

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

AS History Course Essays (HS03) *(Subject Code 5041)*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

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 (3) (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 (7) (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 (12) (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 (16) (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 (19) (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 were the needs of pilgrims in the development of the military orders 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 should consider a range of reasons for the growth of the military orders, both the Knights Templar and Hospitaller, with a focus on the needs of pilgrims for care and protection. These might be balanced against the Orders' growth as a reflection of the military needs of the Crusader States and the development of the Orders as a means of religious expression for the knightly classes. In support of the needs of pilgrims reference may be made to the events of 1119. The murder of 300 pilgrims travelling from Jerusalem to the river Jordan by Saracen bandits during Holy Week of that year highlighted the issue of protection for pilgrims, while the defeat in the Battle of the Field of Blood illustrated the strategic weakness of the Crusader States and the need for military support.

Other factors relevant to the developments of the military orders include:

- the roots of the Hospitallers in 1070 and their caritative role
- the actions of men such as Gerard, Raymond of Le Puy and Hugh of Payens in shaping their relative orders
- the lack of manpower in Outremer
- the need for the permanent presence of a regular army of trained soldiers and the problems of feudal society in providing manpower
- the nature of crusading as a temporary penitential pilgrimage and the needs of the crusaders states for manpower

- the development of the crusading ideal. Religious enthusiasm, the potency of the orders' message as an ideal, or the wider monastic revival which provided the context for their growth
- the stimulus provided by Bernard of Clairvaux, links with Cistercians and 'In praise of the New Knighthood'.

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

How important was the part played by economic factors in the expansion 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 should consider a range of reasons for the growth of the Cistercian order, with a focus on economic factors. These might include:

- their focus on the wilderness
- benefactors and uncultivated land
- sheep farming and wool production
- manual labour and the use of conversi
- the flood of endowments; papal privileges
- the economic context of European demographic and economic expansion.

Alternative reasons for growth might include:

- the spiritual success of the order
- the impact of Citeaux as a mother-house
- the social catholicity of its appeal
- the roles of Bernard of Clairvaux and Stephen Harding. By the time of Bernard's death in 1153 his abbey at Clairvaux was mother-house to 68 of the 343 houses of Cistercian monks. The order grew after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, and his charismatic personality and personal example in austerity and asceticism, his prestige

and inspirational role, his ‘golden eloquence’ in articulating Cistercian ideals, especially his letters and debates with Peter the Venerable as a means of promoting the New Monasticism, are central.

Other relevant factors include:

- the constitution and organisation of the order, especially visitations as a means of preserving Cistercian ideals
- the period after Bernard’s death in 1153 with the growth of criticism and dilution of the order’s economic ideals and purity.

A well-argued essay might emphasise that economic factors brought damage as well as growth.

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

How important was Catherine de Medici in bringing about the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion?

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.

Catherine de Medici was a constant factor in the period from 1559 to 1562, seeking to protect her children and maintain the authority of the crown. This often meant that she was seen as personally power-seeking, scheming, over-protective of her sons and responsible for the growth of faction and rivalry.

The importance of her role might be explained by consideration of:

- her position as Queen Mother; as such she was bound to have some influence on the actions and decisions of the king, e.g. in her efforts to resolve religious problems she persuaded Francis II to remove the death penalty for heresy and summon an assembly to discuss religious issues; as Regent for Charles IX, she got the Estates-General to pass the Edict of January to recognise the existence of Catholics and Huguenots in France (although it never was fully put into practice). This generated hostility from the Catholics and particularly the Guises
- her desire to ensure the independence of the crown by trying to prevent the dominance of any one political faction, e.g. she sought to limit the power of the Guises who were particularly influential in the reign of Francis II; she was helped in this by the Chancellor L'Hopital. Her greatest success came in the reign of Charles IX who, as a minor, was more readily influenced by his mother. However, the favouring of the Navarre family

and of Coligny raised the hopes of Protestants and increased the fears of Catholics that she would attempt some compromise with the Huguenots

- her aim to resolve the religious divide peacefully, e.g. by declaring through the Edict of St. Germain that Huguenots could practise their religion without interference; however, this pleased neither side as the edict gave only limited approval of the right of Huguenots to worship and the Catholics were angry that any recognition had been given at all.

Other factors should be considered and weighed against these, e.g. the growth of militant Calvinism supported by a centralised organisation operating through synods and links to Geneva, contrasting with the weaknesses of the Catholic church marred by corruption and abuses; the rivalries and ambitions of the noble families not only to pursue their favoured religion but also to control the Crown – this was promoted by the growth of the clientage system; the economic climate characterised by poor harvests, rising prices and steep taxation in turn promoted the clientage system resulting in a consolidation of rivalries.

Consideration of all these factors should enable some assessment of differing levels of importance, e.g. Catherine's policies were most important because her aims were impossible to achieve: her attempts at reconciliation were misinterpreted as favouritism and exposed France to potential attack by neighbouring Catholic powers; as a woman and a foreigner she had limited credibility. Catherine failed to recognise these limitations and her decision to tolerate dissent by publishing the Edict of January was the stimulus to war. However, the three rival families created a situation where it was virtually impossible to develop policies which would satisfy all groups. Least important might be the economic/financial argument; all sides were affected by this and mounting debt was a deterrent to, rather than a promoter of, conflict.

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**

How important was Henry IV's conversion to Catholicism in enabling him to secure the throne of France by 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.

Answers could argue that the conversion was important because:

- Henry of Navarre became king in 1589 on the death of Henry III by virtue of the Salic law, but had then to conduct a military campaign to seize his inheritance. He unsuccessfully besieged Paris and was not able to be crowned until he converted to Catholicism in 1593 – coronation took place 1594 (Paris is worth a mass)
- once Henry was crowned, the collapse of the Catholic League was inevitable – their *raison d'être* had been opposition to a protestant king in prospect or in reality
- Henry's conversion enabled the Pope to accept him and thus most of France. As most of Europe was Catholic, dangers of foreign intervention receded; he had the support of Huguenots and Catholics when he later fought Spain.

In contrast it might be argued that:

- once converted Henry still had to bribe his Catholic enemies to stop opposing him and continue the military campaign; he allegedly spent 30 million livres on 'the recovery of his kingdom' – he had to be crowned at Chartres because Rheims was still in the hands of the League. After the coronation he had still to defeat the forces of Catholic Spain
- disappointed French Huguenots also became militant as a result of concern that they had no future in Henry IV's France – he had to get the Catholics to accept some freedom of

worship for Huguenots to prevent this damaging his position, but could not afford to be too radical

- this was Henry IV's fourth conversion, and there was some cynicism about his conversion which may explain his eventual assassination by a Catholic fanatic, Ravallac. However, he was also a prince of the blood, and the only possible legitimate claimant to the throne after the death of the Cardinal de Bourbon in 1590
- Henry IV was an effective military leader and could have defeated the Catholics without the conversion factor. He also had the support of German princes such as John Casimir. The French were glad to have him after the ineptitude of Henry III – he had made a significant mistake in murdering the duke of Guise which turned the League against him; his reputation had suffered as a result of the 'mignons'
- political theory at this time was developing arguments about the legitimacy of tyrannicide: this had undermined the position of Henry III (but was equally likely to affect Henry IV). The war with Spain, however, may well have been the most influential factor in ensuring that the people of France, whatever their faith, rallied around Henry IV.

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

How important was the resistance of the privileged sections of society in bringing about the failure of John Law's Système?

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 define 'privileged sections of society' and consider some beyond the nobility, such as office-holders, bankers and investors so that their role may be assessed against other factors. Reasons for the creation of Law's Système and details of its implementation are relevant only where they are linked to the issue of the failure of his experiment. Questioning the degree of failure might be considered but this is not the central focus of the question.

- Resistance of the privileged:

Reasons for opposition might be inter-linked with the effect on Law's system:

Some of the Court nobility were resentful over the ending of the Polysynodie in 1718 and critical of the Protestant foreigner Law's rapid rise to prominence and office as Controller General, as were fellow ministers Dubois and D'Aguesseau; the Duc de Maine and his supporters resented the setting aside of the Regency Council by Orleans. The Parlement of Paris recalcitrance was over wider issues, such as Unigenitus, and the judges resented Orleans' actions against them, e.g. the 1718 Lit de Justice; restrictions on the Right of Remonstrance; the arrest of Parlements; the exile of Parlement to Pontoise in 1720. The bankers and Tax-Farmers had vested interest in the Crown's debt and the existing taxation system, as did many Parlements as rentiers and lenders of capital to the Crown. The huge increase in circulation of paper money in 1717 led to abrupt deflation which affected

holders of fixed capital, whilst the repayment of loans rather than interest would diminish the income of the lenders and rentiers. All of the privileged were horrified by some of Law's proposals, e.g. all-class taxation, suppression of many minor venal offices.

- The actions of the privileged:

The financiers, especially the Paris-Duverney brothers, and wealthy tax-farmers attempted to break the Banque Royale, but failed, worsening their resentment. They set up an "antisystem" company offering higher rates of interest than Law, forcing him to outbid them. The resistance of d'Aguesseau to Law's Système led to the Chancellor's replacement and his resentment was expressed in Parlement, stiffening its resistance. As rentiers, the Parlements were the most implacable opponents of Law's proposals and were also able to pose as defenders of those affected by inflation to win popular support, e.g. in 1718 and 1720. The privileged participated in the wave of speculation – 500 livres shares touched 18,000 by 1720 – and chose their moment to withdraw from the market. Very few of the privileged were ruined by the bursting of the Mississippi Bubble; many made huge fortunes – for example the Duc de Bourbon, lending credence to a conspiracy theory.

Other factors which contributed to the failure might include:

- the Regent, Orleans: restoration of the Right of Remonstrance to the Parlement of Paris in 1715 created their opportunity for resistance; he lacked the full power of a sovereign such as Louis XIV to enforce acceptance; Law was the sacrificial victim to gain Parlement's registration of Unigenitus in December 1720
- Law himself: his reputation as a roué and gambler; the flaws in his system; failure to limit the issue of paper money led to inflation; over-stressing the success of the Trading Companies fuelled speculation; linking the Trading Companies to the Banque Royale so that both were brought down in the collapse; the over-ambitious speed in implementing the system
- the sheer scale of the problem: the massive weight of debt inherited from Louis XIV; the inefficiency of the existing system; the difficulties involved in implementing such a radical scheme; the bursting of the Bubble undermined confidence
- an overall conclusion might be that the privileged had the motives, means and opportunity to resist Law's proposals and could claim to act in the best interests of the people. Whilst other factors were important, their opposition proved decisive.

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

How important were the economic and financial policies of Cardinal Fleury's government in creating a period of prosperity both for the monarchy and for France in the period 1726 to 1743?

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 be expected to distinguish between economic and financial policies, but also to see the links between them. Similarly the degree to which the monarchy was able to share in the prosperity of France and the reasons for this should be addressed. The “government” may be treated as a whole or reference made to specific ministers’ areas of responsibility.

- The financial policies and effects:

The Crown's finances were increased by policies such as: Fleury's deliberate policy of reassurance after the failure of Law's system, through measures such as the restoration of coinage in 1726, and making regular payments on royal debt he was effective in increasing confidence in royal ability to meet its debt repayment and raised further loans. Creating the General Farm, grouping taxes and “farming” tobacco, increased Crown income and the loyalty of Tax Farmers. The policy of retrenchment – careful administration and rigid economies, especially in military expenditure, aided by the effectiveness of the Controller Generals, le Peletier des Forts and, particularly, Orry (1730-1745) – produced the only balanced budgets of the eighteenth century. There was, however, no fundamental reform of the system which left the monarchy dependant on an inefficient tax basis and loans which could not support the costs of war. The re-establishment of the power of the Tax Farmers

was a retrograde step. Thus, the Crown's financial health was somewhat illusory, and even Orry was forced to revive the *dixieme* in the Wars of the Polish and Austrian Succession.

Although the greatest wealth accrued to the financiers, from royal loans and contracts, the stabilising of currency in 1726 did restore confidence in general thus aiding investment in the economy and overseas trade to the benefit of France.

- Economic policies and effects:

The well-being of the French economy and its people was aided by economic policies: the partial reversion to mercantilism, e.g. re-imposing heavy tariffs on foreign goods, maintaining *l'exclusif* whereby all French trade was confined to French ships, continuing to subsidise the manufactures royales, had encouraged French industry and trade. The *corvee royale* of 1738 improved roads to possibly the best in Europe.

The maintenance of the regulations imposed by Colbert, and their extension by Orry, limited economic flexibility and new development, whilst manufacturers resented having to bear the cost of the army of government inspectors. Nothing was done for agriculture, despite widespread famine in 1739-1740, so that "prosperity" was largely restricted to urban areas, in particular the great seaports, and a minority of the population.

On balance a secure economy meant contented middle and upper classes with no pressing reason to challenge the authority of the Crown. However, the inequalities, inefficiency and corruption in the tax system and the opportunity for the wealthy to buy office and, hence tax exemption meant that the Crown did not share to an equal extent in the increasing prosperity of France.

Other factors which had created prosperity:

- overseas trade in the period was building on its earlier stimulus by Colbert and Law's Trading Companies, especially from the West Indies; the Slave Triangle was enormously profitable; private enterprise was largely responsible for the development of the Atlantic and Levantine trade
- France was well-placed geographically to prosper from Atlantic and Mediterranean trade and had navigable rivers. Marseille and Dunkirk were free ports, Nantes and, above all, Bordeaux exploited trade to the Indies and Africa as well as Europe
- distilleries, sugar refineries, cotton manufacture and shipbuilding all developed; the wealthy built magnificent houses and intendants supervised rebuilding of whole town centres, thus creating employment. The general population increase also ensured a cheap labour force
- Fleury's foreign policy had ensured a period of peace, enabling both monarchy and France to prosper.

The conclusion might be that the policies of Fleury's government had aided rather than created a period of prosperity, one in which neither the monarchy nor all of France fully shared, and the Crown's financial well-being depended on the preservation of European peace.

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

How serious a threat to the ‘Concert of Europe’ were the revolutions of 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.

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.

Possible Approaches

Chronological descriptions of the 1830 Revolutions in France, Belgium, Poland and the Italian States are not in themselves useful. Responses will probably follow a Revolution by Revolution approach and explain the impact of the Revolutions in the individual states on the ‘Concert of Europe’ and make judgements about their relative seriousness. However, better answers will probably identify a number of reasons why collectively the Revolutions were/were not a serious threat.

Interpretations

Candidates will probably conclude that the ‘Concert of Europe’ emerged reinvigorated after 1830. Conference diplomacy was utilised to settle the Belgian revolt and allowed for diplomatic cooperation and most importantly the preservation of peace between the Great Powers. The Great Powers displayed restraint in the pursuit of their national interests and respect for the 1815 settlement. Where required the Great Powers had superior military strength and acted decisively to prevent revolution spreading. However, the revolution in France brought to power a liberal regime under Louise-Philippe which divided the Great Powers after 1830 into two opposing ideological camps – the Liberal Alliance (Britain and France) and the Holy Alliance (Russia, Austria and Prussia). This ideological divide contained a serious threat to the workings of the ‘Concert of Europe’, as a degree of consensus and negotiation as required to solve diplomatic problems. Therefore in the longer

term the 1830 Revolutions had a negative lasting impact on the ‘Concert of Europe’. Better answers should present a developed and balanced approach to the question.

Reasons why the 1830 Revolutions were not a serious threat to the ‘Concert of Europe’

- Collective Action by the Great Powers – Conference Diplomacy:

London Conference of November 1830 displayed the collective responsibility of the Great Powers and resolved the Belgian Revolt of 1830-1831, which was arguably the most serious threat to European order. Conference Diplomacy was an agreed strategy for resolving important problems by round-table discussions with a willingness to accept an outcome that was less than ideal, e.g. Great Powers compromised over the choice of monarch for Belgium, a collective ultimatum was sent to the Dutch King to ensure his co-operation and collective pressure was placed on the Belgians to accept the terms placed upon them.

- Restraint in the pursuit of national interests:

Polish and Italian Revolutionaries were not given any aid by Britain and France, despite public pressure to do so through impassioned pleas made in the House of Commons and Chamber of Deputies. The members of the Holy Alliance (Russia, Austria and Prussia) were restrained in their responses to the French and Belgian Revolutions, despite their support of the status quo and the monarchical regimes imposed by the 1815 treaties.

- Respect for the treaties of 1815 and passive acceptance of the Balance of Power:

Britain did not interfere in the Polish Revolt of November 1830 because Lord Liverpool’s government did not wish to challenge Russia’s right to rule Poland as enforced by the 1815 Treaties. Similarly, the Great Powers did not support the various Italian Revolutionaries because they respected Austrian rule, which was also granted by the treaties of 1815.

- Military strength and decisive action of the Great Powers:

The Polish Revolt was eventually crushed by the superior Russian armed forces, which took Warsaw by September 1831. Poland was placed under military rule; the Diet, universities and the separate Polish army were abolished. A harsh policy of Russification was enforced. Austrian troops quickly suppressed uprising in the Duchies of Parma and Modena and the Papal States. The legitimate rulers were restored and Austria reasserted her right to interfere in the Italian States.

Reasons why the 1830 Revolutions were a threat to the ‘Concert of Europe’

Metternich viewed all revolutions with suspicion. Revolution threatened the principle of legitimacy and balance of power established at Vienna in 1815. Revolution could spread quickly across Europe and threaten the traditional power structures. A similar view of Revolution was held by Russia and Prussia (through the Troppau Protocol), therefore any revolution within Europe had to be crushed and was viewed as a very serious threat to peace.

The Polish revolt did pose a threat to Russian authority as Nationalist Polish army officers revolted against Tsar Nicholas I, with the Polish Diet proclaiming national independence in February 1831. However, the impact on the Concert of Europe was minimal as no other power came to the aid of the Polish nationalists.

The Belgian Revolution was perhaps the most serious threat to peace in Europe. The Low Countries were strategically sensitive for France, Britain and Prussia. The King of the United Netherlands called for international assistance in crushing the revolutionaries and upholding the legitimacy of the 1815 settlement.

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

How important is the incompetence of his ministers in explaining the downfall of Louis-Philippe in February 1848?

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 1848 Revolution in France is often referred to as the accidental revolution – an unpredictable series of events and misfortunes that led to the overthrow of the July monarchy. However, Louis-Philippe's ministers proved indecisive, unpopular and confused in the face of the crisis of February 1848. Candidates may argue that the revolution was highly probable due to the inherent weaknesses of Louis-Philippe's ministers, which proved itself unable to solve the deep economic crisis of 1845-1847 and the resulting social discontent. Alternatively they could argue that Louis-Philippe's ministers were politically competent, at least up until the summer of 1846, and that the roots of the revolution lie in the extraordinary economic and social crises that affected most of continental Europe during 1845-1847.

Evidence to support incompetent ministers

- growing political frustration of the middle classes due to Louis-Philippe's increasingly active role in government 1840-1848, reflected in the series of reform banquets which got round the government's ban on political meetings. The Chamber of Deputies refused to reduce the electoral tax qualification to 100 francs in 1847. Louis-Philippe and Guizot refused to offer concessions to middle class liberals during the financial crisis of 1846-1847
- Guizot's ministry failed to alleviate the social and economic distress caused by the economic slump of 1845-1847 and was left extremely vulnerable especially to criticism

from the increasingly vocal and politicised middle classes who were demanding electoral reform

- government lost credibility due to scandals in high places, continuous opposition criticism of electoral corruption and the use of patronage to control deputies. In 1847 the liberal opposition exploited two such scandals – the case of Teste and the case of Duc de Praslin
- Louis-Philippe was the self-styled ‘King of the French’ and lacked legitimacy in the eyes of the supporters of the Bourbons. Republicans felt cheated that the monarchy had survived the 1830 Revolution. Thus the Orleans dynasty had little popular support on the right or left and was easily overthrown during the February Revolution of 1848
- a restrained and unambitious foreign policy was followed which was unpopular with the French public who wished to reassert their country as a dominant power on the European continent. The Mehmet Ali affair of 1840 was a personally humiliating diplomatic defeat for Louis-Philippe, whilst the resolution of the Spanish Marriages affair in 1846 resulted in a hollow victory for the French
- domestically, the innovative policy of increasing public education places resulted in the discontent of elementary school teachers who resented their low wages. The programme of public investment and building of the railways led to overproduction in the coal and iron sectors that compounded the industrial and financial crisis of 1846-1847. Social policy failed to meet the needs of an emerging industrial nation, only the 1841 Factory Act was passed which was badly enforced.

Evidence to refute incompetent ministers

- Guizot’s ministry increasingly faced opposition from Barrot and Thiers, but they sought reform not revolution
- Louis-Philippe had served conservative interests well for almost 18 years, especially after the appointment of Guizot in 1840, whose term in office is usually associated with *laissez-faire* economic policy
- as late as August 1846 the government did well in parliamentary elections and increased its support in many constituencies
- the government survived previous artisan uprisings in 1832, 1834 and 1839, whilst Louis Napoleon’s attempted coups in October 1836 and August 1840 were little more than pathetic fiascos.

The economic and social crisis 1845-1847

This evidence may be used to argue that no ministry could have overcome the disastrous economic crisis of these years, witnessed by the downfall of monarchs and governments throughout Europe, or that Louis-Philippe’s ministers mismanaged the economic downturn which intensified French society’s reaction. This ultimately led to Revolution in February 1848.

- potato blight (1845), failure of the cereal harvest (1845 and 1846), food prices increased (corn prices doubled in Normandy 1846-1847), farmers and urban traders had to increasingly rely on loans

- population of Paris exploded from 860 000 in 1831 to 1.3 million in 1846, real wages of artisans decreased by 10-15% between the 1820s and 1840s, 70% of wages were spent on food. Unemployment increased following the business slump of 1846, value of stocks fell, bankruptcies multiplied, the Bank of France took a £1 million bank loan from the Bank of England.

Through an examination of the events of February 1848 in Paris most candidates will concede that political incompetence and panic triggered the overthrow/downfall of Louis-Philippe. It was the government's decision to ban a Republican banquet planned for the 22 February which triggered the demonstrations in the capital, and Louis-Philippe's lack of decisive leadership which spread panic throughout the court in the following days. Guizot was dismissed on 23 February and the King abdicated the following day. Neither act saved the French Monarchy.

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

Was rivalry between Russia and Austria-Hungary the main cause of the conflict in the Balkans in the years 1870-1890? Explain your answer.

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.

This question focuses on the rival ambitions of Russia and Austria-Hungary, but candidates will need to assess this issue in relation to other relevant factors – notably the power vacuum left by the misrule and corruption of the disintegrating Ottoman Empire, and the emerging nationalism of the Christian Balkan states determined to win independence, with potential for conflict between the major European powers.

For an assortment of strategic, economic, racial and religious reasons, and posing as protector of the Christian subjects, Russia wanted to exploit the unrest in the Balkans in order to extend her own influence there. Austria-Hungary also saw scope for expansion, and wanted Turkey to be weak, but needed to prop-up the Ottoman Empire to preserve her own multi-racial empire. Balkan nationalism spelt opportunity for Russia, but spelt possible disintegration for Austria-Hungary, which was a conglomeration of so many different national groups. However, this rivalry also had implications for the other major European powers – Germany wanted to avoid taking sides, and was anxious to remain friendly with both Russia and Austria-Hungary; Britain and France wanted to keep Turkey strong enough to withstand such pressure, and feared that, if national states were formed, they would be Russian-dominated.

Two major crises dominate this 20-year period – firstly, the Near-Eastern Crisis of 1875-78: sparked by the uprisings and rebellions of the Balkan peoples from 1875, sustained by unsuccessful diplomacy and Turkish repression, and leading to the Russo-Turkish War, the

contentious Treaty of San Stefano and the Congress of Berlin. The delicate diplomatic harmony established in Berlin was destroyed in the second crisis which started in Bulgaria from 1885 with the proposed union of Eastern Rumelia and Bulgaria. Following the growth of an anti-Russian movement in Bulgaria, Russia now opposed the union, while Austria-Hungary supported it, and the crisis marked a further deterioration in international relations. However, by 1890, there had been no large-scale conflict and there was relative peace in the Balkans, even between Russia and Austria-Hungary, with the former now looking more towards Central Asia and the Far East for prestige.

Higher level answers should clearly provide more than a narrative of events and will analyse issues beyond the two-power rivalry, making the links between the decline of the Ottoman Empire as the underlying cause, the resulting emergence of Balkan nationalism as conflict developed, and the practical political interests of Russia and Austria-Hungary, with implications for other European powers.

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

Explain why the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo was so important in plunging Europe into war in 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.

In isolation, it would not be expected that the fatal shooting of the Austrian Emperor's nephew by a young Serb student to plunge Europe into a full scale war – but, of course, this assassination cannot be seen in isolation. Candidates should explain why, for some powers, this murder was very much 'the last straw', by analysing earlier Balkan events and by linking these to the international context. Responses might also consider the chain of events following the assassination which quickly ran out of control.

In relation to the crisis of 1914, candidates should assess the significance of the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908, and the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. The former highlighted the Balkans as a potential European powder keg, leaving a residue of bitterness which foreshadowed the 1914 crisis – marking unqualified German backing for, and a new over-confidence from, Austria-Hungary; while Russia was left humiliated and embittered, with Serbian nationalists now looking to Russia to take on Austria-Hungary. The latter signified Serbia's territorial expansion, and once Austria-Hungary decided to 'eliminate' Serbia, it only needed a spark in 1914. This sort of increasing confrontation in the Balkans cannot be separated from the two competing European alliances. With Germany, pursuing Weltpolitik, no longer a moderating influence, the attempts of Britain and France to maintain peace and a balance of power became increasingly difficult as these alliances hardened.

Therefore, the assassination itself could not be allowed to pass unpunished, provoking a chain reaction involving the major powers. The complicity of the Serbian government was

compounded by the military ambitions of Germany, Austria-Hungary and possibly Russia – leading to ‘blank cheque’, ultimatum and mobilisation, as calculated risks replaced attempts at conciliation, and as events ran out of control through a combination of misjudgements and miscalculations. This sort of overall range should be evident at the higher levels, integrating Balkan events with the international context.

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

With what success, by the time of Lenin's death in 1924, had the Communists overcome internal opposition to their rule in Russia?

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 explain the internal opposition to communism, and candidates are likely to point out that opposition to the Bolsheviks was inevitable, given that they were a minority group that seized power in a coup in 1917 and immediately introduced radical policies that were bound to upset many both on the Left and the Right. Some may differentiate between the 'opposition' within the Party and that from outside.

Bolshevik hard line policies alienated many: for example the closing of the Constituent Assembly in 1918 because it did not have a Bolshevik majority; plus the radical policies taking land and privileges away from established institutions and declaring class war. Although apparently in a perilous position, one reason why the Communists ultimately survived was that the opposition was disparate and had no clear aims or leadership, whereas the Communists under Lenin appeared ruthless and with purpose. He was also ruthlessly pragmatic, as seen in the signing of the unpopular peace with Germany.

Answers are likely to discuss the Civil War between 1917 and 1920. If candidates include foreign intervention in the Civil war, it can be credited, but it is not mandatory. There are debates about why the Reds won – credit goes to Trotsky's Red Army, the policies of War Communism etc. The reality was that the Reds had many advantages on their side – more men, interior lines of communications, control of industrial areas, unified leadership, a common purpose – and the Whites squandered what few advantages they had. All the time the Communists were tightening their control. A good answer should recognise that not only

did the Reds defeat ideological opponents, they also quashed divergent views from within, as the central Party machine increasingly subordinated local soviets to its control and power was generated from the top downwards. Lenin and other leaders were ruthless – as witnessed under War Communism and the activities of the *Cheka* or secret police. The Workers Opposition group made little real headway. Remnants of other left wing opposition groups such as the Mensheviks and SRs had effectively disappeared from the scene by the early 1920s.

However, the Communists also survived because Lenin was a pragmatist; he survived major scares like the Kronstadt Revolt by a combination of repression and timely concession in the form of NEP. His authority was great enough that he got his way. Critics were also silenced by the ban on factions at the 1921 Congress. Even critics of NEP were not too outspoken whilst Lenin was alive. The machinery of propaganda and terror was already well in place by 1924, even though at this stage the Communists did not have a particularly strong hold over the countryside.

The Communists were fairly secure against internal opposition by 1924 – it did not exist in any organised form – even though they faced many hostile enemies. Although there was to be considerable infighting amongst Communist contenders for power, there was no evidence of a serious threat to Communist rule itself.

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

Explain the main reasons why the New Economic Policy was the cause of so many disputes within the leadership of the USSR in the years 1922 to 1928.

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 examine a number of ways in which the NEP was linked to disputes within the communist leadership, and should also attempt to link, prioritise or draw conclusions about these in order to assess the “main” reasons.

NEP was essentially an emergency measure to quell opposition to the ruthless policy of War Communism of 1918-1921, although an ideological justification was also given to NEP by Lenin and others. It was unpopular from the start with many Communists because it seemed like a compromise with capitalism, allowing private trade and encouraging Nepmen and enterprising kulaks to do well. Even though the economy recovered, many Communists detested what they saw as the rebirth of class differences and the triumph of the money-based capitalist economy, despite the fact that major industries were still in state hands. Hardliners like Trotsky came to terms with it grudgingly, and no one was prepared to rock the boat whilst Lenin was alive.

The debate after 1924 was coloured by several factors. One was economic. Despite the relative success of NEP in increasing production, there were still difficulties as seen already in the Scissors Crisis of 1923, when agriculture and industry developed at different rates and threatened to upset the balance in the economy. A major fear was that the peasants would always be in a position to hold the regime to ransom over food, a fear realised in the late 1920s when the regime had to resort to requisitioning because of a shortage of grain deliveries from peasants. This was to be the final signal for collectivisation to start. But NEP

was controversial above all for ideological reasons. All Communists believed in industrialisation, because it was seen as the necessary precondition for socialism. The debate was all about the best way to achieve industrialisation, although the debate was complicated because it became bound up with personal clashes and manoeuvring for power after Lenin's death. Hardliners – originally Trotsky, and later Stalin – believed that the process must be accelerated by the state, and the peasants must be forced to pay for industrialisation and provide food for the cities and for export, which was to mean a major change in the organisation of agriculture. Those on the Right like Bukharin wanted a more moderate approach, believing that encouraging the peasants to prosper would stimulate the demand for industrial goods and thereby help the economy to take off without state intervention. The personal and ideological arguments raged until Stalin defeated both Left and then Right by 1929, by which time the Party was already collectivising and industrialising and thereby putting a nail into the coffin of NEP.

In the last resort, despite some apparent economic successes, NEP was too much at variance with the politics of most Communists to be regarded as, at best, any more than a short term compromise, and therefore its existence in the 1920s was bound to stimulate controversy, both from the standpoint of the economic ideas themselves, and the fact that for some Communists the whole issue was also bound up with political ambition.

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

Examine the extent to which the Weimar Republic had overcome its political and economic problems by the beginning of 1929.

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 state of the Weimar Republic in 1929, and will need to look at both the promising developments of the preceding years (the topic begins in 1925) and their limitations as well as the underlying strengths and weaknesses of the regime in both economic and political areas. Candidates' references to the period before 1925 may be credited but this is not essential. Candidates should assess the situation in 1929 and make some judgement as to the position and prospects of the regime.

An examination of the Republic's political position by the beginning of 1929 might include:

- the Weimar system of democratic government appeared well established, after 10 years, and in the May 1928 elections, parties committed to democracy had increased support to form a broad coalition (SDP, DDP, Centre Party and DVP) under Müller. The percentage voting for pro-Weimar parties had been rising steadily from 52% in May 1924 to 73% in May 1928
- there had been no coups and no major political assassinations since 1923 and political violence appeared much reduced
- the Nazis had done badly in the 1928 elections winning only 2.6% of the vote (in keeping with the Party's steady political decline from the 6.5% of the vote in May 1924). The KPD had done slightly better with 10.6% but this was still less than May 1924. Neither party appeared serious political contenders

- Hindenburg's election as President in 1925 had given the Republic greater respectability and reassured some of the conservative right wing elite groups who were therefore more prepared to support the Republic. Hindenburg had proved a conscientious President who upheld the constitution
- internationally, Germany had acquired greater respectability through the Locarno Pact, (October 1925) and membership of League of Nations (September 1926). These moves had added to the Republic's prestige and expectations of its permanency.

An examination of the Republic's economic position by the beginning of 1929 might include:

- inflation had been cured (Reichsmark established) and the previous five years had seen virtually continuous growth in industrial production which by 1927 had reached 1913 levels. The modernisation of industry involving rationalisation, cartelisation and American mass production methods had been helped by foreign investment and a growing economic confidence
- the burden of reparations had been reduced by the Dawes Plan (and the improved terms of Young Plan were nearing finalisation). More money was now entering the country than leaving in reparations
- living standards were rising thanks to greater social expenditure in the improved financial circumstances, (extension of unemployment insurance extended to over 17 million workers 1927), steadier prices (money wages doubled 1924-1928) and comparatively low unemployment at under a million.

Criticism of the Republic's political position by the beginning of 1929 might include:

- the anti-Republican attitudes still present in influential sectors of society and the continued existence of Left Wing and Right Wing parties
- although the Nazis only polled 2.6% of the vote, they had made significant gains in northern rural areas in 1928 and perpetuated political violence through the SA/communist street fighting
- the resentment of the elites remained – industrialists resented the burdens of the welfare state and the trade unions' demands; landed aristocracy resented their loss of influence; the army considered themselves "above politics", judges and civil servants were not reconciled to democracy; President Hindenburg was a right wing anti-parliamentarian traditionalist
- the decline of the middle-ground liberal party (DDP), support for "special interest" fringe parties and the move of the Centre Party to the right, made moderate government difficult; there had been 6 short-lived coalition governments since 1924 and only 2 had possessed a majority in the reichstag.

Criticism of the Republic's economic position by the beginning of 1929 might include:

- economic growth rates had been unsteady (e.g. a brief downturn in 1925) and industrial production was growing at a slower rate than of other European countries. Germany's share of world production had fallen from 14.3% in 1913 to 11.6% in 1926-1929 and there was a growing trade deficit
- agriculture was in depression because of a world surplus of grain. Prices fell from 1927 and by 1928 over a third of all farms were running at a loss. Agricultural organisation and practices were outdated

- unemployment had begun to rise in 1928 and tension between employers and workers was high (1928 Ruhr lockout). Employers believed the growth was being hindered by the powerful trade unions
- economy recovery had done little for the urban middle class. Bitterness over earlier hyperinflation remained with unsatisfactory schemes of compensation
- state welfare schemes were unrealistic. Since there was a budget deficit they could only be maintained by imposing high taxes, which increased the resentment of the regime felt by the taxpayers.

The underlying problems of the Weimar Republic, still present in 1929 might include:

- the basic flaws in the constitution and operation of politics. Proportional representation had led to weak short-lived coalition governments
- the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, with which the Weimar government was associated, remained in force. Reparations were burdensome and, even although ameliorated, were heavily resented by powerful interests. Allied troops still occupied the west bank of the Rhine and Germany had not regained any land lost in 1919. Stresemann's foreign policy had not increased domestic support and ideas of "fulfilment" were regarded as capitulation by nationalists
- economic stability was based on external loans, particularly from American, and short-term credit was being used for long-term industrial projects. Germany had developed a dangerous dependence on the U.S. economy
- the cultural changes associated with the Weimar Republic (laxer morals and standards of culture) had encouraged traditional hostility to new modernist values. This may have helped to polarise political attitudes to the regime.

Candidates are likely to make some reference to the imminent (post October 1929) crisis and the downfall of the Republic in their conclusion, although this is not essential and the best answers will probably be those that try to assess the position at the beginning of 1929 without any undue influence from what was to come. Most will probably conclude that there were major weaknesses within the Republic even before the crisis of 1929 and that the Republic had only partially overcome its problems by the beginning of that year.

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

Was Hitler's personal leadership the most important factor in the Nazis' rise to power between 1930 and January 1933? Explain your answer.

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 Nazis' rise to power between 1930 and January 1933 and, in particular, should examine the ways in which Hitler himself propelled the Nazis into power. Hitler's leadership qualities will need to be balanced against other important factors leading to Nazi success at the polls and Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in January 1933. Some reasoned assessment as to whether Hitler's personal leadership was the "most important" factor is required.

The importance of Hitler's own leadership qualities might include:

- he made the Führerprinzip integral to Nazi ideology and ensured the party was subordinate to his will, unable to act without his direction or support
- he had great ability as a speaker – a charismatic personality, hypnotic gaze and emotional appeal which provided inspiration, encouraged faith, and suggested a clear sense of direction. Hitler carefully tailored his speeches to his audience
- he knew which policies would have widespread appeal and he played on these; nationalism, anti-communism; economic promises for a brighter future; the restoration of national pride
- he understood the value of propaganda targeting specific grievances. His use of rallies and impressive displays gave the appearance of irresistible power. With the help of Goebbels, Hitler encouraged Germans to "stop thinking, just believe"

- his command of strategy including the reorganisation of the party after the failure of the Munich putsch; the decision to work through the democratic system; the organisational and political campaigns; the anti-Young Plan Alliance with Hugenberg's Nationalist Party (1929) giving Nazis financial support and contributing to the electoral success of 1930; his careful use of SA violence combined with political manoeuvring; his refusal to accept anything less than the Chancellorship, 1932; his deal with Von Papen whereby Hitler became Chancellor with Von Papen as Vice Chancellor in January 1933
- he made careful use of his "loyal" SA. Its power of numbers was intimidating (400,000 members in 1932, four times larger than Reichswehr, and he used it to give the impression that the Nazis were doing something (in contrast to the government) in combating spread of Communism. He deliberately encouraged the fear they created among the elites, which made the conservatives more inclined to give him a role in government because he alone could control the SA.

Other factors which help account for the Nazi rise to power might include:

- the context of the depression; Nazi growth corresponded with the deteriorating economic circumstances and the effect of unemployment which reached 4.5 million in 1931 and nearly 6 million in 1932. In 1928, the Nazis had been a fringe party, but after the slump, in 1930, they became the second largest party
- widespread disenchantment with the Weimar Republic leaving many receptive to the Nazi message and ready to support them; the conservative right, especially large landowners, businessmen and industrialists who saw Nazism as a safeguard from Communism and Socialism; the middle classes, both traditional professional and newer businessmen, who were disillusioned by the policies of the Weimar Republic and hit by the economic crisis; numbers of the working class, attracted by the Nazi's social programme and promises of a better future
- the underlying weaknesses of the Weimar parliamentary government; the problems of coalitions, the polarisation of politics and the breakdown of parliamentary democracy in the face of the depression; the failure of the Weimar politician to agree on the necessary cuts needed to try to rebalance the budget whereby government was forced, from March 1930, to rely on the use of the President's emergency powers under Article 48
- the association of the Weimar Republic with wartime defeat and the view of its politicians as "November criminals". The strength of the right wing in government circles and their fear of Communism, especially after their success in the elections of November 1932
- the parts played by President Hindenburg, Franz von Papen (appointed Chancellor, June 1932), who agreed to the election which made the Nazis the biggest party in Germany, and Von Schleicher whose intrigues against Von Papen led to the latter's negotiations with Hindenburg permitting Hitler to become Chancellor.

In assessing whether Hitler's personal leadership was the most important factor in the Nazis' rise to power, candidates are likely to conclude that Hitler's messianic vision and undisputed position at the head of a tightly structured organisation was indispensable to the success of the movement. However, they may equally argue the view that many voted Nazi for quite rational economic reasons and that this accounted for the percentage of votes won by the Nazis in 1932 (37.4% July 1932, 33.1% November 1932). The able will however, distinguish between the electoral strength of the party (which still polled only a third of the total vote in 1932) and Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in January 1933, which was not the result of an election mandate but the product of political intrigue between Hitler and the right wing elites.

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

Explain the main reasons why Kenya's struggle for independence proved successful 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.

The focus of this question is on identifying the principal reasons for Kenya gaining independence and offering a comparative evaluation of their relative significance. This is a fairly open-ended question which enables candidates to select the reasons, and thereby determine the range of the answer for themselves. Factors in the answer might include:

- **The Mau Mau**

A terrorist nationalist group made up mainly of Kikuyu tribesmen. It caused a State of Emergency to be declared in 1951. Its members swore an oath of loyalty and they used particularly brutal methods of terrorism. Candidates may use material on the Mau Mau to suggest a series of interpretations in terms of the question:

- the terror heightened international awareness of Kenyan nationalism and this put pressure on Britain
- the Mau Mau was a purely Kikuyu movement and very large numbers of black Kenyans continued to support British rule. Mau Mau was unrepresentative and sectional
- it caused increased costs for Britain because large numbers of troops had to be sent to Kenya to maintain order. This was unpopular in Britain

- the terror was largely brought under control after 1956 as large numbers of suspected Mau Mau and many thousands of Kikuyu were herded into camps. British anti-terror tactics were working.

- **The Lyttleton Constitution, 1954**

The Mau Mau may be linked to Britain realising that some degree of change and compromise was necessary. This is best illustrated through the Lyttleton Constitution. This offered limited participation in government for black and Asian Kenyans. As a compromise it failed but it did indicate a willingness, however contained, to move towards some reform.

- **International factors**

British imperial policy was linked to factors external to Kenya:

- The Suez Crisis, 1956, is seen by many historians as a turning point in imperial thinking and one that significantly influenced British political leaders in their thinking on Kenya. Suez showed that Britain was no longer a viable imperial power in Africa. It was a humiliating withdrawal
- much of the pressure to withdraw came from the USA. Britain's special relationship with the USA promoted an anti-imperialist position.

- **Pan-African nationalism**

Nationalism had become endemic across the African continent. It took various forms but its presence and influence on British political leaders was significant. In 1957 Ghana had received its independence from Britain. This reinforced the notion amongst Kenyans that independence was achievable and amongst the British that a clear precedence had been set in Africa.

- **Economic and strategic factors**

Britain's post-war imperial policy was partly founded upon the idea of colonial economic development. This was to establish sound economic links with an empire that was becoming more prosperous through investment. The empire was viewed as a potential economic asset for post-war Britain. By the late 1950s it was clear that Britain's imperial trade was significantly lower than its trade with the USA and western Europe. In effect, the economic benefits of the empire were becoming increasingly less relevant to British interests. This realisation was also applied to Kenya as part of that empire.

- **MacMillan**

Candidates may focus on some/all of the factors referred to above via MacMillan.

- The 'Wind of change' speech in 1960 is significant as it illustrates MacMillan's pragmatism. This is relevant to pan-African nationalism and the Mau Mau

- MacMillan also conducted a cost-benefit analysis on Britain's empire. It clearly indicated that the economic costs outweighed the benefits
- MacMillan was a conservative and only a reluctant supporter of decolonisation. He did, however, have a new sense of realism and he was willing to accept the rationale of breaking with empire in a controlled manner
- He appointed like minded men such as Iain McCleod (Colonial Secretary)
- He was determined to develop the 'You've never had it so good' society in Britain and Kenya was a potential barrier to this aim.

- **Kenyan political leaders**

There were a range of alternatives to the terrorism of the Mau Mau. Kenya had developed a political elite and political parties, e.g. KANU. Men such as Tom Mboya were in the wings and they existed as sound political leaders with who Britain could do business.

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 the changing attitudes of French politicians to the achievement of Algerian independence in 1962?

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 focus of this question is on reasons for the achievement of Algerian independence in 1962 and in particular the attitudes of French politicians. Candidates should balance these political attitudes against other factors in order to reach a substantiated judgement.

Political attitudes

- it would be useful to establish the lack of political stability in France during much of the 1950s. This could be used to develop the idea that political will was fragile and subject to considerable compromise in order to maintain any degree of political support and political stability
- under Pierre Mendes-France, France's strategy was to use military force to end the FLN threat. He was disposed to establish a process of reform after peace had been restored but not complete independence
- Mendes-France's Governor of Algeria was Jacques Soustelle. He favoured the idea of integration. Essentially this necessitated Algeria having more say in its own affairs but clearly within the framework of French colonial power. Mendes-France's successor, Edgar Faure gave Soustelle little support. He was very much under the growing influence of the army in Algeria
- French politicians, certainly up to 1958, were behind strong military action to deal with nationalist terrorism. The policy was one of no compromise

- De Gaulle's arrival as France's new leader may be presented as a major turning point. Candidates may examine de Gaulle's conversion of the concept of independence. They may consider his role as pivotal. He was driven by a vision of a powerful France influencing the development of western Europe, particularly after the introduction of the Treaty of Rome. He also wanted France to play a major strategic role in Europe and neutralise the power and influence of the USA. To him Algeria was a distraction from these aims. Answers may consider de Gaulle's determination to reduce the threat to stability from the army. Ending the commitment to Algeria would undermine the army's power and the dangerous right wing elements who threatened the power of the French establishment. The creation of a new constitution which gave de Gaulle more direct power may also illustrate the process.

Other factors

Candidates may examine the above in terms of the significance of other contributory issues. These could include:

- The role and effectiveness of the FLN:
 - tactics designed to exploit the extremism of the French army in order to increase support and membership
 - strengthening of the organisation after the Soumman Valley Congress of 1956. The FLN became a more formidable terrorist organisation
 - the importance of the Battle of Algiers, 1958. Some may argue that this highlighted the nationalist movement, others may say it irreversibly damaged nationalism.
- The role of the French army:
 - the army used state terrorism i.e. it used its power against innocent Algerians in order to flush out FLN members
 - the tactics created martyrs, which only swerved to increase the ranks of the FLN
 - the army was determined not to lose to Algeria as it had lost French Indo-China
 - the army may be seen as effective in that it developed tactics which profoundly weakened the FLN. This was particularly true during the Battle of Algiers
 - the army became increasingly conservative and right wing and this accelerated the need for independence (see above).

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**

How important are the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, March 1918, in explaining the start of the Civil War in Russia?

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 answers will need to show understanding of the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and how each could have linked to the start of the civil war. The terms were so severe that some Bolsheviks refused to agree but Lenin argued he had no choice but to sign. Russia lost one third of her European land and half her industrial capacity. The loss of the Ukraine's grain was a particular blow.

Some patriotic Russians joined the Whites because they opposed the government that had betrayed "Mother Russia". The civil war began in the summer of 1918 but had been preceded by months of armed resistance and several attempts on Lenin's life.

Answers would be expected to consider the relative importance of other factors that explain the start of the civil war making links between those factors and the Treaty where relevant. Other factors might include:

- the all-important issue of food; the new regime failed to end hunger despite promising "Bread" and this led to opposition
- the break-up of the Russian empire; some fought the civil war to secure self-government and others fought to resist the break up of "Russia, one and indivisible". The Ukrainians and Georgians are known as the "Greens"

- political opposition to the Bolsheviks especially after the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly; they made many enemies, e.g. Mensheviks and SRs joined the Whites when they were banned from the Executive Committee of the Soviets, June 1918
- the role of the Allies; After the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk the British and French governments were willing to support any group that wanted to open up the fighting on the eastern front again. French sent 7 million francs to the leader of the Don Cossacks, January 1918
- the Tsarists; e.g. Tsarist general Yudenich formed a White army of resistance in Estonia
- Lawlessness; some Russians opposed the Bolsheviks who did not seem able to keep law and order, or control the Czech Legion
- Requisitioning; the loss of the “bread basket” Ukraine added to inflation. Lenin sent out squads of workers, soldiers and Cheka to requisition grain and so made more enemies.

Evaluation of their relative importance of various reasons to explain why the civil war broke out will distinguish better answers. The essay may focus very strongly on the Treaty and investigate other factors in less detail, or may have one good paragraph on the Treaty but use the other factors critically.

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 extent to which opposition to the Treaty of Versailles explains political extremism in the Weimar Republic, 1919-1923.

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.

Answers would be expected to consider the nature of political extremism in the Weimar Republic: the extreme left wing including Spartacists and workers' action against the government 1919-1923; and the extreme right wing especially Kapp and the political assassinations, e.g. Rathenau. The best answers will often explain how both wings were extreme compared to the moderate, democratic, constitutional government.

The answers need to consider how far the extremism was prompted by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the way the German delegation was treated: clearly the Spartacist revolt, January 1919, occurred long before the Treaty so may well be seen to have other direct causes but most of the subsequent left wing extremism occurred in the post Versailles world. The answers may argue a closer connection between Versailles and the right wing opposition, but do not expect this argument.

The answer needs to balance the importance of the Treaty of Versailles with the relative importance of other factors that explain the political extremism in the Weimar Republic 1919-1923 making links between those factors and the instability where relevant. Other factors might include:

- the impact of WW1 inside Germany making the country “ungovernable” and so making extreme solutions credible

- the importance of political ideology from abroad, especially the USSR after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917
- the political division within Germany, such as the SPD/USPD divide
- the role of personalities such as Luxembour and Liebnacht, Lüttwitz and Kapp
- regional factors, e.g. Bavaria; attitude of the authorities to suppressing extremism.

Evaluation of the relative importance of various factors to explain why political extremism developed will distinguish better responses.

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 important were territorial ambitions in leading Italy to enter the First World War in 1915?

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 consider Italy’s territorial ambitions in 1915 and balance these against other factors which may have influenced her decision to enter the war in 1915.

Factors which might be appraised would include:

- Italy’s disillusionment as a member of the Triple Alliance
- Italy’s desire to join the “winning” side and so achieve greater status and prestige in Europe
- the need to heal political divisions, strengthen liberal government and defeat socialism
- a desire to distract from the incipient peasant unrest, economic distress and unemployment.

Candidates might choose to consider the value Italy placed on territorial acquisition by reflecting on Italy’s disillusionment with the peace of 1919 (which conceded some, but not all of the country’s territorial ambitions) but this is not essential. Some will choose to analyse the terms of the Treaty of London and may use this to argue that territorial claims were indeed of prime importance. Some may look back to developments pre-1915, but this is not a requirement given the dates of this topic. As always, answers should be rewarded according to the quality of the argument.

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 are fertility rates in explaining population change in Britain between 1870 and 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.

The focus of this question is on the causes of population change in this period. Candidates should pay particular attention to the importance of fertility rates, but must also balance these against other factors creating change in order to draw a convincing conclusion.

Some typical arguments which may be put for the importance of fertility rates:

- the growing use of artificial contraception amongst the middle class after 1918, e.g. Marie Stopes's "Married Love" following on from their use of "natural methods" pre-1914, mainly abstinence and prostitutes
- the increase in working class women after 1920 finding means of natural contraception as well as growing awareness of artificial contraception
- the fear of repeated pregnancies owing to very high peri-natal death rates between 1919 and 1939 due to poor diet.

Other factors explaining population change may include:

- the fall in death rates which accompanied the fall in birth rates
- the improvements in public health especially in support for pregnant women, e.g. maternity clinics in Birmingham after the Great War
- the higher proportion of women getting married after the First World War

- the postponement of families due to wartime and therefore the loss of potential births to fertile women
- the impact of the post-war Depression and the Great Depression on economic prospects
- the economic decline of the lower middle class post-1919.

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 lack of investment by mill owners as a reason for the decline of the cotton industry in the years 1870 to 1950?

Reference to the periods 1914-1918 and 1939-1945 is **not** expected.

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 focus of the question is the causes of the decline of the cotton industry.

Reasons why lack of investment would be seen as critical:

- only £2.8 million out of the £12 million available under the 1948 Cotton Industry (Re-equipment Subsidy) Act was used by the mill owners
- 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
- details may be provided on the rate at which the £ returned to the Gold Standard in 1925 (most commentators agree that it was overvalued by 10%)
- the low investment in the 1920s due to low profits and high interest rates
- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton
- the growth of alternative fabrics such as Rayon in the 1930s
- the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936.

Evidence of other reasons for the decline of the cotton industry:

- the refusal of the weavers to adopt the 'more looms' system in 1931
- general descriptions of the loss of markets such as India due to the First World War may also appear, with reference to the increase in duty on imported British cotton during WW1 which helped the Government of India to raise the money necessary to fund military expenditure
- renewed competition in the 1950s from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong
- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany had introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914.

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

How important were the Presidents of the 1920s in bringing about an economic boom?

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 focus of the question is on Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover and their impact on the economic boom of the 1920s, in comparison to other factors.

- Harding made good appointments, e.g. Hoover as Secretary of Commerce and Andrew Mellon as Secretary of the Treasury. The philosophy was to allow business to run like a smoothly oiled machine. However, Harding's administration was marred by scandals such as the Teapot Dome
- Coolidge was seen to be more honest, and he continued in the same vein as his predecessor. He maintained high tariffs and protectionism whilst helping to expand US industry overseas
- Hoover was important both as Secretary of Commerce and as President. He was known as the Great Engineer. However, although he started off well, it was during his incumbency that the Stock Market crashed. He began his term of office by continuing the Republican laissez-faire economic style. He believed in voluntarism and welfare capitalism, which meant that he could not react well to the start of the depression. He failed to spot the warning signs that the economy was built on shifting sands of consumerism.

Other factors for the boom include:

- the development of electricity allowed consumers to use labour saving devices and home radios
- consumerism stimulated the economy through increased demand
- mass production: this provided the goods people wanted quickly and cheaply, especially cars, e.g. Model T Ford
- cheap immigrant labour helped to keep industry costs down
- the role of big business and entrepreneurs. Advertising helped to create markets both in the US and UK, e.g. Hoover products
- the expansion of industry and overseas markets helped to create a boom because the US could sell its products abroad and take over European companies, and so expand even more.

Candidates may refer to a number of texts such as Tindall and Murphy, which are the most recently published, but historiography is not essential for a good answer.

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

How important, in the years 1939 to 1941, was war in Europe in bringing about economic recovery in the U.S.A.?

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 focus will be on the years 1939-1941, and the New Deal should be referred to to provide balance in the answer.

- the economy was slipping into recession in 1938 and the New Deal measures were not working as well
- the first two years of the war when the US was not directly involved were crucial for industry, because it allowed them to expand with little competition from Europe
- eventually Roosevelt's lend lease programme saw industry in the US capitalise by making armaments and turning loss making business into profitable ones. The economy was most certainly stimulated by the war
- the war spurred on research and development
- it led to fuller employment and allowed for a much more complete recovery from the effects of the depression
- change in governments' foreign policy led to the USA supplying armaments for Great Britain *et al.*

Other factors include:

- the first two years were important but so were the effects of the First and Second New Deals. A range of New Deal measures (especially later ones as indicated) should be considered

- the New Deal had brought about partial recovery through a raft of measures such as AAA, NIRA, CCC, TVA, etc
- later measures such as the AAA of 1938, which replaced the earlier version, helped farming by setting up procedures for limiting the production of basic commodities
- loans were made available and surpluses were put into government barns, and this became the framework for federal agricultural policy for decades to come. These measures illustrate that the ideology of the Roosevelt government was to help specific areas of the economy to recover. This was unconnected to the war
- another success from the First New Deal was the restoration of confidence in the banking system, which again was not connected to the war
- the TVA project which helped a particular region of the US through environmental and power projects was also a success and again unconnected to the war.

Thus it can be argued that the US in certain respects was on the road to recovery anyway, although the war stimulated industry after the downturn in the economy in 1938 after policies like the NIRA, CCC and PWA failed to solve unemployment etc. However, it is arguable as to the extent that this could have happened without Roosevelt's New Deal and the complete turn around in governmental philosophy which it heralded.

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

Examine the extent to which the most important purpose of a castle was as a base for military operations in the period 1066-1087.

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.

Answers should be focused on the role of castles to maintain and extend the conquest. However, the range of functions that they fulfilled was not as narrow as is suggested here and it is expected that at the highest levels answers will show understanding of the range of relevant factors and will arrive at a reasoned, well-supported conclusion. This range of factors includes defending frontiers and establishing control in areas of strategic importance, as centres of colonisation, as residences and administrative centres, acting as police posts and barracks. Answers should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples.

As a base for military operations

- secured borders and quietened troublesome frontiers, e.g. Durham, Welsh marches, strategic sea links secured by Sussex rapes castles
- held new ground, e.g. Sequence of motte & bailey in advance on London post-Hastings (Hastings–Dover–Canterbury–Winchester–Wallingford–Berkhamstead)
- supported each other through the construction of castleries, e.g. Arundel–Bramber–Lewes
- as a base for further conquest, e.g. Chester, Shrewsbury, Hereford
- as a base for operations and a means of intimidating potential unrest, e.g. Southwest, Welsh marches, the north – Warwick, Nottingham, York, Lincoln.

The dates of the building of castles and the siting of castles also indicates the progress of the conquest: the south-east (Hastings, Pevensey, Lewes, Bramber, Arundel) in the 1060s; the midlands (Shrewsbury, Tutbury, the Peak) in the 1070s; the north (Pontefract, Richmond, Conisborough) in the 1080s.

Role of castellans

- gave the tenant the power to control the surrounding district
- the income derived supported his personal needs and enabled him to discharge his feudal obligations
- given to men of proven military skill and administrative abilities, e.g. Robert of Eu, Roger of Montgomery, William of Mortain.

Castles were used for both offence and defence; they were the outward and visible signs of Norman domination and the psychological aspect is attested to by the chronicles. They were also paramount agencies of settlement and colonisation. Royal castellans and vassals were responsible for the military subjection and economic exploitation of the conquered lands.

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

Examine the extent to which the period 1066 to 1135 was one of significant monastic change in England.

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

Answers should be focused on the degree of change and continuity afforded by the conquest and the influence of monastic reform in Europe generally at this time. At the highest levels, answers will show understanding of the extent of continuity and change in English monasticism across the whole period.

The range of relevant factors will include Lanfranc's reforms, effects of patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, racial tension and culture clash, spoliation and the imposition of feudal service and the effects of the introduction of new Orders. A range of well-chosen factual examples should support answers, such as:

- in the first generation after the conquest changes occurred that affect both the discipline of the monasteries (Lanfranc's reform) and their personnel (Normanisation). Some abbeys also lost lands transferred to Norman houses (Le Bec) or to knights in order to meet the impositions of feudal service (Abingdon). Strains were caused by the maintenance of military households (Wulfstan of Worcester) and there were violent clashes as a result of the imposition of new practises (Glastonbury)

- the second generation viewed themselves more as ‘Anglo-Norman’ and monasteries benefited from an increase in both royal and aristocratic patronage. Refoundations were made after the Harrying of the North (Jarrow, Monkwearmouth, Whitby) that continued the monastic tradition in this area. The introduction of new Orders (Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinian Canons) led to an upsurge in the number of those joining orders, as well as to the economy, particularly the Cistercian foundations in Yorkshire. There were changes in the design and layout of monastic churches which now followed the *Decreta* of Lanfranc (Rochester, Evesham, Durham) rather than the *Regularis Concordia* (Winchester)
- Latin replaced the vernacular but annals were maintained through later writers (Orderic Vitalis, Eadmer, Simeon of Durham). By preserving the past a degree of continuity was maintained. There was continuity of English saints (Swithun, Cuthbert, Edmund, Werburgh) and hagiographers rewrote the lives of such English saints for new audiences (Augustine, Edith of Wilton, Wulfhilde of Barking)
- English monasticism also experienced cultural interchange on a wider scale than it previously had. The effect of an Italian archbishop from Normandy, Norman abbots – and monks – in the wake of the conquest and the impact of Bernard of Clairvaux can be balanced against the role of Englishman Stephen Harding in the constitution of Clairvaux (the *Carta Caritatis*) and Bernard’s secretary William, returning to plant Cistercian monasticism in the north
- 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 practices, rebuilding, imposition of servitia and the endowment of Norman monasteries with English lands. But English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of English and Norman culture, the introduction of the new Orders and being drawn into the mainstream of European reform; but English saints still protected their churches, attracted pilgrims and provided mausolea.

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

Examine the degree to which the security of Henry VII's government was challenged by the Cornish rebellion of 1497.

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 focus of this question is on the security (or otherwise) of Henry VII's government in the 1490s. The question has a wider context than simply 1497, since there were many other challenges faced by the King at this time, especially Perkin Warbeck; many answers will legitimately address these wider issues, perhaps even making comparisons between various examples of Henry's security being "challenged", but this question is focused on the specific example of the Cornish rebellion. Answers will be expected to provide a range of secure evidence about the circumstances and outcomes related to the events of 1497, and to place those events in the context of the issue of Henry's "security". Some answers may show a different balance than others, perhaps making the most of a narrower, analytical understanding of Cornwall in 1497. Other answers may stand back more and be able to differentiate between this "challenge" to Henry's position and others. Either approach is valid as long as 1497 is examined and assessed rather than simply described.

Key events and developments may include:

- the causes of the rebellion, such as the unpopularity of the large parliamentary subsidy and other taxes granted to Henry VII to deal with the possible invasion threat from Scotland. This threat seemed urgent following James IV's extensive border raid into northern England in 1496 to test the ground for the extent of English support for Perkin Warbeck. Other causes discussed may include Henry's government being seen as

- grasping, local gentry resenting their exclusion from power and influence and complaints about Henry's use of patronage in the West Country
- the course of the rebellion, such as its spread into adjoining counties, led by the lawyer Flamanck and the blacksmith Joseph. Lord Audley in Somerset was the only magnate to support the rebels. The rebels marched across southern England, gaining recruits and sympathisers as it went, and reached Blackheath. This suggests that their grievances were not just local but that resentment against government taxes was deep and widespread
 - the crushing of the rebellion such as the troops raised by Lord Daubeney and the King, the defeat of the rebels on June 17, and the capture and execution of the leaders of the revolt – followed by extensive fines for those who had supported the rebellion
 - the links between the rebellion and other dangers to the King, above all the intervention of Perkin Warbeck in the later stages of the Cornish rebellion, including his abortive siege of Exeter and his later flight into sanctuary and eventual surrender.

Discussion of the significance of the rebellion is plainly of more value for successful answers than detailed narrative of the events. Some may argue that it was a major challenge, revealing the weakness of the regime, especially in the West where the local gentry had expected to be rewarded with greater influence after their contribution to the overthrow of Richard III. They had also wanted removal from power of Richard III's northerners after Bosworth, something that Henry VII had failed to provide. It could also be claimed that the rebellion made Henry VII very cautious about asking for further parliamentary grants after 1497, and that the King increasingly resorted to raising finance through benevolences and enforcing feudal dues. In other words, Cornwall in 1497 changed his ways and taught him to avoid wars and to be generally more careful against provoking opposition.

Other answers may well dismiss the Cornish rebellion as a relatively minor local difficulty. Such an approach could conclude that it was very easy for the King's forces to achieve military success against the rebels, or that the only thing making the Cornish rising dangerous was its link to the more important threat from Warbeck and his allies, or that 1497 was simply too late; Henry might have been in serious danger from rebels and pretenders earlier in his reign but now, ten years after Stoke, he was utterly secure.

As usual, the key to a successful answer will be a direct assessment of the "degree" to which Henry was challenged, supported by precise, selective specific evidence. High-level answers will not necessarily have more evidence than those of lesser quality – they will handle their evidence better, with a greater degree of understanding and greater depth of definitions and concepts.

Note that a "balanced approach" does not mean an even-handed one. Answers may be trenchant in belittling the importance of the rising or totally convinced that it was a near-fatal threat to Henry's position. The requirement, as always, is for a case to be argued that shows understanding of issues and alternatives. It cannot be expected that answers will provide comprehensive or equal coverage of all aspects.

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

Examine the relative importance of Wolsey and Henry VIII in shaping the course of English foreign policy in the years 1509 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.

The focus of answers should be on the significance of Wolsey's influence on the conduct of England's foreign policies, as against that of Henry VIII. How far was Wolsey responsible for shaping foreign policy when it came to the really significant decisions? Was he only responsible for day-to-day management of policies that were always ultimately decided by the King? Successful answers will provide an argued assessment of this key debate, backed by selective evidence from the whole period between 1509 and Wolsey's fall.

Note that a 'balanced' answer will not necessarily be an even-handed one; and that exhaustive, 'complete' coverage of the 20 years involved in the key dates should not be expected. Many high-quality answers may have no more (or even less) narrative detail than less successful responses, but their evidence will be more precisely applied to the question and show greater depth of understanding – for example in explaining how policies and the key relationship between Wolsey and the King changed over time.

Key events and developments might include:

- Henry VIII's wish for war against France to emulate the glorious achievements of Henry V (and perhaps to ensure that nobility and gentry were won over to full-hearted support for him)
- Henry's difficulties in overcoming the reservations of key advisers such as Fox and Wareham – it was actually 1511 before the King could get his own way

- the formation of the Holy League by Pope Julius II in 1511 providing Henry with an opportunity to exploit the church's quarrel with France
- the war of 1511 to 1514, including Wolsey's role in organising the successful expedition of 1513
- Wolsey's emergence as chief minister by 1515, partly because of his brilliant diplomacy in bringing about the 1514 peace with France
- the setbacks of 1515-1517 when Wolsey and Henry lost the support of Charles of Spain who made peace with France at Noyon, and the Emperor Maximilian also deserted England to make peace with France
- the big foreign policy success of the Treaty of London in 1518, where Wolsey and Henry hijacked the plans of Pope Leo X
- the death of Maximilian in 1519 and the election of Charles of Spain as Emperor Charles V
- the attempts of Wolsey and Henry to pose as mediators in Europe, leading to the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520
- the agreement at Bruges in 1521 when England pledged to support Charles V against France – and the war of 1522 to 1526, which brought massive expenditure but no real gains for England
- the imperial victory over Francis I at Pavia, and the planned English invasion of France that had to be abandoned when the Amicable Grant came close to causing revolt within England
- the setback of Charles V repudiating his marriage contract with the Princess Mary, Henry's only legitimate heir
- Wolsey's attempt at a "diplomatic revolution", by working for peace with France through the Treaty of More in August 1525 – leading to the League of Cognac in 1526 and the Treaty of Westminster in 1527
- the increasing importance of Henry's wish for a divorce from Catherine of Aragon and the way this began to dominate foreign policy and to force Wolsey into policies which were likely to fail, which probably led directly to his downfall. Key events within this were Charles V seizing control of Rome and the Pope in 1527 and the peace between France and Charles V at Cambrai in 1529.

It will be evident from this massive list of specific examples that answers cannot be expected to include all or even most of the possibilities. Any sensible selection will be sufficient as long as it is used as supporting evidence for an argued assessment. On the other hand, there should be awareness of the key dates; answers dealing exclusively with one aspect (e.g. the early relations with France, or the problems of the divorce in the later 1520s) would by definition be unbalanced.

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**

With what success did James I deal with the problems presented by Puritanism in the period 1603-1611?

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 on the problems presented by Puritanism, both in theory and practice, and this should be combined with an assessment of James' handling of these issues. The problem Puritanism posed could be set in the context of an analysis of royal authority. James was Supreme Governor of the Church of England and the Church was based on the Book of Common Prayer, the 39 Articles and continued vestiges of Catholicism – all of which were challenged by Puritanism. It could also be assessed in terms of James' position in 1603 as a 'new' and 'foreign' king with a Presbyterian context which would shape his initial reaction to Puritanism.

The bulk of answers will focus on the practical aspect of the issues James had to deal with in relation to Puritanism. These are likely to include:

- the Millenary Petition
- the Hampton Court Conference
- Bancroft's Canons
- the appointment of Abbot
- the Authorised Bible.

The Millenary Petition might be considered a 'problem' but it may also be used (with reference to its content) to suggest the moderate nature of most Puritans.

Candidates may also comment on how James manipulated the Hampton Court Conference to his own ends but also that there was some area of agreement with the moderate Puritans. Some may also point out that James regarded it as settling the issue of Puritanism.

To underline the idea of settlement candidates may consider the purpose of Bancroft's Canons in separating the majority of moderate Puritans from the very small minority of radicals. Particular attention may be placed on James' use of Bancroft as a scapegoat or more probably the importance of Canon 36 which was used to enforce the 39 Articles and therefore conformity. Again the moderate nature of Puritanism may be reinforced by the small number excluded and the fact that many radicals left the country, thus removing themselves as a problem. Calls for the return of the 'Silenced Brethren' were few.

The appointment of Abbot and the release of the Bible in 1611 may be used to indicate what was at the heart of James' approach to the problems of Puritanism, and to religion generally. These suggest that he was moderate and was willing to accept outward conformity in a broad church.

Overall, the evidence is likely to lead candidates to the conclusion that, generally, James was successful in dealing with the problems presented by Puritanism, but any judgement needs to be fully supported from the evidence.

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

With what success did James I rule Scotland in the years 1603-1625?

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 candidates will need to identify the problems that James had to deal with, the focus of answers should be on an assessment of how successful his policies were.

Answers are likely to consider:

- James' objectives
There are three areas candidates may focus on in relation to James' aims – control, Union and religion.
- Methods and Policy
In terms of control and rule, candidates may consider the following: use of the Scottish Privy Council; postal service; the role of Dunbar; James' own knowledge; management of Scottish Parliament; dealing with the clans.
- In terms of religion, candidates may consider James' practical approach but also might comment on the variation in policy post-1617 and the emergence of problems post 1621.

Candidates will need to make an overall assessment of the effectiveness of James' policies, perhaps emphasising success in certain areas but not in others.

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 role of the British governments in combating the Jacobite threat in the period 1715-1745?

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 concentrate on the role played by the Whig governments of this period and the military commanders whom they employed. However, they should contrast these with other factors in order to reach a balanced judgement. Note that the question is not confined to the two major Jacobite disturbances, and therefore candidates should make reference to incidents such as the Spanish invasion of 1719 and the Atterbury Plot of 1722.

In 1715, the new Hanoverian regime was far from popular with the general public, but enjoyed the firm support of a determined Whig government. Tory leaders such as Ormonde and Bolingbroke had fled the country under pressure from the Whigs, leaving the Tories demoralised and capable of little realistic opposition. The Whig movement, with Stanhope and Townshend taking the main initiative, adopted a determined approach in the face of possible Jacobite activity, raising troops, making an arrangement with the Dutch for further help if necessary, and seizing the arms and horses of known Catholics in the London area. Although relatively few government troops were in Scotland, these proved in the end adequate to cope with the ineffective Mar. On hearing of a West Country conspiracy in late September, the government acted decisively and swiftly arrested the presumed leaders.

Candidates should make some reference to the role of government in dealing with the relatively minor incidents between 1715 and 1745. The arrest of Count Gyllenborg and the search of the Swedish legation effectively ended the prospect of Swedish support for the Old

Pretender in 1718. Swiss and Dutch battalions were brought in to deal with the Spanish invasion in 1719. The Atterbury Plot of 1722 resulted in the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and the imposition of a large fine on English Catholics, together with harsh treatment of Laver and Atterbury.

By 1745 the Hanoverian dynasty and the Whig oligarchy were much more securely established than in 1715. Although initially taken by surprise, the British army was too large for the Young Pretender, and the Duke of Cumberland showed ruthless determination in his pursuit of the rebels, culminating at Culloden. George II's refusal to consider flight to Hanover was an indication both of his determination and his confidence in government preparations.

Candidates should contrast the above with other considerations, such as the unreliability of promised French support in both 1715 and 1745, the limitations of military commanders such as the Earl of Mar and the Young Pretender, the less than inspired leadership of the Old pretender himself, and (not least of all) the weather.

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

With what success did Warren Hastings assert British influence both as Governor of Bengal (1772-1773) and as Governor-General of India (1773-1784)?

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.

Hastings became Governor of Bengal in 1772, a post effectively in the gift of the East India Company. Candidates should be aware of the background to Indian affairs at this time: Clive had extended British influence in India, but a combination of excessive speculation and corruption created a loss of confidence which the British government attempted to tackle in the Regulating Act of 1773.

In his early days in Bengal, Hastings was mainly interested in restoring stability through administrative and financial reform, rather than expanding British influence. The Nawab of Bengal's power was subordinated to the East India Company in the interests of efficiency, native tax-collectors were made responsible to company officials, and legal reform created a more stable environment. Also he gave company support to the Nawab of Oudh, a long-term friend of the company, in his struggle with the Moslem Rohillas.

The Regulating Act of 1773 gave Hastings increased status as Governor-General of Bengal, but forced him to work closely with a government-dominated council, and it was difficulties here which paved the way for Hastings' later problems. In the Mahratta Wars of 1777-1782, Hastings asserted British rights against possible French expansion. However, he had less success dealing with an invasion of the Carnatic (1780-1783) and was involved in a financial scandal with the Begums of Oudh (1782).

Hastings' actions were seen by some British politicians as despotic and tyrannical, resulting in his impeachment in 1786 in connection with the issues with the Begums. Acquittal followed a lengthy trial (1788-1795).

Candidates should make a genuine attempt to comment on the degree of success which Hastings achieved. Like Clive, he was an effective servant of both the Company and the British government in relatively difficult times and circumstances. French influence was resisted, there was some financial reform, useful links were established with some native princes and overall there was an expansion of British influence.

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

Examine the extent to which Whig politicians' views of the Poor Law changed between 1815 and 1834.

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 dates in the question are designed to focus candidates' minds on developments from 1815 but no detailed knowledge of specific Whig politicians before 1830 is expected. An intelligent attempt to explain and assess the growing concerns of Whig politicians from 1815 and the changing circumstances which led to the creation of the Poor Law Commission is what is required. Candidates may challenge the underlying assumption of the question and should be rewarded according to the quality of the argument.

Arguments in support of changing views might include:

- the aftermath of the French Wars placed an increased strain on the old Poor Law System
- the rising cost of the Poor Law increased the political importance of the issue
- the Swing Riots heightened politicians' concern, particularly since they occurred in areas where the Speenhamland system operated
- the climate of opinion was changing owing to classical economists such as Ricardo and Utilitarians such as Bentham
- the appointment of a Royal Commission and its findings crystallised views of the desirability of reform.

Arguments against changing views might include:

- the Whig concern was with the growing cost of Poor Law rates and there was no real concern to improve the Poor Law
- the expansion of the electorate caused the change in approach, especially after 1832
- Melbourne did not have a clear majority, so although the Poor Law Amendment Bill received widespread support in the Commons (157:50), this may not accurately reflect Whig opinion
- views did not change until the apparently scientific investigation by Chadwick, so it was a sudden, not a gradual shifting of attitudes.

Candidates may challenge the underlying assumption of the question suggesting, for example, that the Whig politicians' views did not change greatly but that their capacity for action became greater after 1832. All essays should be rewarded according to the quality of the argument.

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 the Oxford Movement in creating the Anglican revival in 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.

The focus of the question is on the factors which led to reform and renewal in the Anglican Church in this period. Peel and Melbourne took their role on the Ecclesiastical Commission very seriously and were determined to revive the fortunes of the Anglican Church. Their work in tackling abuses in the Church was matched by the dynamism and spiritual depth of the Oxford Movement until Newman's announcement of his conversion to Catholicism sent shockwaves through the Church of England.

Factors suggesting that the Oxford Movement was central to the Anglican revival in the 1830s include:

- the interest in religion stimulated by the *Tracts For The Times*
- the major role played by Pusey
- the interest of bright graduates involved with the Oxford Movement in the Church of England – until the 1870s, 50% of Firsts were ordained into the ministry
- Gladstone and many other High Anglicans remained in the Church of England and acted as major benefactors.

Other factors leading to the revival and suggesting The Oxford Movement was of limited importance include:

- the Ecclesiastical Commission carried out many important reforms which helped to hold the Church of England together despite the rival attraction of Catholicism
- most church leaders stayed outside either wing

- Gorham Decision forced the Church of England to remain a broad church
- the conversion of Newman to Roman Catholicism increased internal strife
- the Anglican clergy increased from 12,000 in the 1820s to 21,000 in 1871
- Wesley and the Methodists had already stimulated a renewal
- the influence of the Clapham Sect
- key role of evangelical writers in increasing the output of Christian works.

Historiography in this area is limited but Rubenstein does suggest that the Oxford Movement was a vital energising force. Ker, in his biography of Newman, makes the point that the Tractarians deepened the divisions within the Anglican Church in the period prior to Newman's conversion, because evangelicals were suspicious of what they saw as incipient "popery".

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 extent to which the Liberal governments of 1906-1915 succeeded in their aim of promoting greater national efficiency.

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 on the degree to which greater national efficiency was achieved by Liberal legislation. New Liberalism had both national efficiency and welfare as objectives in the social and industrial reforms which they introduced. The drive to national efficiency was derived not so much by New Liberalism's theoretical collectivist (state action) approach as by practical considerations following poor initial military performance in the Boer War, revelations about the physical (and educational) condition of recruits, and the *Report on Physical Deterioration* of 1904. These were reinforced by deteriorating relations with Germany before 1914 and the requirements of physically fitter men for the navy, and particularly for recruits for both the standing and potentially-required volunteer armies.

Before 1914 some measures, for example the Workmen's Compensation Act and the introduction of Old Age Pensions, and to some extent National Insurance, were aimed principally at alleviating and/or reducing poverty. Measures for children, including those under the 'Children's Charter' such as improving health, the introduction of school meals and medical inspection, were combined welfare and national efficiency reforms. Improvements in conditions of work for merchant seamen, miners, shop workers and those in the sweated trades (e.g. tailoring, lace-spinning and box making) were, in varying degrees, about economic efficiency as well as welfare. This was also true for Labour Exchanges, but with the emphasis on national efficiency in bringing employers and particularly potential employees together effectively. It is also possible to argue that the increases in taxation of the wealthy in Lloyd George's 1909 'People's Budget' were aimed at providing revenue to

improve national efficiency through a fairer system of taxes to pay for social reforms. Candidates may also refer to the 1906 Merchant Shipping Act, the Census of Production Act, the Patents and Design Act (1907) and the creation of the Port of London authority as examples of the drive towards greater national productivity. During the First World War, especially from the spring of 1915, the drive for national efficiency spread: to military training on a much wider scale; varied measures such as new licensing laws and dilution to increase efficiency in industrial output; and new and increased welfare measures, e.g. for female munitions workers.

The historiography in the main sees improvements in national efficiency and welfare reforms as joint objectives of Liberal governments. Children were to be fitter and healthier, adults protected from the worst conditions at work and to some extent from unemployment and poor health. The elderly were helped from the worst poverty by the introduction of pensions. On the other hand the Liberal governments made few improvements in housing and education, although implementation of the 1902 Education Act led to much greater numbers in secondary education. Undoubtedly there was greater national efficiency by 1915 compared with the situation revealed in 1906 and under previous Unionist governments. That improvement was important for the national effort in the Great War.

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

How important a factor was the Easter Rising of 1916 in the eventual partition of Ireland in 1921?

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 the main focus should be on the 1916 Rising and the eventual compromise of partition in 1921, which led to the new state in southern Ireland and province of Northern Ireland (an Ulster reduced to six counties), candidates will need to set these developments in context. They will need to refer to key events in order to assess the importance of the Easter Rising.

These key events include the postponement of Home Rule for the whole of Ireland and the avoidance of possible civil war following the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. From 1914, initially, tensions in Ireland subsided and generally in both north and south there was support for the British war effort. It seemed this might help a resolution for the Home Rule issue later. However, the comparative peace in Ireland was shattered by the Easter 1916 rebellion in Dublin by a small group of Republicans including Connelly and Pearce. They wanted total independence from Britain. The rising was soon defeated, but the British government made the crucial mistake of executing, and thereby making martyrs of, 15 leading rebels in Kilmainham Gaol. As a result, by the end of the War, Sinn Fein (which had made little headway before 1914) gained extensive support. Its leader, Eamon de Valera, who had been involved in the Easter Rising, and Michael Collins, who was to lead the fighting against British forces, both wanted nothing short of a totally independent Republic. Home Rule was no longer an option for them. The strength of Sinn Fein was seen in the 1918 'Coupon' Election where they gained 73 seats to the now insignificant 7 of Redmond's Irish Nationalists. The Sinn Fein members refused to go to Westminster and formed the Dail

in Dublin. During 1919 two rival governments, one in Westminster and the other in Dublin, sat in uneasy co-existence. In Ulster, Unionists were adamant that the official status of Ireland must not change. In 1920 Lloyd George's Coalition government decided it must suppress what was an illegal Sinn Féin government and its military support, the Irish Republican Army (IRA), previously called the Irish Volunteers. Apart from the use of regular troops the attempted repression was conducted violently by the Black and Tans and 'Auxis'. Failure of either side to win 'militarily' led to the 1921 compromises, which reflected the political division within Ireland. The 1920 Government of Ireland Act divided Ireland into six counties in the north with a government in Belfast and the other 26 counties were to be governed from Dublin. However, this was Home Rule for both parts, as Westminster still had overall control. It was accepted in Northern Ireland, perhaps paradoxically as this was the only part of Ireland to adopt Home Rule in the end. Sinn Féin rejected separation as well as the control of Westminster. However, given the realities in the north, led by Collins and Griffiths they negotiated a final agreement with the British governments by the end of 1921. The 26 counties became the 'Irish Free State' with dominion status, but with some ports still under British control. There was de facto acceptance of the six Ulster counties' exclusion. Final agreement was something of a triumph for Lloyd George in a Conservative dominated Coalition, but Sinn Féin divided with De Valera not accepting the Treaty. Civil war followed for over a year in the new 'Irish Free State' before the 1921 settlement was accepted, at least for the time being. Clearly events, most of which stemmed from the 1916 Rising and its suppression, together with actions of leading politicians, use of force by both sides (or all three if the Unionists and Ulster Volunteers are included) and eventual politicians' compromises, were crucial in determining not only partition, but its form.

The 1916 Rising was perhaps the catalyst for the divisions in Irish society and politics leading to partition as the outcome in 1921. However, it can be argued that the deep-seated religious and political (and possibly economic) divisions in Ireland, and/or the events of 1918 (from the General Election) to final partition in 1921, played an as important, or even more important, role than the 1916 Easter Rising itself.

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

Explain the main reasons why it is difficult to achieve agreement about whether Britain was an industrial or an agricultural economy in 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.

Focus of the Question

This question focuses on the condition of Britain's economic structure in 1750 and should encourage the candidates to examine the relative claims that Britain was industrialising and that it was backward. Essentially, Britain was both – it depends which regions are the primary focus. In addition to a discussion about which Britain could best be described as, the more able candidates may consider what is actually meant by the term 'industrial economy'.

Industrial Economy

There is considerable evidence of the growth of manufacture in Britain by 1750:

- this can be identified in the Midland region with the growth of proto-industrial output in hosiery, lace and small metal wares – tin toys, buttons – and in small arms
- the growth of the textile industries in both Lancashire and Yorkshire are also significant developments in this period
- straw hatting was a feature of the southern Midland counties, for example Bedfordshire
- what is significant about these industries is the organisation of the workforce, through putting out, the manufacture for non-local markets and the external systems of finance
- a significant proportion of those involved in the manufacture had this employment as their primary source of income.

Factors of production which suggest it was not an industrial economy:

- most of this manufacture took place in the workers' own homes, not in factories or mills, most of this took place in the countryside, not the town and workers still involved themselves in agricultural production at key times during the year
- large-scale production of iron and steel was still very limited. The Darbys of Coalbrookdale were able to produce on a fairly large scale, but most production of heavy metals was in 1750 limited by power and also by demand.

Agricultural Economy

Much of the British economy was still agricultural:

- it was the main employer of labour
- the majority of the population lived in the countryside
- grain was a major export commodity
- money from land was used to finance developments in industry (for example the Fitzwilliams in Yorkshire).

However, Britain was far from being a subsistence economy:

- considerable developments had, and were, taking place in agriculture to improve output and the range of goods produced – for example the development of stock rearing associated with the East Midlands
- improvements in arable farming and the development of technologies were also continuing
- much of the investment in agriculture was conducted on a large scale
- East Anglia was a major region to develop its agriculture as was the area surrounding London.

Overall

It would be more accurate to describe production as proto-industrial rather than industrial. Candidates may refer to the work of Pat Hudson, Kriedte, Medick and Schlumbohm, Clarkson and Mendels in relations to this. Britain was a country of regions, some of which were developing industries and which would go on to become major industrial areas – for example Yorkshire and Lancashire. However, it would be difficult to argue that in 1750 Britain was either agricultural or industrial, not only because of the different profiles of the different regions, but also because of the symbiotic relationship between the two. This is most evident in finance and in the development of the infrastructure of roads.

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

Explain the extent to which there was a deterioration in the condition of the working classes between 1780 and 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.

The question asks candidates to assess the claims made by the optimist and pessimist explanations of the impact of industrialisation on the standard of living of the working class between 1780 and 1830, and to draw conclusions as to whether the pessimists who argued for a decline in the conditions of those employed on a wage basis – the working class – were correct. The argument is no longer two-sided with the work of the revisionist historians who have, to some extent, re-drawn the parameters of the debate.

Deterioration

- the argument put forward by the pessimists, particularly Hobsbawm and E.P Thompson, was regarded as the most convincing for a long time. This had much to do with the acceptability of a left-wing Marxist analysis of industrialisation, as developed by Thompson in the *Making of the English Working Class*
- the alienation of the working classes was achieved through the growth of the urban proletariat working in factories and living in squalid urban slums without basic sanitation
- it was evidenced through high infant mortality, low life expectation, the descriptions of Chadwick's report (after 1830) and through statistics of prices and wages, which demonstrate that the standard of living of the urban proletariat deteriorated significantly
- Hobsbawm was also able to produce unemployment statistics to demonstrate the lack of security in employment in Bolton.

Improvement

- the optimistic view was forwarded by Ashton and Hartwell. Their focus dates were 1780-1850 and suggest a significant improvement, especially in the twenty years after 1830
- optimists place more emphasis on the wages and opportunities offered to the skilled working classes, for example, overseers and engineers. They also consider the benefits to agricultural labourers employed in the industrial regions whose incomes certainly appear to have increased
- Ashton made many claims for the provision of water to towns and the benefits of cotton rather than wool
- many of these claims are difficult to sustain. However, the increase in the population and the disappearance of mortality crises do suggest that there was a significant improvement in diet.

Overall

- revisionist historians would argue that the situation is more complex. Horrell and Humphries have argued that the optimists and pessimists have distorted the argument by focussing primarily on the male income and the male experience
- revisionist historians argue that a more accurate picture can only be gained by considering the family wage and the contribution of females. This focus may mediate some of the worst picture of the wage/price indices but at the same time make the qualitative description/experience worse.

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

How important are political considerations in explaining why the 1833 Factory Act was passed?

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 causes of the 1833 Factory Act. As well as political considerations, one or more of the humanitarian concerns (perhaps linked to the evangelical movement) and the influence of utilitarianism may be assessed. A high level answer should consider whether the Act be considered a vote winner (or at least not a vote loser/cause of further extra-parliamentary pressure) by Earl Grey's Whig government, or whether one or more of these factors was more important. Equally an argument that more than one factor was responsible for the Acts passage may suggest judgement. Lower level answers may simply describe the act with limited reference to motivation.

Evidence political considerations were significant might be limited. The Act was clearly detrimental to the newly enfranchised middle-class factory owners. The Act limited child labour by setting maximum hours of work, forbade children to work at night, stipulated that children under nine should not work and that those aged between nine and thirteen should have to attend compulsory lessons. As such it was a direct threat to the financial well being of middle-class factory owners who were enfranchised by the 1832 Reform Act. This new group might at first glance appear to be Whig supporters. As the Act did not benefit them, the Whigs might be thought to have ignored political considerations.

However, the pressure for the restriction of child labour meant that the Whigs would have to pass a Factory Act of some sort. By focusing on the emotive issue of child labour the Whigs were appealing to middle-class morality and presenting themselves as the party of

humanitarianism. It might therefore be argued that the Act was a nicely conceived pragmatic measure, aiming as it did to ensure middle-class 'liberal' opinion was satisfied. Equally pragmatically, it might be argued that the Act's implementation avoided alienating middle-class support by its inadequacy. The appointment of four inspectors for the whole of the country ensured that those owners who wished to continue exploiting child labour would almost certainly avoid detection. In fact the largest group who objected to the Act were the working class who relied on the wages of their children. They, however, did not have the vote.

Other factors might include:

- **humanitarianism** 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
- **utilitarianism** stressed the greatest good for the greatest number. Those who lost out by the Factory Act were seen to be the minority (right thinking people) benefited – children practically, adults because of the succour such measures brought to them.

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

How important are economic conditions in explaining the development of Chartism in the period 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 1838/1839 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 on 10th April. Some mention may also be made of O'Connor's co-operative idea. Candidates should assess reasons for the development of Chartism that show awareness of the changing motives over the ten year period. Some answers may address specific reasons for the development of each failure of each wave, though some conclusions that consider the whole period should be necessary for judgement.

Candidates are directed to one reason for the development of the Chartist campaign – economic depression. The cyclical economic problems of the period have led some historians to see Chartism as a ‘knife and fork’ issue. Industrialisation had worsened the life experience of the working class: overcrowding, pollution, disease-ridden towns; poor working conditions, which the 1833 Factory Act had only gone some way towards addressing – when the trade cycle was at its nadir, suffering was extreme. Wages were falling; food prices and unemployment were rising. From 1837 a general depression set in enhancing these concerns. For those who slipped into poverty, the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act meant the only relief available was in the notorious workhouses.

Chartism's essentially political demands are not inconsistent with economic causes. The working class were the only ones who suffered from the vagaries of the trade cycle, and they

comprised almost the entire Chartist movement. Political representation through universal suffrage and select ballots would enable the workers voice to be heard in parliament and lead to legislation to ameliorate the suffering. The demands for payment for MPs and the abolition of the property qualification for MPs would ensure the working-class would gain class representatives in the House of Commons, whilst annual elections would ensure government generally would have to respond to the wishes of the majority working class.

However, there is a need to consider political motives – the dissatisfaction of radicals with the 1832 Reform Act. Reference to the six points of the people’s charter and evidence of why the demands were necessary would show the limits of 1832. Payment for MPs and an end to the property qualification for voting would be needed to end the landed dominance of the House of Commons – 71% in 1841 after the Reform Act; equal constituencies would remove the remaining anomalies: Doncaster (population 10,000) had no representation; secret ballots would end pocket boroughs that had disappeared in 1832; annual parliaments would make the government more accountable, given that the reformed governments could claim to represent the people, yet acted more as an elected dictatorship, and universal suffrage would give the vote to more than the 18% of adult males enfranchised in 1832 and end the anomalies based on the £10 qualification (many skilled workers qualified for the vote in London, but many of the middle-class the Act was meant to enfranchise did not qualify in Wales). Reference might be seen to the fact that Reform Act had whetted radical appetites, that the working-class now assumed that the next step would be to grant them the vote, but given the attitude of politicians (e.g. ‘Finality Jack’ Russell) there was a need for further agitation. This might be linked to the relative effectiveness of agitation in 1831/1832.

There may be reference to the other demands of the working-class which might be addressed through the Chartist movement, so people joined and made the movement a broad church – an eight-hour day, an end to child labour and government hostility towards Trade Unions, for example.

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

With what success, by 1951, had Attlee's Labour governments fulfilled the hopes of those who had voted in favour of a 'welfare state' in 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 explain a range of groups supporting the idea of the 'welfare state' and a range of reasons and motives for doing so. Answers should also focus on the whole period between the 1945 'Labour landslide' and 1951, when the post-war Attlee government lost power. Some answers might make effective use of material from the war years, when the Churchill coalition was planning for the future and the Beveridge Plan was widely popular, linking this to 1945 and the reasons why so many voted Labour – but this is not a requirement. The key issues are the identification, at least briefly, of "those who voted in favour", together with some assessment of their "hopes", followed by a direct argument about how far these hopes were, or were not, satisfied. Evidence about those who were not in favour in 1945 (opposition from some Conservatives, from the medical profession etc.) can be made relevant here but it should be applied to this specific question and not described for its own sake. Similarly, many answers may focus much attention on Aneurin Bevan and the NHS, but this could lead to an unbalanced or excessively narrow approach.

In 1945, the Attlee Government was attempting to fulfil its promises in the face of practical difficulties and parliamentary politics and some political opposition. It could be argued that the election campaign and the euphoria of victory had led to unrealistically high hopes. There may be answers which look back to 1942, or even before the war, to contrast the attitudes of the 'Hungry Thirties' with changed views emerging after and because of the war – but, again, this material should be directly applied to the question. The end date "by 1951" should be addressed as a point from which the overall achievements of the Attlee

governments can be assessed. Evidence relating to 1951 might also include the split between Bevan and Gaitskell over prescription charges. Some answers, usually very good ones, might perhaps even provide a summing up of the so-called 'post-war consensus' until 1979 – but this is by no means required and many very good answers will have no such long-range perspective.

The implementation of the welfare state can be defined in various ways: specific issues such as the national health, national insurance and so on; or a wider view of state provision for all, post-war planning and the idea of 'never again'. The success of this implementation can also be defined in various ways: as a taken-for-granted achievement, as a partial success undermined by economic problems and opposition from vested interests, or as a ruinous mistake that overburdened the economy and led to the 'nanny state'. Any such assessment is valid as long as it is coherently argued and supported by appropriate selected evidence. High-level answers will be developed in analytical depth, perhaps showing awareness of the constraints upon the implementation of radical reforms at a time of 'austerity'.

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

With what success, during his years in power, did Winston Churchill foster a sense of national unity and purpose in all sections of the British people?

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 Churchill in the context of the whole period between May 1940 and the end of the war, although the focus on “national unity and purpose” does lead naturally towards the years 1940-1941, when Britain was fighting alone and Churchill was the focus of the nation in its “finest hour”. Better answers will also be able to differentiate between various “sections of the British people”; and although the wording of the question allows for an exclusive focus on Churchill himself, many answers, usually good ones, will explain the context of the wartime coalition and how Churchill’s role was related to others, such as the politicians from all parties, leading newspapers, BBC broadcasters, perhaps even those producing films, posters and cartoons.

The framing of the question as “with what success?” allows for an excellent answer to be constructed on entirely positive lines – the ways in which Churchill’s leadership did succeed – but some candidates may score well by differentiating between areas in which there was more “success” than others, perhaps identifying examples of mistakes, or of the difference between propaganda myths and hard realities, or analysing “sections of the British people” who remained sceptical in their attitudes to Churchill. Some answers, usually good ones, will also focus on changes over time, differentiating between times of desperate survival up to 1942; turning-points such as Alamein and the Battle of the Atlantic; or the period from 1943 onwards when it became clear that the war would eventually be won.

Churchill had many methods of fostering unity during the war. Some were psychological and propagandistic, such as using the radio to keep up morale and to exploit myths like Dunkirk or The Few. Others were political, such as using key ministers to achieve results (e.g. Bevin, or Beaverbrook, or the Beveridge Plan). Some answers may differentiate between the “contribution” of Churchill as opposed to others; either playing Churchill’s role down, or giving him particular credit for making effective use of others by choosing them, motivating them and co-ordinating them. As noted above, there are many opportunities here for differentiation between success and failure, or between myth and reality. Many answers may note that disparity between Churchill’s legendary reputation and the fact that there was a lot of grumbling and dissent underneath, even during the so-called Finest Hour. The Labour Landslide of 1945 did not come from nowhere.

It is possible that some answers might make good use of their own knowledge of Churchill consolidating his political position (and thus “unity”) within the Conservative Party in 1940, overcoming the doubters in the “Halifax faction” and burying the memories of isolation in the 1930s. But this material should be directly applied to this question and the issue of national unity, not description for its own sake or as ‘background’. The same would be true of material relating to Churchill’s outwardly amazing defeat in the 1945 election. A balanced approach is essential but answers cannot be expected to provide comprehensive or even coverage. Successful answers will cover a selected range of issues across the years from 1940 to 1945, will have a balanced assessment of Churchill’s successes, or otherwise, and will relate Churchill’s “contribution” to the contributions of others.

Note that in view of the flood of publications and TV programmes in 2002, it is possible that candidates may make direct use of references to the views of Mo Mowlam in BBC’s *Great Britons*, or to favourable biographers such as Roy Jenkins or Geoffrey Best, or John Keegan. If well done, such references could be highly effective – but they are by no means a requirement. Many an answer will achieve high marks without any such historiographical material at all.