse in 1187-8 it was the orders which ensured continuity; the two Hospitaller castles of Crac des Chevaliers and Margat survived the Muslim onslaught and provided footholds which Richard and the Third Crusade exploited to ensure the continuing survival of Outremer for a further century.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism***B: The Development of new Monasticism in Twelfth Century Europe**

How important was the influence of the Carta Caritatis in the success of the Cistercian order during the twelfth century?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers will consider a range of reasons for the growth of the Cistercian order, in particular the role of its constitution and organisation. This is likely to include:

- an outline of the growth of the order, number of houses, popularity, moral influence. Its rapid growth from one house in 1112 to 343 in 1153 and 738 by 1500
- the Carta Caritatis (Charter of Charity) – the constitution of the order confirmed by Pope Calixtus II in 1119, and the impact of the organisation and discipline it provided
- the structure and discipline of the order, ensuring uniformity of observance and the contrast with the previously dominant Cluniac monasticism
- the federal framework and uniform observance of the monastic rule
- filiation, daughter houses, visitations and the general chapter as means of preserving Cistercian ideals through the concept of mutual love, and maintaining the austerity so admired by patrons
- the role and influence of the author of the Carta Caritatis, Stephen Harding, source of a monastic philosophy which maintained and strengthened the ideals of New Monasticism

- the use of conversi; the social catholicity of the Cistercians which let them tap into lay religious fervour in social groups previously excluded from monasticism. Also, the economic impact of the lay brothers.

Evaluation may focus on alternative reasons for growth:

- Bernard of Clairvaux – the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, his role as the order’s foremost apologist and recruiting officer
- his charismatic personality and personal example in austerity and asceticism, mentor to Popes and councillor to kings
- his prestige and inspirational role as preacher and author and the order’s relative decline after his death
- also, the impact of Clairvaux as a mother-house, mother house to a filiation of 159 Cistercian monasteries by the time of Bernard’s death in 1153
- Bernard’s ‘golden eloquence’ in articulating Cistercian ideals, especially his letters and debates with Peter the Venerable as a means of promoting the New Monasticism
- the role of economic success in growth, sheep farming and wool production, manual labour and the lay brothers, the significance of monastic seclusion and the uncleared waste.

Sustained judgement and understanding may focus on the challenge to the implication of the question in the role of Cistercian mythologizing and hagiography – the view that written structures and the constitution of the Carta Caritatis were only created after success.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*****A: The origins of the French Wars of Religion**

How important a factor in explaining the outbreak of the French wars of religion in 1562 was the developing social and political strength of the Huguenots?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers will need to assess the social and political strength of the Huguenots and the extent to which it was developing, against the effects of other factors explaining the outbreak of the wars by 1562. The social strength came from the membership of the religious group; answers are likely to refer to numbers and social groupings. Estimates suggest approximately 2 million or 12% of the population of France were Huguenot by 1570. They were unevenly scattered with large concentrations e.g. in Rouen and the Huguenot crescent of the south. Most were townfolk and most were from the lower social groups. However, in the 1560s a good number of conversions were amongst the nobility. There is a debate linked to economic conditions about why this happened. There are other views which promote clientage as the most likely factor and evidence for this is seen in the south-west of France. This would help to explain the pressure placed on the crown to consider some toleration of Huguenots and events which led to the First War.

Politically, the Huguenots were not strong for much of the period pre-1562; they had been persecuted under Henry II and they had few representatives at court, – most notably Anthony, King of Navarre and Louis, Prince of Conde. On the death of Henry II, they were both kept away from the main policy making by the Catholic Guises. The Guises, under Francis II, continued the policy of persecution, e.g. Anne du Bourg was burned at the stake and the death penalty was imposed for anyone attending Huguenot meetings. Their attempts to gain favour with Catherine de Medici were not successful. However, they did attempt to seize

power in the Tumult of Amboise of 1559. The plot failed but had the effect of generating some initial leniency which eventually led to some relaxation of the laws. This was however, also a function of the death of Francis II, the minority of Charles IX and the regency of Catherine de Medici who wanted to establish a new equilibrium in government and saw using the Bourbon Huguenot family as one means of achieving this. Once the support of the monarchy seemed to be forthcoming, the Huguenots gathered strength. The resulting backlash was a major factor in the outbreak of the Wars of Religion.

Therefore, answers should assess, against the growth of the Huguenots, the strength of the forces ranged against them e.g. the Guises and the Catholic party, and the policies of Catherine de Medici as Regent. Mention could be made of the formation of the Triumvirate, the Edict of Toleration, the Colloquy of Poissy and the Edict of January. Discussion of the growing political, personal and financial weakness of the crown and its subordination to faction is also important in arriving at a reasoned assessment.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*****B: The role of Individuals and ideas in the French Wars of Religion, 1562-1598**

How effective was Henry Navarre as the leader of the Huguenots in the years 1576 to 1598?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

After the death of Coligny in the Massacre of St Bartholomew in 1572, Henry was the leader of the Huguenots, albeit imprisoned in Paris until his escape in 1576. As a leader he should be assessed in terms of his military, political and personal success.

In political terms, Henry's first success was in the Peace of Monsieur (1576) where the terms were largely dictated by the Huguenots – e.g. they gained the right of free public worship outside Paris throughout France, *chambres-mis-parties* were created in all sovereign courts and the king was to call the Estates General. However, the subsequent opposition of the King, and lack of support of the Estates General made these agreements difficult to enforce and resulted in further war. The brevity of this war was a result of Catholic weaknesses rather than Protestant strength and some ground was lost. Henry had more success in the short 7<sup>th</sup> war but again the peace arrangements could not be enforced and Huguenot rights were not maintained. Militarily, Henry of Navarre came under increasing pressure following the death of Anjou and the rise of the Catholic League. He looked for aid from England and German Protestants with mixed military success.

Eventual Huguenot victory could be seen more as the result of circumstance/other factors than of Henry of Navarre's making e.g. the seizure of Paris by the League (Sixteen), the murder of the Duke and Cardinal by Henry III, the decision by Henry III to join forces with Henry of Navarre to regain Paris, the subsequent assassination of the king. Once Henry of

Navarre was King Henry IV (in name only) the military struggle which followed between the League and Henry of Navarre was more successful, culminating in the siege of Paris in 1590. However, the intervention of Spain relieved Paris and brought further League victories. Fortunately, the failure of the League to find an acceptable candidate for the throne created fears of Spanish domination and Henry's decision to become Catholic turned the tables. This was probably the masterstroke, and resulted in his coronation. He understood the need to win over Paris and the people, did not try to prevent Spanish forces leaving the capital peacefully and dealt leniently with the League. His mastery of propaganda techniques, e.g. worshipping in every church in Paris ensured acceptance. The subsequent defeat of Spanish forces and the issuing of the Edict of Nantes finally secured the throne.

Answers which refer to military events alone will not be effectively balanced. Some consideration should be given to Henry's character, political acumen and use of propaganda to arrive at a reasoned conclusion about the effectiveness of his leadership.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative C : The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1688-1789*****A: The Regency, 1715-1723**

How important, in explaining the Regency's failure to solve the problems of France, 1715-1723, was the fact that the Regent lacked the authority of an absolute monarch?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers will be expected to identify a range of problems which faced France in the relevant period – constitutional, political, religious, financial, economic and possibly, if to a lesser extent, social. The problems were exacerbated by their inter-relationship. The international tensions bequeathed as a result of the Peace of Utrecht might be seen as a further significant “problem” but coverage of this cannot be expected as the focus of the specification is only on domestic policy.

There was a minor on the throne; Louis XIV distrusted Orleans so in his will set up a Council of Regency, which included Louis' illegitimate sons, to control Orleans; the Parlement of Paris wanted reinstatement of the Right of Remonstrance and had been restless over the registering of the Papal Bull Unigenitus even before the death of Louis; Parlement claimed to be the defenders of Gallicanism and, as a result, offered some hope for Jansenists in the Church which was bitterly divided by 1715 with the Archbishop of Paris in prison. The massive burden of debt left by Louis XIV was the most urgent problem for the Regent to solve and the chance of doing this was slim in face of entrenched privilege and tax exemption; many of the nobility were keen to regain some role in government and Orleans was very conscious of the Frondes in the last Regency in France and he wished to avoid any confrontation which might lead to civil disturbance.



It is valid to challenge the “failure” of the Regent to resolve some of the problems but this should not be given undue weight as the focus of the question is on assessment of the various reasons for his difficulties – if not total failure.

Technically a Regent did have the authority of the monarch but Orleans had compromised its absolutism by restoring the Parlement’s Right of Remonstrance in return for the overturning of Louis XIV’s will thus making him sole Regent. Orleans then faced difficulties in gaining Parlement’s acceptance of Law’s financial schemes and the registration of Unigenitus, but he did deal firmly with their opposition by exiling the Parlement. The Polysynodie failed because of the indolence of the nobility and had been an astute manoeuvre by Orleans to divert the nobility rather than a serious attempt at power-sharing. Commitment to religious principle can be argued to have been the reason for the failure to resolve the issue of Jansenism, which had proved a problem even for Louis XIV, and Orleans’ compromise solution over Unigenitus pleased neither side. Other problems were too long-standing in nature to be dealt with in so brief a period: the tax-exemption of the nobility and the resistance of the financially privileged, which under-mined then ruined Law’s financial experiment; the flaws of the tax system; the enormity of the royal debt; economic dislocation. None of these had been dealt with by Louis XIV and proved too much for Orleans – although he did try to tackle them, so might be argued to have failed because he was over-ambitious or even naive rather than lacking in authority.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1688-1789***B: Cardinal Fleury, 1726-1743**

Explain why and with what consequences Cardinal Fleury was allowed to control the government of France for so long.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers should examine the reasons for Fleury controlling the government of France for so long and the consequences of this.

The points analysed might include:

Why he was able to control the government of France.

- royal favour – had links to royal family – respected and admired by his pupil Louis XV who showed great loyalty to him – enabled him to stay in power 13 years
- his character – seen as mild and inoffensive but could be ruthless if the occasion demanded it. Had energy, determination, wisdom, was respected and revered (a bishop). Honest and ran an honest administration
- conservative and pacifist approach suited the times – enabled him to work well with his team (D’Agnesseau, Maurepas, D’Angervilles, Orry). This helped him achieve some success with policies, e.g. finance which avoided experiments and restored confidence; economic policies which developed overseas trade – enabled growth and brought moderate prosperity, harmony in the system of government; agitation of Jansenists appeased for a time; more stable government which avoided rebellion, some improvement

in relations with the parlement. Such policies created general satisfaction and enabled him to stay in power.

Consequences:

- the Parlements were left defenceless and sore
- the old tax system had been restored with all its faults and there was no blueprint for reform
- the power of the Parlements had not been crushed
- the army and navy had been neglected
- the Jansenists were left bitter as a result of Fleury's intransigence
- return to mercantilist policies brought with it all the old rigidity – not advantageous e.g. to industry
- led to serious delusion about the health e.g. of the financial structure until the 1780s.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative D: Europe, 1825-1850*****A: European Diplomacy 1825 to 1835**

How serious a threat to Great Power relations in the period 1831-33 was the Mehemet Ali crisis?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Mark as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

In order to establish the impact of the Mehemet Ali crisis upon Great Power relations (Britain, Russia, France and Austria) an assessment of those relationships needs to be examined before the period in question briefly.

***Relationships before 1831***

One interpretation is that the Mehemet Ali crisis DID seriously threaten Great Power relations as they had proved themselves on the eve of the crisis willing and able to work together to solve potential triggers for armed conflict between themselves. Britain, France and Russia co-operated to guarantee Greek Independence (London Protocol 1830). Belgian independence was guaranteed by all the Great Powers with the Treaty of London (1831).

Alternatively arguments can be made that the crisis DID NOT threaten relationships which were already strained following the breakdown of the Congress System which proved that the Great Powers' main concern was self interest. In any case the crisis did not lead to armed conflict between the powers.

Candidates need to assess why the situation in the Near East was extremely sensitive and a possible area for the future conflict between the Great Powers. This was due to their different aims for the ailing Ottoman Empire e.g. Britain wanted to secure trade routes to India and prevent Russian expansion westwards, Russian aims were unclear, but control of the

Dardanelles to maintain the Black Sea shipping link was key, Austria wanted to maintain the Empire to prevent Russian expansionism whilst France wanted to protect her close ties with Egypt.

Long descriptions of the Mehemet Ali crisis are not in themselves useful, although a brief context is. What is needed is an analysis/commentary on the impact of Ali's actions on Great Power relations.

#### *The Mehemet Ali Crisis*

Mehemet Ali, Viceroy of Egypt, launched an attack on Syria in November 1831, threatening the strategically important city of Constantinople. This was in order to secure territory promised by the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire following Egypt's support during the war of Greek Independence. The Sultan turned to Russia for help and by 1833 14 000 Russian soldiers had saved Constantinople and the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi followed.

#### *The threat posed by the crisis*

France supported Mehemet Ali, but disliked Russian direct action, as did all the Great Powers. The Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi increased Great Power fears further as its impact was to, in effect, make Turkey a virtual Russian satellite state. From the Russian viewpoint it was a defensive treaty, secret clauses limited the Sultan's responsibilities to closing the Dardanelles to foreign warships whenever Russia was at war, sealing off the Black Sea from enemy attack. From the viewpoint of Britain and France this treaty gave Russia the right to send warships through the Dardanelles. British and French hostility forced Russia to seek Austrian support and the two Empires signed the Munchengratz Agreement in September 1833.

#### *Conclusions*

The Mehemet Ali crisis reconfirmed and some may argue intensified the traditional East versus West division of the Great Powers. The Munchengratz Agreement, which was later signed by Prussia, was in effect a renewal of the Holy Alliance and the Troppau Protocol which had contributed to the death of the Congress System. In 1834 Palmerston created the Quadruple Alliance which was committed to the restoration of liberal monarchies in the Iberian peninsular. It can be argued that the crisis was not that significant as it was the traditional fear of Russian foreign policy that re-engaged the tension between the Great Powers. It can also be argued that self-interests of the Great Powers also made harmonious relations between them difficult. Some may argue legitimately that there were other more serious points of conflict between the Great Powers during 1831-33 (for example the consequences of the Belgium and Polish revolts just fall inside this period), but this should be balanced with a thorough examination of the Mehemet Ali crisis.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative D: Europe, 1825-1850*****B: The Revolutions of 1848 and their immediate aftermath to 1850**

Examine the extent to which divisions within the ranks of the Italian revolutionaries were responsible for the failure to create a united Italy in the period 1848-1849.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Mark as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

The main focus of answers should be the divisions among the ranks of the revolutionaries, although this will need to be balanced against other internal and external factors causing the failure of a united Italy in the period 1848-49. Divisions ranged from ideological/political, geographical, social and cultural.

*Ideological/political divisions*

- Moderate/radical lines due to the influence of nationalist writers – Mazzini, Balbo and Gioberti.
- Political divisions were intensified by Charles Albert who required potential allies to submit to Piedmontese control, as he was more concerned with extending his own and Piedmont's power than uniting Italy.

*Geographical divisions*

- Inter-state rivalry and local disputes precluded co-ordination.
- Uprisings in Milan and Venetia were against Austrian rule.
- Sicily wanted independence from Naples and Bourbon rule.
- Uprisings in Naples, Tuscany, Piedmont and the Papal States were in order to secure a more representative and liberal government.
- State suspicion and reluctance to support Charles Albert and Piedmontese ambitions.

*Social divisions*

- Prevented unanimity of action, as the propertied classes feared a social revolution and “mob rule”.
- Ferdinand II of Naples staged a successful counter-revolution in May 1848 because of fears provoked amongst property owners by peasants occupying noble estates.
- Revolutions were middle class affairs and lacked mass support due to their ignorance of the plight of the peasantry and failure to introduce social policies.

*Cultural divisions*

- Little awareness of a national self-identity, confined to an educated minority who could not spread their message to the masses due to the scores of local dialects and overwhelming illiteracy.

However, there were other internal reasons for the failure to create a united Italy in 1848-49. Significantly these include:

- The withdrawal of Pope Pius IX’s support for Charles Albert’s declaration of war against Austria in March 1848. It increased the forces of absolutism as the Catholic powers of Europe were bound to uphold the Pope’s temporal power and independence and removed the possibility of Gioberti’s Papal federation.
- The potential leaders of the national movement (Charles Albert, Mazzini, Pius IX) lacked widespread support, had insufficient power and inclination to co-ordinate the struggle for a united Italy.
- The provisional and inexperienced revolutionary regimes were unable to provide effective solutions to the economic and political problems that had brought them into power. This was clearly a factor in the downfall of the Roman Republic and a reason why Piedmont once again sought war with Austria to deflect attention away from internal crises.

External factors played a significant role in the failure to create a united Italy.

- Superior military powers crushed the disorganised troops of the uncoordinated revolutionaries.
- Austrian forces swiftly recovered under the leadership of elderly Radetzky. Within a month of his victory at Custozza in July 1848, all of Lombardy and Venetia (apart from Venice) had been subdued. Piedmont was defeated yet again by Austrian troops in 1849 at Novara; and the Austrian Navy destroyed the Venetian Republic.
- The French forces of Louis Napoleon defeated the Roman Republic in 1849.

Some of the following observations may be made in the conclusion.

- The key factor in the revolutions’ collapse was the reassertion of Austrian military power.
- The revolutionaries were struggling to maintain the gains they had made in 1848 due to the internal divisions and a lack of co-ordination.
- The restoration of Habsburg control was only temporary and was eventually overthrown by the lessons learnt in 1848-49. Firstly that Italy would need outside help to overthrow Austria, secondly that the Papacy would no longer be a way to gain unity, and thirdly that the Piedmontese constitution was the most logical way to pursue a Liberal Italy.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870-1914*****A: The Balkans, 1870-1890**

With what success did the Congress of Berlin secure peace in the Balkans in the years 1878 to 1890?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates should review the details of the Congress and Treaty of Berlin with the initial success in averting further conflict and apparently providing a balanced settlement. They should make reference to the break-up of an enlarged and Russian controlled Bulgaria, checking the prospects of Russian dominance in the Balkans after the earlier Treaty of San Stefano, Bosnia-Herzegovina occupied by Austria-Hungary, Britain's gain of Cyprus, independence confirmed for Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria, French consent to pursue Tunis etc. Germany alone gained nothing. However, although the acclaim of 'peace with honour' might suggest personal success for Bismarck and Disraeli, the Eastern Question was not solved, and no-one was satisfied. The Treaty can only be regarded as a temporary and limited solution, providing the sources of future unrest in the Balkans, with a lack of Turkish reforms, and increased Slav nationalism and Russian bitterness. It marked a humiliating diplomatic defeat for Russia, breaking the Dreikaiserbund; Austria-Hungary now had a foothold in a Serb province and her relations with Russia were bound to deteriorate. The Bulgarian crisis starting in 1885 destroyed the delicate diplomatic harmony established at Berlin, with a revolt in Eastern Rumelia for union with Bulgaria, contravening the Treaty, and undermined Bismarck's carefully balanced network of alliances, with a further disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in Europe only 7 years after the Treaty of Berlin. The uneasy peace by 1890 revealed Austria-Hungary as the dominant power in the Balkans with Russia turning towards the Far East.



Higher level answers should show range over the period up to 1890 and should provide a balanced assessment, recognising that although the Treaty was perhaps as successful as could reasonably be expected, this success was largely superficial, and Balkan issues were put on ice rather than solved. Candidates might also observe that the Balkan states themselves seemed to count for little, and in future Balkan nationalism would be increasingly difficult to ignore. Less effective responses will tend to be over-descriptive, with a narrower focus, perhaps on short-term success in 1878.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870-1914*****B: The Balkans, 1890-1914**

Explain why events in the Balkans contributed to the growth of international tension in the years 1908 to 1914.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

The main events in question focus on the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, the two Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, and the 1914 crisis following the assassination in Sarajevo. These events, which marked an upsurge in Balkan nationalism, need to be seen in the broader context of international rivalry, and cannot be separated from the increasing tension and ultimate conflict between two competing European alliances. Balkan nationalism threatened the stability of the multi-racial Austro-Hungarian Empire, and enabled Russia to sponsor and promote Serbia. German Weltpolitik highlighted the diplomatic tensions and increasing brinkmanship. Rivalry between the Balkan states themselves was a further complication. The annexation of Bosnia in 1908 caused diplomatic turmoil, with serious implications for the future, as Serb nationalists now looked to an embittered Russia to take on an over-confident Austria-Hungary. The developing nationalism of the Balkan League, reflected in the Wars of 1912 and 1913, strengthened Serbia and changed the military balance, threatening Austria-Hungary and increasing Russian influence. The murders at Sarajevo proved to be the catalyst provoking a chain reaction involving the major powers – ‘blank cheque’, ultimatum, mobilisation, alliance commitments etc. International tension escalated into European war.

Good answers are likely to link Balkan events with the international context, highlighting the diverse reactions to these complex issues, and relating Balkan nationalism to international rivalry, as diplomatic relations continued to deteriorate.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917-1929*****A: Lenin and the consolidation of the Bolshevik state 1917-1924**

How accurate is the view that there was a tightening of Communist control over the USSR between 1921 and the death of Lenin in 1924?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers should focus upon certain key themes and events in the period 1921-24, although the context may well be set by examining the impact of the Civil War years. These had already seen the imposition of a considerable amount of centralised control, as part of the Bolshevik strategy for winning the war. Centralisation had already been evident in the draconian nature of War Communism, with state control of industry, ruthless requisitioning of food from the peasantry and conscription. Political control from the centre had been tightened as the powers of local soviets were superseded, the relative lack of discipline in the Party was addressed by growing direction from the centre, the committees of workers running factories had less authority and military discipline in the Red Army was tightened up – all possibly the inevitable result of a war situation which demanded centralised control, but also perhaps in the spirit of the Leninist concept of ‘democratic centralism’. Dissatisfaction with shortages and the nature of Bolshevik control was evident in events such as the Tambov Revolt and the Kronstadt Rebellion. Although Trotsky in 1920 was arguing for more coercion, including the militarisation of labour, Lenin had already decided on economic concessions in the NEP, introduced at the Tenth Party Congress, but this was accompanied by a political clampdown: the clampdown on internal debate and the consolidation of the one-party state. Factionalism was banned, and the machinery was in place to prevent any open discussion of policy, although expressions of discontent continued, for example by the Workers’ Opposition. The new mood was evident, for example, in the decision of the Thirteenth Party Conference in January 1924, manipulated by Stalin, to denounce the “New

Course” of Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev. The remnants of other political parties on the Left were soon disposed of after 1921.

Answers may well include a discussion of the extent to which the NEP was a “retreat” or part of a coherent policy. Despite the opportunities now available on the free market allowed by the NEP, the fact that the State still controlled the “commanding heights of the economy” such as the factories and mines ensured a considerable element of Communist control. The discussion might also include Lenin’s concerns over bureaucracy and the direction of the Party: for example the process, already well under way, by which power was increasingly centralised in a few bodies such as the Politburo, Orgburo and Secretariat. Lenin’s Testament and other later writings showed his concern with growing centralisation and what he referred to as the evils of “bureaucratisation”.

Stalin’s role as General Secretary was important, with his control over the Party machine, making him the most powerful man in the USSR even before Lenin’s death. The formation of the USSR following Stalin’s 1922 plan and consolidated in the 1924 Constitution marked the beginning of centralised control over the various Republics.

There might even be a discussion of cultural and other factors. Lenin in 1922 was issuing secret orders for an attack on the Church. In 1922 a Ministry of Censorship was established and there was growing interference of the Party in cultural life and the subordination of culture to political needs, although this was nothing like as developed as it was to become under Stalin. Such a discussion of cultural affairs is not obligatory.

Communist control still had its limitations in 1924. Despite attempts to spread the Communist message around the countryside, the Party was still essentially urban-based, and the Communists were not to achieve firm control in rural areas until Stalin’s collectivisation programme.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917-1929*****B: Stalin's rise to power 1922-1929**

Why did debates about economic policy play such an important part in the events surrounding Stalin's rise to power in the 1920s?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers should focus upon the debates over economic policy, particularly the treatment of the peasantry and the best path to Socialism – basically Left v Right – which took place in the context of the political manoeuvrings which resulted in Stalin's rise to power. NEP, despite its apparent success in restoring production after the devastation of the war and the civil war years, was only regarded as a temporary measure by most Party members. NEP provoked arguments about the undesirability of allowing capitalist practices such as private ownership and the reopening of class divisions, for example the growth of a Kulak class in the countryside. In addition, economic progress had not been smooth: the Scissors crisis had revealed the disparate growth rates of industry and agriculture. There were fervent arguments about rapid industrialisation v gradual industrialisation, and the role of the peasantry in this process.

The economic debates became inextricably linked with the infighting for power following Lenin's death in 1924. However, the debates were not just cynical ploys in a power struggle: although some Party members changed their stance during the 1920s, all Communists accepted that the ultimate goal was industrialisation and socialism – but there were serious arguments about the best way to achieve this.

By the mid 1920s Stalin was arguing against Trotsky's policy of "Permanent Revolution" and in favour of Socialism in One Country: the belief that the building of socialism could begin in Russia, using internal resources alone. Although Trotsky modified his position, Stalin used

his ideas as a means of attacking the Left. In 1925, with Trotsky having been defeated in the political debates, Zinoviev and Kamenev went into opposition against the majority led by Stalin, Bukharin and Rykov. In 1926 the defeated Zinoviev and Kamenev joined the defeated Trotsky in the United Opposition, calling for accelerated industrialisation and a reduction in the influence of the Kulaks. This probably helped Stalin since it reinforced the impression of opportunism on the part of the opposition. Bukharin, who had become the chief advocate of the “gradualist” approach, encouraging the growth of a healthy peasant economy as a basis for further economic progress, was joined by Stalin at the Fifteenth Party Congress in December 1927 to defeat the opposition. Members of the opposition lost their posts, and in Trotsky’s case were exiled. Stalin no longer faced a serious threat from the Left. His own increasing ruthlessness was already in evidence in 1928 when requisitioning methods (the “Urals-Siberian method”) were resumed against the peasantry following a shortfall in grain deliveries. The Right (Bukharin, Rykov etc.) were alarmed and attempted an accommodation with the defeated Left, but isolated, they were defeated in turn. Stalin was effectively the leader of the USSR, and whilst not yet powerful enough to eliminate past or perceived future opponents completely, he was free to launch the “second revolution” of collectivisation and industrialisation.

Answers may well include material on Stalin, other individuals and various events to explain how Stalin arrived at supreme power. Themes may include the uncertain situation of the leadership following Lenin’s death and inconclusive Testament, the changes in the nature of the Party which enabled Stalin as General Secretary to get supporters in key positions, Stalin’s skill in presenting himself as a man of the centre and adapting to circumstances, the many personal failings and tactical mistakes of supposedly intelligent Communists like Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev. All this is relevant, but only if applied to the question, which is about the economic debates, which were seen as crucial to the development and indeed survival of the USSR as a socialist state. It is up to candidates to argue the extent to which the debates about NEP, the peasantry, the rate of industrialisation etc. were the main driving forces of individuals or factions, and to what extent they were part of a struggle for leadership or power for its own sake. The truth is probably that the two strands were intermingled to a greater or lesser extent in every individual. But the question is not just about Stalin’s rise to power.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative G : Germany, c1925-1938*****A: The Weimar Republic c1925-1933**

Explain the importance of the German Chancellors, Brüning, von Papen, and von Schleicher, in the collapse of the Weimar Republic between March 1930 and January 1933.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers will be expected to examine the contribution of each Chancellor to the collapse of Weimar democracy and Hitler's seizure of power and to make some assessment of the importance of the role of each of the three:

e.g. Brüning (Chancellor March 1930-May 1932) resorted to the President's Article 48 in an attempt to combat the depression and unwittingly gave Hitler an opportunity to break into politics by calling elections in July 1930. His austerity programme increased the Nazi vote and his public works scheme came too late. Schleicher, (who had supported his appointment) turned against him and he resigned over a disagreement with Hindenburg concerning agrarian reform in East Germany.

The debate on the importance of Brüning's role, might be expected to centre on whether his method of government by decree was an attempt to preserve the Weimar political system, or whether this was a stepping stone to Hitler's dictatorship. His policies, and his "helping hand" to the Nazis in the 1930 election, might also be examined.

Von Papen (Chancellor May-November 1932) came from the right wing and attempted to rule through a non-party government of "national concentration" made up of members of the elite, none of which were in the Reichstag. He hoped to win Nazi support by lifting Brüning's ban on the SA in June 1932. Measures, such as deposing the Socialist coalition

government in Prussia, undermined democracy. His agreement to Hitler's demand for more elections in July 1932 gave further opportunities to the extremist parties. He considered using the army to suppress opposition, but the threat of civil war led Schleicher to persuade Hindenburg to appoint himself. Papen's subsequent intrigue with Hitler produced a scheme whereby Hitler would become Chancellor with von Papen as Vice Chancellor.

Comment on the importance of von Papen's role will involve discussion of his hostility to the Reichstag and his attempt to rule with the elites. His action in deposing the state government of Prussia which undermined both parliamentary government, and the left, and provided a precedent for Hitler, might also be mentioned.

Von Schleicher (Chancellor Dec. 1932-Jan 1933) was influential behind the scenes throughout 1930-1932. His concern over the power of the Nazis (whom he hoped to incorporate in a working government) and fear of civil war led him to put himself forward as Chancellor, with the Nazi, Gregor Strasser as Vice Chancellor. He favoured a broader based government but his links with the Nazis alienated the left, while his agrarian plans (similar to Brüning's) also lost him support from the traditional right.

The importance of Schleicher's role lay in his influence on Hindenburg, the appointments and dismissals of Brüning and von Papen, and his own misjudged chancellorship. It was von Schleicher's actions which led directly to Hitler's invitation to become Chancellor.

A well balanced answer may also explain the importance of these Chancellors in the context of other events leading to the collapse of Weimar democracy - the impact of the depression, the growth and appeal of the Nazi party and Hitler in particular, the part of President Hindenburg and the Weimar constitution and the attitude of the elite. These factors are not, however, essential to high level answers. The main focus of all essays should be on the Chancellors themselves and candidates can show higher level skills of analysis, balance and judgement either by concentrating solely on an assessment of the various Chancellors – perhaps comparing one with another – or by balancing the roles of the Chancellors against other factors.



**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03****Alternative G: *Germany, c1925-1938*****B: The Nazi consolidation of power 1930-1938**

With what success did Hitler attempt to win the loyalty of the army between 1933 and 1938?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers will be expected to focus on the relationship between Hitler and the army and are likely to consider:

- the potential problem of winning army loyalty (the potential danger of an established and powerful institution led by respected members of the elite)
- the attempt to reassure the army through the weakening of the SA in the Night of the Long Knives
- the importance of Hindenburg's death and Hitler's position as "Supreme Commander" supported by the army oath of loyalty (1934)
- the use of anti-Bolshevism, anti-liberalism and nationalist slogans to win support
- the influence of rearmament and conscription helping to create the "twin pillar" idea of the army and the Nazi Party as two columns which upheld the State
- Hitler's action in leaving the army largely unchanged, although larger (a 20 fold increase 1933-1939) and with a Nazi approach to training, before the breakdown in relations in 1937/8
- the turning point, following the revelation of Hitler's plans for a more aggressive approach to foreign policy in the Hossbach memorandum (1937)
- Hitler's exploitation of the Blomberg-Fritsch affair to make changes to army leadership
- Hitler's assumption of the post of Commander-in-Chief with a new High Command, the OKW, set up under Wilhelm Keitel. This gave Hitler direct military powers for the first time and was an important final step in Hitler's consolidation of power

- the Beck conspiracy which followed Hitler's decision to attack Czechoslovakia in May 1938. (Beck, army Chief of Staff, failed to win over other commanders in opposition to Hitler's plans and after resigning in August 1938 planned a March on Berlin. This was called off after Hitler took the Sudetenland – but many other generals had tacitly sympathised and had adopted a “wait and see” attitude, showing the limitations on army loyalty.)

Candidates will need to look at Hitler's attitude and methods in his quest for uncompromising loyalty and they will need to consider the extent to which Hitler did ultimately succeed in winning over this key institution. This should lead to some assessment of the relationship in 1938 (but note that while future developments may be referred to, specific material from the war years is irrelevant here).

Particular areas worthy of consideration might include:

- the army's underlying worries over the pace of rearmament and the direction of foreign policy, especially after 1937, which meant loyalty might only be skin deep (as evidenced by the ambivalent attitude of officers to the Beck conspiracy)
- army concerns about the role of the SS
- the continuing power of individual army leaders
- the (understandable) reluctance of army generals to voice their fears, possibly coupled with an underlying arrogance, leading them to believe that they could still direct events
- an inclination not to take Hitler's plans seriously.

Candidates are likely to conclude that Hitler was never entirely successful in winning the loyalty of the army, although after 1937/8, he was in a much stronger position and it became almost impossible for the army to stand against him (although continuing opposition in some quarters was, of course, to culminate in the Bomb Plot of 1944).

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa*****A: Britain and Kenyan Independence, 1953 to 1964**

How important was the contribution of Kenyan nationalism to the achievement of Kenyan independence in the years 1953 to 1963?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers may attempt to distinguish between the different types of Kenyan nationalism. This may include reference to the extremism of the Mau Mau and the non-violent approach of Tom Mboya. Candidates may suggest that the Mau Mau was a sectional group who represented the Kikuyu tribe rather than the whole black Kenyan population. They may go on to suggest that the Mau Mau's impact was relatively limited. By 1958 most of its active members had been imprisoned, as had its leader, Kenyatta. The Mau Mau was an economic burden on Britain and its actions continued to highlight the demand for independence on an international level but it never presented itself, in the minds of the British, as a viable option for responsible government in a post-colonial Kenya. Democratic political parties emerged in Kenya with the aim of promoting independence. The most significant of these was KANU (the Kenyan African National Union). This gave Kenyatta a degree of political respectability when he became its leader. Kenyan democrats were represented at the vitally important Lancaster House conferences between 1960 and 1962. Other factors also contributed to independence. The role of Macmillan is of great significance. Candidates may suggest that he acted as a catalyst in the move towards independence. He viewed Britain's African colonies as whole and he accepted that by 1960 the tide of pan-African nationalism could not be halted. This is referred to in the 'winds of change' speech. Macmillan was not a traditional reactionary Conservative. He had an international perspective and was aware of the impact of Britain's humiliation in the 1956 Suez crisis. Other factors may include the failure of attempts to establish compromise solutions pre-Macmillan, e.g. the Lyttleton Constitution. Candidates may suggest that the driving force in achieving independence was

Macmillan. He appointed men such as Macleod, who were modernists and committed to the idea. Macleod was able to steer a politically acceptable route through to the post-colonial settlement through his work in organising the Lancaster House conferences. To a large extent the initiatives for independence came from the political will of the British and the changes in the economic and political agenda for Britain. The measure of international status was no longer empire. Britain's future lay with its influence in Europe and its alliance with the USA. Colonies were increasingly becoming an irrelevancy and a political and economic liability and Macmillan recognised this.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa***B: France and Algerian Independence, 1954 to 1962**

How important was the part played by de Gaulle in the granting of independence to Algeria?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

De Gaulle may be presented as a key factor in the achievement of Algerian independence. His response was driven by a range of inter-related issues. The French army had become a real threat to the stability of the French political system. In its determination to ensure victory and avoid the humiliation of defeat Army leaders sought to overthrow the French government because of the possibility of conceding to independence. The Army formed an alliance with the Algerian colonists which heightened the threat to the stability of France. These factors are related because by removing the Algerian problem De Gaulle would also remove the military threat. Candidates may suggest that the tactics used by the French army in Algeria contributed to independence because they created a massive support base for the independence movement which may not have come into existence otherwise. Reference may be made to the use of military terrorism. The role of the FLN may be referred to. Their tactics were based on terrorism and the creation of martyrs. By provoking the French Army they were able to expand their own influence. The FLN threat was never eliminated and its organisation became ever stronger. The impact of French public opinion is also an important factor. The link here is with the FLN terrorist tactics. As more young French conscripts were killed in Algeria so public opinion increasingly sought to put pressure on the Army to solve the problem and on the government to abandon Algeria to the Algerians. Again there is a link to the wider issue of political stability in France itself and the effects the struggle to retain Algeria had on France. Candidates need to identify de Gaulle's perception of empire in the wider context of France's interests by the early 1960s. He was committed to developing France as a strong European power and Algeria was a barrier to this objective. His objective

was to develop France as the driving force in Europe and challenge the influence of the USA. In many ways Algeria was a major distraction. It consumed resources and it gave France a bad name internationally. Most importantly it undermined the internal stability of France (as referred to above). De Gaulle was not opposed to retaining Algeria but it was not politically expedient in the wider context of French interests internationally. De Gaulle may be presented as a political catalyst. Without his intervention Algerian independence would have been a much slower process. However, de Gaulle's conversion from 1958 was a fairly slow process. He did not arrive as an unquestioning champion of Algerian independence. Candidates may explore the idea that by 1958 a stalemate had developed in Algeria. Although the FLN had been badly damaged e.g. its leaders and activists were in exile in neighbouring states, it still existed. A military solution had failed and it was in this context that de Gaulle moved to deliver a political solution. This enhances his significance in the achievement of independence.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924*****A: The accession to power of the Bolsheviks and Lenin's regime**

Examine the extent to which practical considerations determined changes in economic policy in Russia in the years 1917 to 1923.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

The 'bread, peace and land' elements of Lenin's programme all have some bearing on the economic changes made. The earliest decrees of the Bolshevik regime were to appeal to the masses of an economically shattered, war-weary country, by providing some immediate relief and the longer-term prospects of some stability and prosperity.

The real impact of these decrees did not live up to the initial promises, not least because of the Civil War, which led to the imposition of War Communism, with its price-fixing and requisitioning. Also, in mid-1918, the law on nationalisation was implemented, but production problems persisted. (On the other hand, the Whites were defeated in due course.)

The Kronstadt Rebellion of March 1921 was largely a response to continued economic privation and led to the re-introduction of a degree of private enterprise under the New Economic Policy. Lenin represented this change as a response to practical needs and as part of the transition to world revolution. Relatively wealthy classes of peasants, the kulaks, and speculators, the "Nepmen" were created in the process, neither of which were welcome to those whose Marxist ideals remained (more or less) intact.

The most conventional conclusion would seem to be that the economic intentions of the Bolsheviks at the time of their accession to power were seriously hampered by pre-existing circumstances and the prolongation of armed conflict, to the point that economic policy represented a reaction to rather than an agent of change.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924*****B: The establishment of the Weimar Republic**

Examine the degree to which the flaws of the Weimar constitution explain the continuing instability in the years 1919 to 1923.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

As Golo Mann wrote in the 1960s of the Weimar constitution, “what is put down on paper will influence future developments without determining them”. The basic terms of the document meant a significant change from imperial to democratic government, encompassing a presidency, a bi-cameral assembly and members elected to the lower house by proportional representation. There was, on the other hand, the contingency power of Article 48 which allowed specific decree rule in emergency circumstances – a power which was not applied in the specified period. The ‘flaws’ which were of short-term significance can be summed up in the phrase ‘too much (democracy) too soon (after WW1)’.

For all the good intentions, both idealistic and pragmatic, of the constitution, it could be argued that it made little difference to the actual direction of the government, which devoted most of its attention to ‘other factors’, notably the Spartacist (1918-19), Kapp (1920) and Munich (1923) risings, all duly suppressed but not without their impact on stability; the demands of the Treaty of Versailles (1919) in relation to land, reparations and defence; the Ruhr occupation and passive resistance (1923), which resulted from the failure to meet the financial demands of the treaty; and the hyperinflation (1923), itself partly a consequence of the economically damaging Ruhr episode.

Indeed, the balance would seem to indicate that any form of government would have needed to deal with these immediate threats in the prescribed period and that, therefore, the impact of the constitution was, in itself, limited. Another view might be that the attempt at democracy which it represented was actually responsible for provoking extremist opposition and



furthering economic decline. The focus will probably fall on the ‘experiment at democracy’ aspect, with particular reference to proportional representation (Article 22).

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924***C: ‘Mutilated Victory’: Italy and the First World War, 1915-1920**

How successful was the Italian government in dealing with protests against the post-war peace settlement in the years 1919-1920?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

The winning of support from bitter ex-soldiers by the newly founded (March 1919) Fascist movement weighs in on the ‘not very’ side of the debate, in view of the subsequent rise and eventual accession to power of Mussolini (October 1922). Within the prescribed period, the seizure of Fiume by the proto-fascist D’Annunzio (September 1919) is perhaps an even more direct illustration of the immediate effect of the Italian failure to make territorial gains which the right-wing regarded as the just rewards of a ‘victor’ nation. (Dalmatia, etc)

The on-going ‘*trasformismo*’ meant that weak liberal coalition government persisted after the 1919 election. Ministers seemed impotent in the face of industrial unrest (*the ‘biennio rosso’*, 1919-1920), Fascist gains from conservative groups and violent *squadrismo*. In this sense, the post-war period was one of great instability in Italy, but it is debatable as to whether the peace settlement was a contributory factor or is another symptom of liberal inertia.

In view of the wider post-war context, it could be said that protests against the settlement were just another pretext serving to galvanise the political extremes in their opposition to each other and to the liberals. Italy was, to all intents and purposes, in a state of Civil War from 1919, which both arose from and exacerbated the economic recession, characterised by a spiralling national debt and price inflation.

The transference of some land to peasants does provide limited evidence of direct government action to address Italy’s problems but scarcely constitutes a systematic response

to deep-rooted institutional weakness. In other words, the government suffered from, rather than responding to, the protests against, among other things, the post-war peace settlement.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870-1950*****A: Population change in Britain, 1870-1945**

How important was female emancipation as a reason why the population grew more slowly after 1901?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates are likely to suggest that the birth rate had begun to slow down after 1871 but that death rates remained nearly constant. By 1900, life expectancy for men and women was only marginally higher than for their mid-Victorian forbears.

Reasons for:

- women's magazines provide evidence that women were increasingly concerned to avoid repeated pregnancies with the impact on their long-term health. This is in addition to the dangers of childbirth itself
- the work of Marie Stopes and her book "Married Love" may also be cited by candidates. Certainly, the high levels of peri-natal deaths in the 1920s encouraged greater consideration of birth control
- a major argument in favour is that the birth rate in the middle class fell fastest and this had the highest proportion of women entering the professions whilst the birth rate remained highest amongst the working class where liberation made least headway.

Reasons against:

- there is some evidence that lower middle class families begin limiting family size through contraception in the 1890s responding to the growing costs of childcare

- the First World War saw sheaths become less taboo and therefore more widely used within marriage
- in the 1890s there seems to have been a trend to marry later. The idea that the war created a reservoir of women who could not marry has been reappraised in the light of statistics showing that a higher percentage of women married after 1919 than before
- clearly the Depression and WWII led to the postponement of marriage/childbearing
- some candidates may advance the point that as female emancipation in this period was largely symbolic, or confined to politics, it could hardly have been a major factor.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870-1950*****B: The Cotton Industry in Britain, 1870-1950**

How important was the opposition of the workers to modernisation as a reason for the decline of the cotton industry by 1950?

In your answer you should **not** refer to the two world wars.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Reasons for:

- technical issues may be linked to the resistance of British trade unions to the introduction of new machinery, at the expense of jobs
- Oldham was a centre of industrial militancy pre-1914 but the first general cotton strikes came in the 1920s
- the work of Robert Ashcroft in fighting for workers' rights may be used to illustrate conflict
- the breakdown of the Brooklands Agreement (1893) after 1908 is evidence of growing industrial militancy
- the refusal of the weavers to adopt more looms system in 1931.

Reasons against:

- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton
- detail may be provided on the rate at which the £ returned to the Gold Standard in 1925 (most commentators agree it was overvalued at 10%)
- the introduction of the Toyoda automatic loom by Japanese manufacturers in 1924. The impact of Japanese competition may be quantified by estimates of approximately two-thirds of lost British sales going to Japanese manufacturers

- loss of markets such as India may also appear with reference to the increase in duty on imported British cotton
- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany had introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914
- the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936, may be cited in conjunction with the problem of failing demand
- national Government intervention in 1934 which effectively stabilised weavers' wages
- renewed competition in the 1950s from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919-1941*****A: America, 1919 to 1929**

How important was consumerism in creating the economic boom of the 1920s?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Consumerism was very important. Buying power fuelled the economy and this greatly expanded in the 1920s. Wages and salaries grew which led to more purchasing power. People spent more than ever before. The standards of living of many in the cities rose. New products and services combined with the effect of the motor car led people to have more leisure time, which further fuelled purchasing. Industry expanded to meet the growing demand for consumer goods and services. Consumers had confidence and so borrowed to purchase.

However, there are other factors to consider:

Role of the Federal government; each Republican President was pro business. These included Harding, Coolidge and Hoover. Their policies were to allow business a free rein and they maintained a high protectionist tariff. Also they were happy to allow business to expand overseas. A number of very able government ministers such as Andrew Mellon and Herbert Hoover (before he was president) were helpful in stimulating the economy. Taxes were cut for the wealthy who further fuelled the economy with their ability to spend large amounts e.g. Vanderbilts. Government also began a construction campaign for national highways all of which led to more jobs, spending etc.

Development and spread of electricity was another important factor because power underpinned consumerism and the ability of industry to expand. Consumers could use radios,



hoovers, refrigerators etc. Development of mass production and other inventions also fed the consumer boom. Cars could be produced cheaper and more quickly e.g. Henry Ford's model T. Cheap immigrant labour fuelled the boom because it was easy to exploit. This kept the costs down and so goods could be made very cheaply indeed.

Extension of credit. This was very important because people needed money to buy goods, which they didn't always have, so credit filled this need. Banks were prepared to lend money and so this helped both consumers and industry. Business could expand and some companies took over U.K. businesses e.g. Electricity, Firestone and tyres. Some business practices were a little dubious, e.g. buying shares secretly on the London stock market to buy up British companies.

Inventions led to the labour saving devices that consumers were eager to buy and without these inventions there would have been nothing to buy.

Advertising – this allowed more people to see what was available and it became much more widespread via the radio and film theatres and so fed the boom. There was a general rise in the number of people going to see films. The film industry experienced a boom during this period as lots of silent movies were rolled out to feed consumers. Film stars grew in popularity which further fed the movie boom. Each star developed a following which in turn led more consumers to the box office. Hollywood and the film studios boomed e.g. Warner Brothers, Fox, MGM etc.

Ultimately it was the government that created the right conditions for an economic boom with their laissez faire doctrine and the USA was able to capitalise on Europe's weakness after World War One.

Different text books emphasise different aspects of the boom e.g. Norton and Kazman have a section on both film and sports stars and their role. Tindall looks at the economic and political aspects of the boom.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative L: : Inter-War America, 1919-1941*****B: The New Deal, 1933-1941**

Examine the extent to which the First New Deal had succeeded in solving the USA's economic problems by 1941.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers are expected to consider the nature of the First New Deal. This included the first 100 days and was federal intervention on an unprecedented level. It set the country on its way to recovery. Positive action was taken as compared to President Hoover's attempts to let business regulate itself. Priority was given to stabilise the financial/banking system, which underpinned the economy. The public's faith was to be restored in the dollar and the banks.

The first 100 days of the First New Deal was the beginning of the vast legislative output 1933-1934. A range of Acts should be considered:

- Emergency Banking Relief Bill – stopped hoarding of gold, reorganised insolvent banks and so gave some confidence back to the American people
- Agricultural Adjustment Act – was a farm plan to increase payments to farmers and restore their purchasing power. Payments were based on parity and encouraged farmers to grow less
- Civilian Conservation Corps – this gave cash grants to needy citizens and public works were set up
- National Industry Recovery Act established the Public Works Administration to set up projects to give employment
- Tennessee Valley Authority established to help a poor region in the South of the country by introducing electricity and creating lots of jobs in the area. This was considered one of the successes of the New Deal.

Relief, recovery, reform were the watchwords of the first New Deal.

These acts were very important because they gave relief very quickly. However, it was the complete change in the government's attitude to intervention which allowed this to happen. Also the role of FDR is extremely important; his personality; fireside chats etc. gave the American people confidence in the government's ability to handle the crisis. But the First New Deal was not the complete answer. Some of the Acts were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Unemployment was not eliminated and still stood at 8 million in 1939. A lot of money got wasted on valueless work. It seemed to some bystanders that job creation was artificial and would not last. Recession occurred in 1937, as spending was cut. Many farmers went bankrupt and matters were made worse by a series of droughts. The First New Deal could not stop poor farming practices. Little was done to stop exploitation of industrial workers and especially immigrants. The First New Deal did not entirely win the confidence of the business community. Bureaucracy massively increased. Critics of the First New Deal developed and the most influential was the Supreme Court because they had the power to declare acts unconstitutional (i.e. against the nature of the original constitution which was set up in the eighteenth century). This meant that these laws had to change to comply with the very letter of the law, e.g. NIRA in 1935 and later in 1936 the AAA.

Candidates may bring in the role of the Second New Deal to illustrate the shortcomings of the First New Deal. The Second New Deal was brought in, in the summer of 1935, to try to help solve the problems left over from the First New Deal such as unemployment and farming, e.g. Wagner Act, which offered protection to workers. The economy finally got a lift with preparations and supplying the allies in World War Two. Therefore the First New Deal was not the answer to the nation's problems and neither was the Second New Deal (there was a recession in 1937).

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066-1087*****A: The Introduction of Norman Military Feudalism, 1066-1087**

How important was the part played by knight service in the system of military feudalism in the period 1066 to 1087?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

The main point is that Norman rule was initially based on force and that the enfeoffment/sub-infeudations that followed Hastings seemed designed to support this. Therefore, the Normans were dependent on knight service to:

- maintain the conquest
- allow mobilisation of large forces in times of crisis
- play a role in castle guard

However, there were limitations to this.

1. Maintain the conquest/mobilisation of large forces:

- to answer the king's military requirements and to protect the new order against rebellion it was estimated that William required 4000-7000 knights, an obligation he was unable to meet personally. Quotas were issued e.g. c1072, Evesham abbey ordered to produce its 5 knights owed for service against the Scots
- knights were first part of a military household (familia). These were usually young and unmarried with the advantage of swift movement to deal with periods of political unrest and early rebellions. These were first seen as part of monastic quotas e.g. 1086: 25 houses close to Westminster Abbey for its quota of 15 knights

- they were fighting men armed, trained and equipped to be part of a mounted army on a continental pattern
  - as immediate danger receded knights were enfeoffed but this was more evident in peaceful areas than in places like the north where families were the norm for a long time. e.g. Abbot of Evesham had settled his quota on lands by 1072
  - the king respected the privacy of the honours and the number enfeoffed depended on individual barons as numbers conferred prestige.
2. Play a role in castle guard:
- the regular work of the knight was to accompany his lord on journeys and expeditions, to campaign for at least 2 months at his own expense and to give 40 days each year to training and castle guard
  - the importance of castles demonstrating force embodied in walled places and their role in maintaining and advancing the conquest is important here, as the emphasis on castle guard shows, e.g. William ordered the abbey of Abingdon to provide knights for castle guard at Windsor
  - many served more or less permanently as a castle garrison and were given small estates nearby e.g. at Mortain's castle at Montacute (Somerset).
3. Limitations:
- knights' fiefs were useful at first but later crippled the economic position of a barony when demesne farming became profitable
  - barons came to rely on knights mainly for the financial benefits of the fief. The king demanded feudal payments (relief, aids) from his tenants in chief and they in turn were owed it by their knightly tenants
  - the limitations of service often caused the king to look elsewhere for troops
  - knights only formed part of William's army. The growing role of commutation/scutage (payment in lieu of service) and the fiscal investigations of the Domesday book to fund a hired army to meet the threats from outside showed the importance of mercenaries – most of whom served as infantry
  - William could also rely on the fyrd – the English militia – though this was seldom used and considered rather inefficient, but it did see service against rebels in the west
  - cavalry were seldom deployed in large numbers for fear of defeat and ensuing destruction. Hastings had been an exception
  - the growing centrality of siege warfare and the importance of castles meant that a large cavalry force was relatively unimportant e.g. Rebellion of 1075 collapsed due to siege of Norwich castle.

Candidates may also consider the role played by other elements of the system (castles, tenants-in-chief, marchers) but this should not form the bulk of the essay and is not a requirement.

Overall, the armoured knight may appear to be the mainstay of the system of military feudalism, but he played only a limited and usually defensive role in warfare.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066-1087*****B: Developments in Monasticism, 1066-1135**

How important was royal patronage in the development of English monasticism in the period 1066 to 1135?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates would need some familiarity with the nature of English monasticism before the conquest but it is not envisaged that real depth of knowledge would be required pre-1066.

Answers should be focused on the condition of monasticism in England in 1066, the degree of change and continuity afforded by the nature of patronage and the influence of monastic reform in Europe generally at this time. Mention may be made of the contribution made to English monasticism by Lanfranc, which could in some ways be seen to be as a result of royal patronage as it was William I who made him archbishop of Canterbury, but this is not a requirement and should not form a main part of the essay.

At the highest level answers will show understanding of the interaction of various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned, well-supported conclusion. The range of relevant factors will include the effects of Normanisation, of increased patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, the degree of continuity afforded up to 1135 and the beneficial effects of the introduction of new orders, bringing England into the mainstream of continental reform. Answers should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples and would be expected to refer to the views of monastic chroniclers where appropriate.

- **Royal Patronage**  
There were not a great number of monastic foundations in England as a result of the conquest. It was not until the second half of the reign of Henry I that royal patronage really took hold.

Battle Abbey was endowed by the Conqueror but it was unusual in that it was very much under the special protection of the ducal house; it was treated as the personal territorial church of the Conqueror, his profitable act of penitence for Hastings.

Cluny's influence was not great in the first place as its strong monarchical constitution did not fit well to the needs of the conqueror, but William Rufus was to endow the Cluniac house at Bermondsey.

Henry I's main endowments came after the death of his son William (1120) and he patronised fashionable movements. There was some rebuilding by the Benedictines, settlement of Augustinian priories and new communities of Cistercians. Reasons for his endowments ranged from the political, organising tracts of lands of uncertain loyalty – Carlisle, South Wales, Selby – to the penitential – Reading.

- Aristocratic Patronage

The monasteries made much greater progress due to their patrons among the aristocracy. The first Cluniac house in England was that of Lewes, founded by William de Warenne in 1077; others such as Roger of Shrewsbury and William de Mortain followed so that by 1100, there were eight Cluniac priories in England.

Foundations were often used to mark a rise in social standing – Robert D'Oilly's foundation of an Augustinian Priory at Osney – or to consolidate estates initially granted by royal patronage – Picot in Cambridge, 1092; Roger de Clinton at Kenilworth, 1125.

When the reformed orders became fashionable many of the nobles of Henry I's court followed the king's lead – Count Stephen's founding of the Savignac Abbey at Furness, 1124. The Cistercian order in particular benefited, because of their preference for 'desert' sites – poor land that brought little financial profit to the barons but could be traded in for spiritual rewards. Five were found in Henry's reign – Waverley 1128, Garendon 1133, Tintern 1131, Rievaulx 1132, Fountains 1132.

Monasteries were also used as mausolea, providing burials, memorials and masses for the dead patron and his family. In an age where violence was largely the norm, the monks could ease a warrior's way to salvation.

- 'Native' Patronage

There was an English element to the founding of religious houses after the conquest. From Evesham and Winchcombe, monks went north in search of simplicity and a more 'English' way of life, as well as to alleviate the suffering resulting from William's Harrying of the North 1070. They refounded Jarrow and Monkwearmouth, later migrating to Durham, Whitby (with the patronage of William de Perci), York and Melrose.

One of the most important foundations after the Battle Abbey was that of an English merchant, Alwine Cild at Bermondsey with the assistance of William Rufus.

- Change through time

In the first generation after the conquest, there was spoliation of English houses, removal of native ecclesiastical leaders and their replacement by Normans, racial tension and culture clash, the introduction of new liturgical practices, extensive rebuilding, imposition of servitia and endowment of Norman monasteries with English lands; but English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of English and Norman culture. English saints still protected their churches, English monasteries attracted endowments from colonists for whom they provided mausolea and Norman reformers collaborated in the monastic revival of northern England.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483-c1529*****A: Pretenders and Protest in the Reign of Henry VII**

“The pretenders Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck represented major threats to Henry VII’s throne.”

How accurate is this statement with reference to the years 1485-1499?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers would be expected to place both Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck in the context of the period 1485 to 1499. There will be examination of why Henry VII’s throne was so insecure during this time. Key events and developments would be Henry’s own usurpation and alienation of significant elements of Yorkist support in spite of his marriage to Elizabeth of York. There may be reference to Lord Lovell and the Staffords’ aborted rebellion in 1486 before consideration of Simnel’s imposture and the threat, real or perceived, from those who supported him such as Margaret of Burgundy and John de la Pole, Earl of Lincoln. Candidates should draw on their knowledge of Warbeck’s career between 1491 and 1499 and the varying support which he received from foreign rulers and the threat which this represented to Henry VII, especially when compounded by internal rebellion as in 1497.

The explanation of how accurate it is to describe the two pretenders as major threats to Henry VII are likely to give particular attention to the key role of Margaret of Burgundy between 1485 and 1499 and later the influence of Maximilian and James IV on Warbeck’s career. There may be coverage of how the Warbeck conspiracy penetrated Henry’s closest supporters as the downfall of Sir William Stanley in 1495 illustrated. Also, “major threat” may lead to an examination of the extent to which Warbeck’s career affected Henry’s relations with Burgundy and explained many of his actions where Scotland and Ireland were concerned.



Key events and developments which are likely to be referred to include:

The “discovery” of Simnel by the Oxford priest Symonds and his decision to pass the boy off as the Earl of Warwick in 1486 was a major threat to Henry VII. The rebellion was raised in Ireland which had long been a centre of support for the Yorkist cause. The defection of the Earl of Lincoln and his flight to the court of the hostile Margaret of Burgundy further bolstered Simnel’s cause. The Duchess, provided money and a force of 2,000 mercenaries under the command of Martin Schwartz which landed in Ireland in May 1487. An army made up of the mercenaries with Irish support and also that of Lincoln invaded the north of England in June 1487. Fortunately, it attracted less support than Henry VII had feared because of the support of undisciplined Irish troops. Henry was able to defeat the invader at the Battle of Stoke in which Lincoln, Schwartz and the Irish leaders were killed in the fighting. Henry pardoned Simnel but nevertheless the king remained vulnerable to Yorkist threats.

The imposture of Perkin Warbeck was a major threat to Henry VII’s throne between 1491 and 1499. This was because of the amount of foreign support he received over the years, not least from Burgundy, France and Scotland at different times.

Warbeck’s imposture began in Ireland in 1491. It is likely that he had been sent there by Margaret of Burgundy impressed by the imposter’s resemblance to her brother Edward IV when young. Ireland was well known as a centre for Yorkist plots. Warbeck’s imposture was threatening for Henry VII because he was engaged in conflict with France over Brittany while his relations with Scotland were also poor.

The Treaty of Etaples (1492) with France limited the threat which Warbeck represented. However, Maximilian and his son Philip continued to support Warbeck’s cause. In 1494 they made a treaty with the pretender which recognised him as King Richard IV of England and promised him help in recovering his crown. The decision of Charles VIII to invade Italy in 1494 took further pressure off Henry VII. However, in that same year plotting against Henry was discovered in the royal court itself. This made it clear that Henry’s survival on the English throne was only due to unending vigilance. The Lord Chamberlain, Sir William Stanley and other plotters were executed.

In 1495 Warbeck attempted an invasion of England. He landed a small force provided by Maximilian at Deal in Kent but when it was unsuccessful sailed off leaving it to its fate. After an unsuccessful attempt to gain support in Ireland Warbeck decided to sail for Scotland. The Scottish king James IV, was pro French in his sympathies and so was happy to welcome the pretender. He married him to his cousin Katherine Gordon. In 1496 James launched a massive border raid into England but there was no evidence of support for the pretender. By 1497 James had tired of Warbeck and the latter decided to try his luck in Ireland. However, the Irish were determined to remain loyal to Henry VII and hearing of the Cornish rebellion Warbeck decided to try his luck there. After landing in the West Country Warbeck was joined by several thousand discontented peasants and besieged Exeter but this came to nothing in the face Henry’s advancing armies. Warbeck fled into sanctuary in Beaulieu Abbey but agreed to surrender to Henry’s mercy.

The king treated the pretender well, but after he attempted to escape he was imprisoned in the Tower. Once there Warbeck was accused of trying to escape and also of plotting with the Earl of Warwick and this led to his execution in 1499. This may have been due to pressure

from Ferdinand and Isabella, the rulers of Spain, who wished to ensure that their daughter Catherine would be marrying into a family that was secure on its throne.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483-c1529***B: The Career of Thomas Wolsey**

How influential was the role of Cardinal Wolsey in the conduct of England's foreign policy from 1515 to 1529?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers would be expected to place Wolsey in the context of the period 1515 to 1529. This would include examination of Wolsey's role in the conduct of English foreign policy, especially whether or not he was an independent player or largely carrying out the demands of Henry VIII for glory and prestige. Key events and developments would include reference to Wolsey's rise to become Henry's chief minister and executant of foreign policy between 1513 and 1515, the pursuit of prestige culminating in the Treaty of London in 1518, the attempt to hold the balance of power between France and Spain between 1519 and 1521, involvement in Habsburg/Valois rivalry between 1521 and 1526 and the search for glory and the campaign for divorce. The thrust of the question is aimed at how far or not Wolsey was in control of foreign policy during that time.

The explanation of the extent or otherwise of Wolsey's role in foreign policy is crucial. There should be discussion of the pressure operating on Wolsey in his conduct of foreign policy, not least his own concerns for peace as balanced against Henry's more warlike ambitions, especially in the early and mid 1520s. There will be consideration of Henry's demands on the cardinal's time and energies, especially in regard to the king's desire for an annulment of his marriage after 1527.

Key events and developments which are likely to be referred to include:

The growth of Wolsey's influence over the conduct of foreign policy in the years 1511-14 (before the period of the question) culminating in his capable negotiation of the peace of

1514 with France and the arrangement of the marriage of Henry VIII's sister Mary to Louis XII. This could provide some context for the situation in 1515.

1515-1517 – when Wolsey and Henry lost the support of the new king of Spain, Charles I, who made peace with Francis I of France at Noyon in 1517.

1518 – the Treaty of London when Henry and Wolsey successfully exploited the Pope's peace plan to unite Europe's rulers in a crusade against the Turks. This was a highlight of Wolsey's diplomacy.

1519 – the death of Maximilian and the campaign for the election of a new Holy Roman Emperor. Henry's campaign to become emperor was unsuccessful and Charles of Spain was elected to succeed his grandfather as the Emperor Charles V. After 1519 Henry and Wolsey tried to mediate between France and the Empire – this helped to enhance England's role in international affairs and resulted in the Field of the Cloth of Gold discussions with France in 1520 and later a meeting with Charles V at Gravilines.

In 1521 the English were persuaded to support Charles V in any war against the French. The war when it began in 1522 brought no real gains for England but instead a great deal of expenditure before it was ended in 1526. The English invasion of France in 1523 achieved little. The imperial victory over the French at Pavia in 1525 led to the English intending to launch another invasion of France which had to be abandoned when the Amicable Grant led to a near revolt in England.

The moves to make peace with France and its culmination in the Treaty of More (August 1525) was virtually a “diplomatic revolution” in English foreign policy. Henry VIII agreed to give up his claims to the French throne in return for an annual pension. Wolsey played a key role in setting up the League of Cognac (1526) to oppose Charles V but it achieved little and in 1527 the Treaty of Westminster saw the signing of a perpetual peace between England and France.

1527-1529 the campaign for Henry VIII's annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. The king's wishes dominated the conduct of foreign policy. Wolsey's campaign to achieve his master's wishes was to be the victim of what was an increasingly deteriorating diplomatic situation. In 1527 Charles's unpaid army stormed Rome and in effect the Pope became the Emperor's prisoner. In August 1529 the Emperor and the French made peace at Cambrai and so Wolsey's last chance of obtaining an annulment of Henry's marriage was defeated. This failure contributed directly to the cardinal's downfall a few weeks later.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603-c1640*****A: The Nature of Puritanism and its Threat to the Crown, 1603-1625**

In the years 1603 to 1618, how serious a threat did the English Puritans pose to the authority of James I both in Church and in State?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates should outline why, from its nature, Puritanism posed a threat to James I. The strength of the beliefs of the ‘hotter sort of Protestants’ their anti-popery, predestination and, especially, their desire for further reformation potentially posed a challenge for the authority of a monarch who was Supreme Governor and ‘God’s representative on earth’. There must be some direct comment on the relationship between church and state in the higher level answers and many will deal with this in considering the nature of Puritanism and the potential threat it posed because of James’ position as Supreme Governor. Candidates should make the critical point that in the seventeenth century the church and state were one. This was recognised directly by the Puritans in their comment in the Millenary Petition that they did not want the ‘dissolution of the state ecclesiastical’.

A consideration of the major ‘Puritan events’ of these years – the Millenary Petition, the Hampton Court Conference, Bancroft’s Canons and the Book of Sports – should be in answers as illustrative material. As such it should be assessed in terms of the actual threat posed. For example, candidates may point out the relatively moderate requests of the Millenary Petition and the acceptance in it of James’ authority. A key part of answers will be an understanding of the importance of how James’ reaction to the Puritans illustrated his increasing understanding of Puritanism in England and was a significant factor in ensuring that the threat they posed was limited. From his early context of seeing Puritanism in the light of Presbyterianism in Scotland James realised the essential moderation, especially to his political authority, of the majority of Puritans. Thus the Hampton Court Conference and

Bancroft's Canons were used essentially to isolate the minority of extremists. Some might point out that the 'separatists', to a degree, already isolated themselves and the 'Silenced Brethren' effectively removed the immediate threat they posed by retreating to the Netherlands or America. Candidates should also indicate that James' policy also was based, as a Calvinist, on some sympathy with elements of the Puritan cause, as suggested by the reinterpretation of the events at Hampton Court by Curtis and Collinson. As such many Puritans were pleased by the translation of the Bible that appeared in 1611 but also the appointment of Abbot as Archbishop. Abbot illustrates the other key to James' religious success, his support for a broad inclusive Protestant church that most Puritans felt that they could remain within.

Some might also consider the threat of Puritanism in its wider social context and here use the Book of Sports profitably. Likewise some candidates might touch upon calls for ecclesiastical reform in Parliament, the Apology and Satisfaction and responses to James' foreign policy. Credit should be given for setting the threat posed by Puritanism in this period in the context of post 1618 responses to James' apparent pro-Spanish foreign policy or Charles I's religious policy of destroying James' broad church. Some candidates might point out that most Puritans, being moderate, could separate their religious life from direct attacks on the state, especially since James' pragmatism allowed them the scope to conform and did not push them into open opposition. The real threat was therefore limited.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603-c1640*****B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603-1641**

Examine the extent to which the problems of Charles I in Scotland in the years 1625 to 1640 were the result of his own mistakes.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates need to illustrate clearly Charles' policies towards Scotland and how they created problems, alongside the other factors that added to his difficulties. While many will have, rightly, 1637-1640 as their key focus, there should also be some reference to how the 'rebellion' of these years related to Charles' approach to Scotland from 1625.

Reference and comment may be made on how Charles' policy was designed to assert his authority. The problem was that Charles had a very uncompromising view of his power being based on Divine Right and unlike his father was unable to be pragmatic which was exactly what was required for seventeenth century kingship but particularly as an 'absentee king' of Scotland. This fundamental character flaw in Charles' approach was complicated by the fact that he was out of touch with Scottish opinion. Yet because of his views and character he also made no real attempt to understand it. This situation became worse after his dismissal of Monteith. Charles appeared merely to use the Scottish Privy Council as a cipher and in terms of his overall approach to governing Scotland candidates should be credited for making comparisons to James' approach. The October 1625 Act of Revocation by direct royal fiat, described as 'the groundstone of all the mischief that followed', can be reinforced by reference to the mistrust created by Charles' visit to Scotland of June-July 1633. Again the emphasis can be on the failings of Charles as a personal monarch. The action against Baron Balmerino could also be used as an illustrative example of the problems created by Charles' approach.

Given the nature of the crisis in the years 1637-1640 candidates should make clear the importance of Charles' religious policy in Scotland. An outline of the basis of this will show why it alienated Presbyterian Scotland. Again it stemmed from his perception of his authority and lack of contact with Scotland. Some might once more refer to James' policy, despite its own problems post-1618, to illustrate the differences. Charles' response to the 'rebellion', his refusal to compromise and the attempt to use his other kingdoms to reassert his authority, exacerbated the crisis and were typical of his approach since 1625.



**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714-1802*****A: The Nature, Extent and Threat of Jacobitism, 1714-1746**

How important was the part played by the Old Pretender, James Edward Stuart, in the failure of the Jacobite movement in the period 1714 to 1746?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Throughout the entire period, and until his death in 1766, the Old Pretender was regarded by his followers as King James III. However, although firmly convinced of his right to the English throne, he lacked both the skill and the determination to achieve this objective. He might have gained the throne directly on the death of Queen Anne in 1714 but for his stubborn refusal to renounce Catholicism. His somewhat belated arrival in Scotland at the end of the '15 rebellion was hardly an impressive contribution. He did attempt to secure both Swedish and Spanish support for proposed uprisings in 1718 and 1719, but negotiations with Sweden proved fruitless, whilst the Spanish landing in Scotland proved futile. From then onwards, residence in Rome kept him distant from Jacobite activity in Britain, and he played no direct role in the '45. His main role after 1719 was as a dignified and credible, if somewhat inactive, figurehead for the Jacobite cause.

Candidates should also refer to other factors which limited Jacobite success during this period. The lack of foreign, especially French, support was of major importance both in 1715 and 1745. Jacobitism was never popular in England, where the Tories were discredited and the Whigs worked hard to ensure the survival of the Hanoverian regime; prosperity and complacency combined to limit Jacobite prospects south of the border. Apart from an initial slow response in 1715, the British army was on the whole well equipped to cope with the disturbances in 1715 and 1745. In 1715, the Earl of Mar's leadership of the Scottish Jacobites was unimpressive and support was relatively fragmentary. Between 1715 and 1745, the Jacobite cause was too often linked in the public mind with Britain's European

rivals (mainly Spain and France). The Young Pretender raised Scottish enthusiasm in 1745, but did not have similar impact in England, and arguably demonstrated indecisive leadership with his decision to withdraw at Derby.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714-1802***B: The British in India, c1757-c1802**

How important was Robert Clive's contribution to the establishment and development of British influence in India?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Clive originally went to Madras in 1743 as a junior clerk for the East India Company, rising to become a wealthy merchant. He gained military experience during the relief of Madras at the end of the War of Austrian Succession, and became prominent with the capture of Arcot in 1751. He returned to India as a Lieutenant-colonel in the employ of the East India Company, and Governor of Pondicherry, just before the outbreak of the Seven Years' War. His main objective was to destroy French influence, making alliances with native rulers as appropriate.

News of the 'Black Hole of Calcutta' in 1756 gave Clive the excuse to head for Bengal, and conflict with the Nawab, Siraj-ud-daulah. The latter, together with some French support, was defeated at Plassey (June 1757). This began a period of substantial British political and military involvement in India, with the new Nawab, Mir Jafar, expecting continued British military support, and granting the company the right to collect taxes in certain parts of Bengal in return. Clive had to suppress rebellions against Mir Jafar, and in practice became the real ruler of India.

Clive now turned his attention firmly on the French, destroying their base at Chandernagore in Bengal (1758), and then driving them out of the Sarkars (1759). Further successes included defending Mir Jafar against the Nawab of Oudh and routing a Dutch attack in Bengal (both 1759). Clive returned to Britain in 1760 confident that French influence in India was (almost) over, and that full British control of Bengal was imminent.

He returned again to India in 1765 due to continuing instability. As Governor-General, he established the concept of ‘dual government’ in Bengal, a system which soon led to corruption amongst native officials. A nervous breakdown resulted in Clive’s final return to Britain in early 1767.

Candidates should demonstrate an analytical approach, and may well identify the following ways in which Clive contributed to the establishment and development of British influence in India:

- military – Plassey, support for Mir Jafar, expulsion of French
- diplomatic – links with Mir Jafar
- political – establishment of ‘dual government’ in Bengal
- financial – obtaining the collection rights in Bengal
- personal – determination, commitment, ruthless opportunism.

Undoubtedly British influence in India increased considerably due to Clive’s efforts (strong British presence in Bengal, diminution of French and Dutch influence), but problems remained: corruption, the rivalries of jealous princes, and the nature of the relationship between the East India Company and the British government. Do not excessively reward candidates who present highly narrative responses, but look for genuine attempts to link specific issues to the establishment and/or development of British influence.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815-1841*****A: Government Response to Poverty**

How important were rising costs in influencing the attitude of Whig politicians towards the reform of the Poor Law in the years 1830 to 1833?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates should mention that one of the major factors in influencing politicians was the rising cost. They can mention actual cost rise and the impact on costs of systems of poor law relief such as the Speenhamland system of supplementing rates to reflect the price of bread in periods of inflation and the number of children in the family.

However, they also need to mention other factors. The impact of the Swing Riots of 1831 on the minds of politicians and their attitude towards outdoor relief. There is also the impact of utilitarian thinking on the need to rationalise the administration of the Poor Law as a way of modernising a rather ramshackle system.

The Whigs were concerned to maintain their support amongst the newly enfranchised middle class voters who faced steeply rising Poor Rates due to the economic recession. The economic recession is an important part of the context in which the Whigs made their decisions. Their laissez faire view of economics meant that they could not bring themselves to create work through job creation so they had to reduce the number of claimants. Outdoor relief was seen as open to abuse by those who did not actively seek work. The dire warnings of Malthus about the impact of population growth seemed to be made more likely by the operation of the Speenhamland System. The creation of single sex workhouses would serve to limit the natural increase in the least economically productive classes.

Poverty was seen as the product of idleness, not the outcome of a manufacturing revolution based upon low wages. Some candidates may argue that Whig politicians were influenced by the selective evidence presented by Chadwick. Even after the 1832 Reform Act, Parliament was dominated by the landed class who needed to keep the Rates down and so it is not surprising that politicians were mindful of these powerful forces when making policy decisions.

However, the politicians were also influenced by the thinking of Benthamites such as Chadwick who was Secretary to the Poor Law Commission. The idea that costs could be cut by limiting the claims of the 'undeserving poor' was very attractive. Some candidates may also argue that ignorance of cyclical unemployment in a newly industrialised economy was also a factor.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815-1841*****B: Religion and Politics in England and Ireland, c1820-c1841**

How important was Catholic Emancipation in religion and politics in England and Ireland between c1820 and 1829?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates should mention the Anglican Establishment and how this was seen as out of place in Ireland where 80% of the population was Catholic. They should mention the development of the Catholic Association from 1823 onwards and the impact of the County Clare Election of 1828 in precipitating a crisis by 1829. The issue affected the King's relationship with his ministers. The issue of Catholic Emancipation was vital to O'Connell's ability to unite middle class opinion with the mass of the peasantry (many of whom could already vote but who had no hope of becoming MPs) whose main grievance was land. O'Connell's rejection by the House of Commons only served to focus completely the political crisis on this divisive issue.

They can also mention the explosive quality of the issue on the politics of the Tory Party. Liverpool successfully kept the issue off the party agenda for much of the 1820s. However, Canning's rise to the premiership reopened party divisions due to his support for Catholic Emancipation. Peel's decision to persuade Wellington that Catholic Emancipation must be passed in 1829 to avoid civil war helped cause the disintegration of the party by the end of 1829. The 'ultra' Tories who favoured no compromise felt betrayed by Peel who had previously been seen as a staunch opponent of Catholic Emancipation. Candidates may also refer to the way in which George IV opposed Canning's promotion over the issue of Catholic Emancipation in 1822. Popular anti-Catholicism was an important political weapon and helped to ensure support for the conservatives in urban centres like Liverpool and Manchester where there was tension due to the influx of Irish workers who were blamed for falling wages

and poor conditions of employment. The strong views about Catholicism also reflect the evangelical revival in England both within the Church of England and amongst Non-Conformists whose emancipation had been confirmed in 1828. This depth of contextual understanding is only likely to be found in stronger responses.

Some candidates may argue that Catholic Emancipation was a lesser issue c1820-1821 when politics was affected by the crisis over Queen Caroline. Others may argue that it was a less important issue for many in the Church of England than the internal debate amongst Anglicans.



**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895-1921***A: The Nature and Impact of New Liberalism, 1906-1915**

Examine the relative importance of ideological and political factors in the emergence of a new kind of Liberalism after 1905.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers are expected to consider both ideological and political factors in a context of competent knowledge of the major reforms of the Liberals. The best will weigh the relative balance of those factors. New Liberalism was derived from both a changing philosophy and particularly a changing society in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Gladstonian Liberalism emphasised individual freedom, responsibility and “self help” together with strict limitations on state expenditure. New Liberalism recognised the role of the state in social issues and implemented this in government after 1905. The leading politician in implementing ‘new radicalism’ had been Joseph Chamberlain. His concept of state (and local government) action to attack poverty and unemployment remained with many who stayed in the Liberal Party and who advocated reform to improve living conditions. The need for action was encouraged by the findings of Booth and Rowntree, and the revelations of poor health and fitness of recruits for the Boer War. The concept of help from the cradle to the grave was at least born. In terms of ideology Hobson and Hobhouse advocated not socialism, but to “supply all workers at their cost price with all the economic conditions requisite to the education and employment of their powers for their personal advantage and enjoyment”. These included a right to work and to a living wage. The intellectual arguments, as well as action, were pursued by Churchill and Lloyd George. They continued with the concept of individual liberty together with state promotion of measures to improve conditions for ‘the multitude’ and especially the poor. In particular Lloyd George introduced legislation (e.g. pensions and National Insurance), but also promoted redistribution of wealth by progressive taxation (1909 Budget). Churchill implemented measures to combat unemployment and raise

wage levels in the sweated industries. In the early years Liberal government measures for children's welfare were introduced (school meals, medical inspection, the Children's Charter). The Liberals were also trying to enhance their appeal to the working class electorate and were conscious of rivalry from the new Labour Party. This partly explains the introduction of improved conditions for British seamen, the 1906 Workmen's Compensation Act, the Trades Disputes Act, limiting the miners' working day and the Shops Act. However, New Liberalism attempted to focus on the 'larger community interest'. The need to maintain clear differences from the Conservatives in government (1900-1905) and, as seen in the 1906 Election, was crucial. New Liberalism was not socialism and candidates can argue on the relative influence of ideological and political factors either way, or with balance. The issue is not clear cut as to whether concern about the challenge from the new Labour Party was more important than desire to ameliorate poverty.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895-1921*****B: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland, c1895-1921**

How important was the First World War as a reason for Sinn Fein's replacement of John Redmond's "Home Rulers" as the more important and popular nationalist party in Ireland by 1918?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers should weigh the relative importance of the First World War against both longer and other short-term factors. The Irish Nationalists clearly remained the more important and popular nationalist Party until the First World War when the dramatic shift took place. However, Redmond had neglected changes taking place in Ireland before then. There was a cultural movement through the work of the Gaelic League, amongst others. Sport was encouraged by Sinn Fein looking for fit young Irish men. From a separate cultural identity developed a concept of a (completely) separate political identity. Aggressive separatist nationalism challenged Home Rule, e.g. Arthur Griffiths starting the *United Irishman* in 1898, which preached 'Sinn Fein' (Ourselves). He founded Sinn Fein as a Party in 1902. The I.R.B. began in 1907. Emergence of a more extreme nationalism coincided with the return of the Liberals to government in 1906 and growing concern amongst Protestants especially in Ulster. Crucially after the 1910 Elections the Liberals needed Redmond's votes in the Commons especially in reducing the Lords' powers. The Third Home Rule Bill was subsequently introduced. The arming of Ulster Unionists led to the nationalist equivalent, the Irish Volunteers. Ireland (and possibly Britain) were probably saved from civil war by the outbreak of the First World War. The implementation of Home Rule was delayed until the end of hostilities – but seemed the final decision (though not accepted by the Unionists). Most Irish Nationalists at first rallied to the war effort, but 'extreme' elements used that co-operation to oppose Redmond and increase their own support. 169,000 of the Irish volunteers backed Redmond, but 11,000 did not, rejected Home Rule (and constitutional means) and

called for complete independence. The I.R.B. held the rising of Easter 1916. After surrender martial law was imposed and the ringleaders executed. The 'martyrs' were heroes and the Irish Nationalists, led by the complacent and ineffective Redmond, severely damaged. In 1917 Sinn Fein won two by-elections. Opposition to Irish conscription, a major mistake by the British government in 1918, increased support further for Sinn Fein. In the December 1918 Election Sinn Fein won 73 seats (to the Irish Nationalists) and formed the Dail. The crucial period of change was during the War and especially from Easter 1916. British mistakes in brutal suppression of the Rising and execution of its leaders greatly intensified support for Sinn Fein and its political agenda of independence and republicanism. The increased influence of Ulster Unionists on the Coalition government in the later stages of the War further intensified nationalist feeling and suspicion that a British government could renege on even Home Rule. It was not so much the First World War itself which explains the change in Irish politics and support for different Parties but the Easter Rising, consequent events and British governments' reaction to them.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750-1830*****A: Britain's Economy in 1750**

Examine the degree to which national markets for agricultural produce and manufactured goods had been established in Britain by 1750.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers would be expected to assess the two main aspects of the question – agriculture and manufacture and in each case discuss the changes, which had and were taking place in terms of the organisation and markets.

A whole range of different periods for an agricultural revolution has been suggested. Candidates should be aware of these interpretations although it would not be necessary for them to quote the historians' names. Kerridge argued that the main developments took place between 1570 and 1767. He focused on ley husbandry, drainage, new crop systems and new stock. Kerridge justified his claim by stating that the population doubled during this period and was successfully fed. This interpretation suggests that agricultural improvements took place in localities and was not based on market changes. A.H. John and E.L. Jones place the revolution between 1670 and 1750 and argued for a change in the regional geography in farming. The techniques to which they attribute an increase in production – turnips, clover and crop rotation were only suited to the lighter soils. Recently, historians such as Joan Thirsk and Michael Turner have supported the traditional argument that the key period for change was 1750 to 1850. This theory has stressed the developments in wheat production achieved in Norfolk. This meant that the Midlands turned to stock production and other regions specialised in dairying, turkeys etc. If candidates agree with Thirsk, Turner, et al., they will state that the markets were local up to 1750, or at best regional. However, they should be aware of diversity and the importance of the London Market. This was significant not only for market gardening and specialisation in the 50 miles around the capital but also

the selling of animals and dairy produce in the capital which had been moved some considerable distance.

Analysis of industrial manufacture is likely to focus on the model of proto-industrialisation. Inherent in this was the production in regions of textiles and other manufacture such as the small metal trades, framework knitting etc. in the localities to be sold in the localities to merchants who would distribute raw material and sell finished goods in the national and international market. Reference here could be to the work of Pat Hudson. The manufacture of iron and steel was also regionally based due to the accessibility of raw materials, but was sold nationally. However, candidates should also be aware that such manufacture did take place in the locality and did not have a national market. For this they might refer to hats, boots, shoes, clothes, household items such as pots and pans and brushes.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750-1830*****B: The Standard of Living of the Working Classes, 1780-1830**

Examine the relative importance of living conditions and incomes to the standard of living experienced by the working classes in the period 1780 to 1830.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers would be expected to assess the arguments which suggest that the period 1780-1830 witnessed significant improvements in wages and prices which benefited the population, but at the same time as these changes took place there was little improvement in working and living conditions. The question assumes that the changes affected all areas and all people equally, however, answers would be expected to discriminate between regions, classes and genders as well as change over time.

Discussion and supporting material offered could be:

**Working and Living Conditions**

Recently discussion has focused on qualitative rather than quantitative data and has demonstrated that living conditions in towns deteriorated due to overcrowding and poor sanitation. In the countryside, enclosure of the common fields and, later, the restrictions on poor relief meant a negative material change in the lives of working people. However, people in the countryside were spared the worst excesses of a lack of sanitation experienced in urban areas. Machinery such as the threshing machine may have increased production, but it deprived agricultural workers of employment which had a negative effect on their living conditions. The development of technology in the mills and factories may have improved working conditions, as the machinery became both safer and more sophisticated. However, at the start of the period working conditions both in the home and the factory were poor,

mainly due to the increasing emphasis on profit which permeated both domestic and industrial manufacture. The question does assume a somewhat false dichotomy between conditions and wages.

#### Incomes and Consumption

The wages of skilled workers did improve significantly and as a result their standard of living – living conditions did improve as they were able to earn more and to purchase more luxuries. There was some improvement in the wages of those in rural areas around the industrialising areas. However, for the unskilled and the majority of agricultural labourers there was little improvement. If wages did increase they were offset by periods of unemployment in towns, or underemployment in the countryside.

Candidates may refer to a range of historians in their answers. The Optimist – pro-capitalist school has been spearheaded by Hartwell, and the pessimist–Marxist view put forward by E.P. Thomson and Hobsbawn. More recently Humphries, Horrell and Rose have advocated a qualitative as opposed to a quantitative approach.



**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832-1848*****A: The Significance of the 1832 Reform Act**

How important was utilitarianism as a cause of the Whig reforms of the 1830s?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers should consider the motives behind the Whig reforms of the 1830s. These are specifically identified in the specification as the Factory Acts, the Poor Law Amendment Act and the Municipal Corporations Act. Answers should explicitly consider the motives behind each of these three acts and as the question focuses on motivation, consideration of motives other than the influence of the utilitarian movement is necessary.

The question directs candidates towards one motive, the Utilitarian principles of Bentham (the greatest good of the greatest number). Their significance is as follows:

- the drive for efficiency that the Poor Law Amendment Act represents
- the narrow conception of the causes of poverty that the Benthamites accepted, believing that the vast majority of poverty was caused by idleness and therefore the idle poor should be removed from the community, receiving relief only in workhouses, where conditions should be worse than outside to encourage people to work – the principle of ‘less-eligibility’
- the presence of Benthamites like Chadwick, Bishop Sumner, Bishop Blomfield, Bourne and Lewis on the 1832 Poor Law Commission are significant, with their emphasis on utilitarian principles like uniformity
- this emphasis on uniformity was applied to local government in 1835 - the 1832 Reform Act had established a principle of uniformity that led to the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act.

However, consideration needs to be given to other possible motives:

- it could be argued the Reform Act extended political power beyond the land-owning elite to the middle-classes and therefore reforms reflected their concerns and interests - it is possible to see the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act in this light, given the savings in local rates paid by the middle class under the inefficient and expensive Speenhamland system. Certainly governments of the period were much more responsive to the middle-class as they were now a crucial part of the electorate (see the repeal of the Corn Laws)
- humanitarianism was a factor behind the 1833 Factory Act, with its attempts to prevent the exploitation of children. The compulsory registration of births in 1836 might be used as evidence that the former measure was a genuine attempt to tackle the issue of child labour.

Good answers might offer judgement by arguing that the intentions of Chadwick and Senior in relation to the Poor Law might be seen as more important than the reality of the legislation, whilst the uniformity of the Municipal Corporations Act might be seen as proof of general principles. However, the financial benefits to the middle class the Poor Law Amendment Act brought, coupled with the limits to the Factory Act might suggest that politicians were more concerned with being elected than any general principles like utilitarianism or humanitarianism.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832-1848*****B: Chartism, 1838-1848**

How serious a threat was Chartism to British governments in the years 1838-1848?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

The Chartist campaign peaked in 1838/9 with meetings and a petition to parliament, in 1842 with a second petition, the rejection of which led to strikes and riots, including the Plug riots in Lancashire and finally in 1848 with a third petition following a rally at Kennington Common in London. Some mention may also be seen of O'Connor's co-operative idea. Candidates should assess the extent of the threat the Chartist movement offered to the existing political system and show awareness of the changing severity of the challenge over the ten-year period. Some good answers may assess the extent of the threat for each successive wave – very good answers would try to identify some common threats. Equally, good answers might assess severity by discussion of ways in which Chartism was not that threatening to the government and law and order.

Candidates need to provide material to support a judgement that the Chartists were or were not threatening. Part of explicit analysis should be a clear understanding of what is meant by 'threat' in the context of 1838-1848. Arguments that governments may have fallen, that uprisings may have led to serious outbreaks of violence, that governments may have been forced to accede to the demands of the Chartists, that the monarchy felt threatened are all reasonable, but are not exhaustive.

Evidence of a clear threat might include reference to:

- geographical extent of Chartist support – Lanarkshire, West Riding, Midlands, South Wales, Black Country, North East, the Potteries

- the fact that these regions were the important industrial centres, and the possibility of industrial conflict, notably in the sabotage of the plug plots
- sheer scale of those signing the charter, attending meetings e.g. Kennington Common in 1848
- the way Chartism tapped into the radicalism of pre-1832, and drew on existing radicals, journals, organisations, leaders
- the strength of the chartist culture – the network of schools, libraries, churches and discussion groups where politics were debated and Chartism gained mass support
- the way Chartism drew strength from the economic problems of the period
- the diverse nature of the movement which incorporated other movements agitating for factory reform etc.
- the dynamism of O'Connor and other leaders
- the extreme radicalism of the Charter, which aimed to dismantle the existing political system at a time when the door of change had been lodged ajar
- the violence of the Newport Rising, 1839 and the severity of the sentences for Frost and Williams suggest a government running scared.

Against this should be set evidence that the governments, if threatened, did not feel severely threatened:

- government actions swiftly crushed uprisings - arrests of leading Chartists in 1839 & 1842, armed response to public meetings in Newcastle in 1838, riots in Lancashire and South Wales in 1839 (20 killed at the Newport Rising), use of the army in Wolverhampton in 1842. The use of troops transported swiftly by railway and the use of urban police forces after 1839. Furthermore, many objected to the violence of the Chartists and support was lost to the objections to the Anti-Corn Law League
- the governments' success in undermining support with social legislation - the repeal of the Corn Laws ensured cheap food, whilst a Factory Act restricted hours of work for women and children
- it was always likely Chartism would implode - the divisions in the movement between physical and moral forces and between different leaders (e.g. O'Connor, Lovett, Frost), the lack of a middle class alliance with the working class after 1832 (apart from a brief period in 1842 when middle class non-conformist radicals supported the movement, the campaigns threatened the middle class who had won the vote in 1832)
- the reformed House of Commons was still dominated by aristocratic interests, yet felt safe enough to reject the first two petitions
- other powerful counter-attractions for the dissatisfied (Ten Hour Movement, Anti-Corn Law League, Trades Unions)
- as the economy improved, Chartism lost support.

Good answers might argue that the initial violent responses of 1839 shocked the government, evident by the severity of sentences given to those who rose at Newport, but by 1842 violence had given way to sabotage and by 1848 to peaceful protest, though other arguments are equally valid.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929-1951***A: The Making of the Welfare State 1942-1951**

How thoroughly had the wartime coalition government prepared the way for the Welfare State by 1945?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Answers will be expected to focus on the period between 1942, when the Beveridge Plan was formulated, and 1945, when the ‘Labour landslide’ in the general election was seen as the launching of the welfare state.

“1945” will be interpreted by very many candidates as the election itself. But some answers, often good ones, will range ahead to the end of the year, covering the first few months of Labour in power and perhaps dealing with some of the early difficulties that Attlee’s cabinet faced in implementing their policies, in and after 1945. This approach is a valid way of assessing “how thoroughly”, or not, the way had been prepared – but any post-1945 material should be directly applied to *this* question and not deployed as extraneous description. Similarly, material from before 1942 *could* be used effectively to set in context the arrival in power of the Churchill coalition in 1940, with its key Labour ministers; or to contrast the political attitudes of the war years with the very different attitudes of the 1930s, but such material needs to be effectively used and not just ‘background’ for its own sake. The key period is 1942-1945.

Key issues might include:

- the definition of the welfare state and what it involved in social reform in health, education, national insurance and state planning

- the wartime coalition government and its key personalities from the three main parties (candidates should know that Beveridge was a Liberal!)
- the main policy steps taken during the war especially the Beveridge Plan and the 1944 Butler Education Act
- the policies and promises adopted by Labour in fighting the 1945 election and in forming the new government
- the extent to which there was united opinion in the country by 1945 in favour of a welfare state.

The question offers scope for alternative arguments and for differentiation about the degree to which the nation was fully behind the idea of a welfare state by 1945. Some answers will take a very positive line, arguing strongly that the shared experiences of the ‘People’s war’ and the impact of wartime propaganda over long years of ‘total war’ had brought about fundamental social change and made the nation ready to accept state intervention on a grand scale. Others will identify significant areas of disagreement and potential opposition. One of the factors that had a significant effect on increasing support for Labour between 1943 and the 1945 election was that Labour was seen as unreservedly in favour of full implementation of the Beveridge Plan as opposed to Conservatives who were lukewarm. Some answers may point out that even the Labour Party was not completely united and there were internal party divisions which came into the open later with the 1951 split between Aneurin Bevan and Gaitskell.

Answers will often focus on the wartime government, with balanced coverage of 1942-45 following through its aims, its actions and policies and the results by 1945. But some answers may focus a large proportion of their evidence on 1945, perhaps using the actual election campaign as a case-study. This approach could be highly effective – we cannot expect all answers to have equal or comprehensive coverage. And some answers might have a direct approach to “how thoroughly” the government had “prepared the way” by winning over public opinion. Such answers might devote more attention to the impact of the wartime government on popular attitudes than to the actual policies and personalities of the government itself. If well applied to the question, such material on national newspapers (mostly strongly supporting the welfare state at least in principle), propaganda through films, posters, cartoonists such as Low, changing attitudes and expectations as seen through Mass Observation etc., could be valid and effective.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929-1951***B: Winston Churchill in opposition and government, 1929-1945**

Examine the extent to which Churchill himself was responsible for his frequent conflicts with the leadership of the Conservative Party during the 1930s.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-4    L2: 5-9    L3: 10-14    L4: 15-17    L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Although even coverage is not an essential requirement, good answers would be expected to include analysis of both the “leadership of the Conservative Party” and the personal role of Churchill himself. The “conflicts” had two sides: caused both by the various reasons why the Conservative leadership was suspicious of and hostile to Churchill and by the actions, attitudes and personal agenda of Churchill and his entourage. Answers should be focused on a balanced (which does *not* mean equal) assessment of who was mostly responsible.

Churchill was an outsider for almost the whole period before the collapse of Neville Chamberlain’s authority early in 1940. Even when Churchill became prime minister in 1940, there was still much opposition to his appointment especially from elements within the Party who preferred Lord Halifax – and who regarded Winston as unreliable and disloyal. Contrary to the hero status that Churchill attained later, he did not have a united Cabinet at first. This aspect, the rivalry with Halifax and so on, could well be used in a relevant and effective way – but the question specifies “the 1930s” and exhaustive descriptive detail on 1940 would not be appropriate. Similarly, past “baggage” from Churchill’s long career before the 1930s, possibly as far back as 1900, could be made highly relevant if used as evidence about Churchill’s personality, and as explanation of how Churchill’s reputation affected later developments – but the time scale of this topic begins in 1929, and no candidate should be penalised for “failing” to go back before then. On the other hand, pre-1929 material which is used for a relevant purpose (not as story-telling) should be duly rewarded.

Appeasement, and Churchill's campaign against it, will inevitably and justifiably figure prominently in many answers but there were many other issues involved. Better answers will avoid fixation on the disagreements about the Hitler threat. Useful other factors in the "conflict" might include: differences over the empire; economic issues such as 'imperial preference' and the Gold Standard; the Abdication Crisis and Churchill's support for Edward VIII; the role of key individuals in Churchill's team of advisers (even the very existence of his personal "staff" of researchers and supporters); and personality clashes, for example with Baldwin.

"Examining the extent" of the responsibility for conflicts may include a clear-cut argument about Churchill being "right" or "wrong" – one-sided assessments will often lack depth but such an approach might be highly effective if supported by selective evidence and showing awareness of the issues. Other answers, usually good ones, may attempt to reach more differentiated conclusions, perhaps seeing Churchill as "right but provocative and difficult to deal with" or as "right in some cases but not in others".



## Summary of mark scheme for HS03

Marks	Understanding of question	Knowledge	Analysis	Balance & judgement	Quality of language and structure
1-4	Little understanding or reference to focus of question.	Lacking specific relevant factual information.	Generalised assertion.		Poorly structured. Limited grammatical accuracy.
5-9 <b>Either</b>	Some understanding – may be implicit.	Selects some relevant and accurate material.	Mostly narrative or descriptive with some links especially in introduction and/or conclusion.		Loose in structure. Some effective use of language but limited grammatically.
	<b>Or</b> Understands question, at least in part.	Some appropriate material but rather thin.	Some analysis but limited and/or addresses only part of question.		
10-14	Generally explicit understanding.	Selects appropriate material but may lack depth.	Shows some analysis with arguments and comments responding to the question but may lack weight.	Limited balance – not fully developed or convincing.	Coherent structure. Generally effective use of language. Some grammatical errors.
15-17	Explicit and aware of different approaches to question.	Generally precise and well selected.	Develops a focused argument for most of the answer.	Covers all parts of the question to provide a balanced explanation.	Coherent structure. Effective and mostly accurate language.
18-20	Explicit and sustained.	Precise selection of relevant and accurate material.	Maintains a consistent argument for the greater part of the answer. Good understanding.	Reasonably balanced and offering some convincing judgement.	Accurate, fluent and well structured. Shows some maturity and conceptual awareness.

Note that the actual mark awarded at each level will depend on how well the candidate matches the given criteria. Marks may go up for slightly better knowledge/analysis/balance or quality of language, and down when one or more of these is weaker. Examiners start in the middle of a level and then adjust up or down.