

General Certificate of Education

History 5041

Course Essays (HS03)

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

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.

Contents

HS03

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| General Guidance for Examiners | 5 |
| Alternative A | 11 |
| Alternative B | 15 |
| Alternative C | 19 |
| Alternative D | 24 |
| Alternative E | 28 |
| Alternative F | 32 |
| Alternative G | 36 |
| Alternative H | 40 |
| Alternative J | 44 |
| Alternative K | 50 |
| Alternative L | 53 |
| Alternative M | 57 |
| Alternative N | 61 |
| Alternative O | 65 |
| Alternative P | 67 |
| Alternative Q | 71 |
| Alternative R | 75 |
| Alternative S | 79 |
| Alternative T | 84 |
| Alternative U | 89 |

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.

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

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

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

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

L2: *Either*

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

Or

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

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

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

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well-directed prose.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

So, is the response:

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

Important Note

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

Summary of mark scheme for HS03

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

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

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

Explain why the castles of the military orders were so important in the defence of the Crusader states of 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.

Analysis will focus on the contribution of the castles of the military orders within the context of the geographical and manpower problems faced by the Crusader states, and also the shortcomings of crusade as a means of supporting the states. Answers should be supported by detail on the defensive needs of the Crusader states after c1100 and the role of the military orders. Key themes may include the following; the geographic weakness of the Crusader states and the orders' role as castle garrisons.

Students should be aware of the long-term strategic weaknesses of the crusader states, in particular manpower and geography, the departure of the pilgrims after 1099 left only 300 knights to defend the newly won territory, while a frontier in the mountains of Lebanon and the Jordan valley left the crusader states open to attack from inland Muslim cities such as Aleppo and Damascus. Castles then were vital to hold passes and river crossings.

A significant military function of the Orders was their holding and maintaining of castles in the east. They were especially important in the frontier regions. Linked to this is the key issue of castle cost and the wealth of the orders. Unlike much of the Frankish nobility, the Templars and the Hospitallers were rich enough to build and maintain their own castles. They were given or sold castles by rulers and nobles who lacked either the manpower or resources to keep their castle. The Hospitallers alone were responsible for twenty-five castles in the East, including Krak des Chevaliers, acquired from the Count of Tripoli in 1144. Even so, the cost of the castle at Belvoir led to the near bankruptcy of the Hopitallers. This castle was of great importance as it was part of a 'great frontier' (Riley-Smith) and was the centre of operations against the Muslims in the region.

Candidates may also consider the role of the Hospitaller castles in northern Syria including Bait Jibrin and Krak des Chevaliers on a strategically important section of the frontier with Islam. Also important were castles such as the Templar castle at Bagras which commanded the Beylan pass, or Marqab which commanded the coast road. Candidates may look at the survival of the Hospitaller castles such as Margat, Krak des Chevaliers and Belvoir as footholds after the collapse of 1187–1188. Students may also look at issues of scale and innovation as well as function; for example in the development of concentric castles such as Belvoir and Krak des Chevaliers.

Evaluation may focus on other ways in which the orders contributed to the defence of the crusader states; their martial spirit and skill; their inspirational role and the manner in which they made permanent the crusading ideal, the way they expressed the martial and religious ethos of the period. Students may also look to the weaknesses in the contribution of the orders through rivalry and lack of numbers, or to the role of the Kings, nobility and crusaders in defending the Holy Land.

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 Robert of Molesme in the success of the Cistercian order during the twelfth century?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should focus on the successful expansion of the Cistercians and in particular the role of Robert as a reason for the order's success, although there are other reasons to consider. These include the roles of Bernard of Clairvaux and Stephen Harding; the Charter of Love (Carta Caritatis); the maintenance of discipline through filiation and visitation; economic issues.

Robert of Molesme played a key role during the early years of the Cistercians, as the initial leader of a break from Benedictine monasticism in 1098 and as the prior of Molesme and the visionary of a more austere lifestyle. He led his followers to Citeaux, but was forced to return to Molesme the following year. However, his vision of reformed Benedictine monasticism established the Cistercian ideal; reviving the simplicity and balance of the original rule, with a return to corporate poverty, symbolised by manual labour, and a location remote enough to save the monks from outside distractions. Citeaux was a 'place of horror, a vast wilderness'. Robert led an initial group of fervent idealists in search of seclusion. They had little notion of establishing a new order. Moreover he was only at Citeaux for about one year and the expansion into a monastic order took place under the influence of Stephen Harding, Abbot of Citeaux from 1109 to 1133.

Stephen Harding and the impact of Citeaux as a mother-house also led to the spiritual success of the order. Students may analyse the role of his Carta Caritatis (Charter of Love) in maintaining discipline while expansion took place and in establishing a clear monastic philosophy for the order. The attraction of the ideals of the order will be of central importance; their uncompromising insistence on poverty, simplicity and austerity.

The role of Bernard as an inspirational figure will also be relevant. By the time of his death in 1153 his abbey at Clairvaux was mother house to 68 of the 343 houses of Cistercian monks. Students may consider the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, his charismatic personality and personal example in austerity and asceticism, his prestige and inspirational role, and the decline after his death. Also relevant would be Bernard's 'golden eloquence' in articulating Cistercian ideals, especially his letters and debates with Peter the Venerable as a means of promoting the New Monasticism.

The role of economic success was also significant in allowing further expansion; in particular the role of lay brothers or *conversi*. Discussion could include the social catholicity of its appeal which created an opportunity for the uneducated servant and working classes to enter religious life. Also relevant is their impact on economic success. They had a cheap source of manual labour, allowing communities to be self-supporting. Furthermore their focus on the wilderness made their monasteries relatively cheap to fund, while benefactors were pleased to grant uncultivated land. Their skill in sheep farming and wool production was notable. Their austerity led to a flood of endowments as well as funds for re-investment aided by the papal privileges granting exemption from tithes in 1132. The economic context of European demographic and economic expansion might also be considered.

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 the Tumult of Amboise (1560) in bringing about conflict between Catholics and Protestants by 1562?

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 Tumult was a plot by Huguenots to overthrow the Guises; Conde is usually perceived as its initiator, but there are suggestions that it was partly funded by Elizabeth I. It was led by de la Renaudie, a protestant nobleman, and the claim was that it was done out of loyalty to the king. Any plot with such a high profile was bound to generate some tension but:

- it was discovered before anything occurred, the major participants were arrested, interrogated and some executed
- Calvin did not give the plot his approval
- there was no significant persecution of Huguenots as a result of the discovery of the plot – conversely, there was a policy of religious moderation
- contemporary accounts play down references, commenting on ‘the troubles’ rather than serious religious conflict
- Catherine de Medici attempted conciliation, e.g. released religious prisoners and allowed non-catholic to present their petitions.

It could therefore be argued that the plot was not allowed to create conflict.

However, there were other issues/actions which did contribute to the outbreak of war, and candidates might consider both long and/or short term factors to provide some balance of particular relevance are:

- the government set up the *Chambre Ardente* to try cases of heresy; conviction could lead to the death penalty
- the *Edict of Chateaubriand* 1551 prohibited the printing and sale of Protestant literature, provided rewards for those who reported Protestants to the authorities and charged magistrates with the role of hunting out and punishing Protestants as ‘fomentors of sedition’ thus making Protestants traitors
- the Huguenot presence in towns was strong (although only 10–15% of the population lived in the towns) giving an inflated view of the strength/ influence of Huguenots: there were over 1000 Huguenots in the *Midi* (which had a record of resisting royal taxation)
- Protestant literature and trained ministers were smuggled into France, e.g. from Geneva
- fear that Protestantism would grow because of the support of the elites, e.g. the Bourbon family, prominent women such as *Jeanne d’Albret*, Queen of Navarre, Magistrates such as *Anne du Bourg* (burned at the stake)
- rivalry between Bourbon and Guises.

Answers may focus quite heavily on Catherine de Medici’s attempts to maintain peace – the collapse of the *Colloquy of Poissy* may be used to illustrate both her ambitions and the extent of her failure which identified the divisions and consolidated the two sides.

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 responsible was Henry III for his own downfall in 1589?

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 1574, Henry III inherited the French throne and had lost it by 1589; factors in this could be:

- he was perceived as ostentatious, frivolous, and generally weak
- his extreme religiosity, extravagant entertainments and his relationship with his mignons encouraged critics
- he failed to control the Catholic League e.g. the Day of Barricades 1588
- he was responsible for the assassination of the duke of Guise and had lost the support of the Catholic Church and control of the Estates – General by 1588
- it was widely perceived that he was reluctant to fight the Huguenots
- the debts inherited in 1559 and added to subsequently made it difficult for the king to develop an independent and effective military force to defeat/control the factions
- the death of his mother, Catherine de Medici 1589 left him even more isolated politically
- his alliance with Henry of Navarre in order to regain the capital, Paris, resulted in his assassination in the same year.

However, there were factors beyond his control, for example:

- lack of resources and economic difficulties such as rising prices reduced living standards of the lower classes and generated opposition
- he failed to produce an heir
- the widespread peasant revolts 1578–1580 generated by social/economic discontent
- the death of his brother, Anjou, which left him in a particularly precarious position as the heir was now the protestant Henry of Navarre
- the emergence of the Catholic League. By 1588 he had failed to combat the take-over of Paris on the day of Barricades by the League and had been forced to accept their demands that he promise to fight heresy and recognise Cardinal de Bourbon as his heir. Propaganda such as ‘The Just deposition of Henry III’ undermined his position
- his financial situation was precarious – by 1585, many office-holders were owed more than a year’s salary. Henry however aggravated this situation by e.g. using money for wages to pay for war against the League.

Some answers might cite the strengths of Henry of Navarre – he was prepared to abjure the Calvinist religion to end the wars; he had a reputation as an effective military leader; he was seen as personable, generous and a contrast to Henry III.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative C : The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743***A: The Regency, 1715–1723**

How important was the part played by the Parlement of Paris in the failures of the Regency in domestic affairs?

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 identify areas in which the Regency can be said to have failed and then evaluate the actions of the Parlement against other factors responsible for failures. There should be appreciation of the linkage between some of the reasons and Parlement. Focus on the successes of Orleans is not relevant to this question although some qualification of the degree of failure might usefully be made.

- areas in which the Regency failed might be: fully upholding the authority of the Crown over the Parlements; in enforcing the Papal Bull Unigenitus; creating the Polysynodie; implementing the radical financial system of John Law
- the responsibility of Parlement: during the later years of Louis XIV Parlement, as defenders of Gallicanism, and some as Jansenists, had resisted the registration of the Papal Bull Unigenitus. This continued under Orleans and became intertwined with Parlement's resistance to Law's system. As rentiers the Parlements were the most implacable opponents of Law's proposals. Chancellor d'Aguesseau's opposition to Law led to the Chancellor's replacement and his resentment was expressed in Parlement, stiffening its resistance to the financial measures. Orleans compromised with Parlement over Law's système and Law was the sacrificial victim for Orleans to gain Parlement's registration of Unigenitus in December 1720. Parlement also posed as defenders of those affected by inflation and those ruined by the crash of the système in 1720. The hedging of the registration of Unigenitus with so many restrictions limited its effectiveness and enabled later Parlements to dispute its enforcement.

Other factors responsible for the failures

- Orleans himself: his determination to set aside the will of Louis XIV so that he could become sole Regent led him to restore Parlement's Right of Remonstrance thus creating the judges' means to challenge his policies. The issues of finance and religion gave the opportunity
- the sheer scale of the problems inherited from Louis XIV, especially the disastrous financial problems of the Crown
- the failure of the Polysynodie was the result of the nobles' ineptitude and its failure suited Orleans' purpose
- the major flaws in Law's system: failing to appreciate the need to limit the fiduciary issue, he continued to print money fuelling inflation and the loss of confidence; linking the Trading Companies to the Banque Royale meant that both were brought down in the collapse
- the wider resistance of the privileged to Law's proposed reforms: e.g. office-holders, Tax Farmers and bankers whose financial self-interest was at risk from his proposals. The bankers and Tax Farmers had a vested interest in the Crown's debt and existing taxation system, as did many Parlementaires 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 the holders of fixed capital, whilst the repayment of loans rather than interest would diminish the income of lenders and rentiers. All of the privileged were horrified by some of Law's further proposals, e.g. all-class taxation; suppression of many minor venal offices
- the greed of speculators which contributed to the rise in share prices and the deliberate withdrawal from the market of astute major investors led to the bursting of the Bubble bringing down Law and his policies
- Court and ministerial faction played a part in the criticism of Orleans' policies, especially Law's scheme, and encouraged Parlements resistance, e.g. the Duc de Maine and his supporters were resentful over the setting aside of the Council of Regency; some Court nobles resented the ending of the Polysynodie in 1718 and, together with Secretaires of State Dubois and D' Aguesseau, were critical of the Protestant foreigner Law's rapid rise to prominence and office
- the resistance of Jansenists to the implementation of the Papal Bull Unigenitus.

A conclusion might be that there were other factors which played a part in the failures of the Regency, but Parlement was the body with the legal authority to question policies and the Parlementaires had a vested interest in opposition to some proposals. However, although only the Regent, Orleans could be held responsible for the failures as this was an absolute monarchy and he had the power to over-ride the Parlement.

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

With what success did Cardinal Fleury's government deal with the domestic problems facing the French monarchy between 1726 and 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 might consider a range of issues but some attempt should be made to explain why these were problems and, specifically, why they affected the monarchy. The degree of Fleury's success in each area may then be evaluated. The "government" may be treated as a whole or reference made to specific ministers' areas of responsibility.

The problems facing the monarchy: above all, the issue of its finances; the flaws in the system of administration including the role of the Parlements; the Jansenist controversy; perhaps the economy and its imbalances, with the qualification that this was inadequately appreciated as a problem by the French monarchy.

- the financial problems and the effectiveness of policies: expenditure had exceeded income for many years even in times of peace. Court extravagance played a part but the major cost was in servicing the royal debt. The Crown was in the grip of financiers; lacked a national bank and creative accountancy such as that of Britain; relied upon an inefficient and complex taxation system and was restricted by the vested interests of the privileged
- Crown finances did improve for much of the period thanks to measures 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. This was effective in increasing confidence in royal ability to meet its debt repayment and thus further loans could be raised at less extortionate rates of interest.

Creating the General Farm, grouping taxes and “farming” tobacco, increased both Crown income and the loyalty of the 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

- however, Fleury did not pursue fundamental reform of the system which left the monarchy dependant on an inefficient tax basis which could not support the costs of even the limited War of the Polish Succession as a dixieme had to be introduced. Although this ended in 1738 it had to be re-introduced in 1741 as the costs of the War of the Austrian Succession began to expose the weakness of the Crown’s finances and ever costlier loans had to be raised. The re-establishment of the power of the Tax Farmers was a retrograde step. Thus, the Crown’s financial health had proved illusory
- the system of government: Central government did not present major problems for the monarchy during this period and Divine Right was not seriously challenged. The personality of Louis XV might be seen as a problem for the monarchy in his over-ruling of Fleury in 1740 to commit France to war but until then Fleury had provided an effective and stable administration. There was some opposition from Parlements, especially that of Paris which exercised its Right of Remonstrance
- Fleury can be seen as successful in asserting royal authority over Parlement, e.g. compelling the Paris Parlement to register the King’s declaration that all clergy should support Unigenitus in 1730; in the major assertion of royal authority in 1732 with the exile of 139 judges when they had refused to conduct their judicial duties. However, Parlement continued to strengthen its position as defender of Gallicanism against what it claimed as Ultramontanism of the Crown. Even though the Parlement of Paris formally condemned the 1732 pamphlet, *Judicium Francorum*, its arguments were ominous for the authority of the monarchy: that the Parlements of France were one body representing the nation and that the monarch could not contract with the people save through its authority found willing supporters later in Louis XV’s reign and beyond
- Jansenism: Fleury preserved the authority of the monarchy over the Church by reaffirming both Gallican principles and the Church’s tax privileges, and over religious belief by the upholding of the Unigenitus
- economic policies and effects: the French economy was aided by Fleury’s 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 and facilitated trade as well as troop movements. As a result the potential income of the French Crown improved but this was not, in practice, proportionately increased as there was no updating of tax registers. The maintenance of Colbert’s regulations, and their extension by Orry, limited economic flexibility and new development and nothing was done for agriculture, despite widespread famine in 1739–1740. Thus prosperity was largely restricted to urban areas and a minority of the population but this was not perceived as a problem for the monarchy – as yet.

The conclusion might be that the cautious policies of Fleury's government had aided the appearance of stability and benefit to the Crown but, to a large extent, failed to appreciate and tackle the major problems which continued to be underestimated or ignored in the personal rule of Louis XV.

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 was the Spanish crisis of 1830–1835?

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.

Candidates will need to assess the threat and evaluate its ‘seriousness’ with reference to some of the following detail:

Brief background to the Spanish crisis 1830–1835

The struggle between absolutists and constitutionists was intensified in Spain by the succession dispute following the death of King Ferdinand in September 1833. Queen Maria Christina was acting as regent for her daughter Isabella when Don Carlos (Ferdinand’s brother) claimed the throne. Carlos was supported by absolutists so the Queen turned to the constitutionists for support. The crisis over the Spanish Succession worried the liberal powers of France and Britain whose sympathies lay with the constitutionists.

British and French involvement in Spain

Following Don Carlos’ claim to the throne France offered to support Britain by assisting the constitutionalist cause. Palmerston complicated matters as he distrusted the French and believed France had territorial ambitions in the Iberian peninsula. Palmerston wanted to create a ‘Western Confederacy’ to defend liberal institutions and to act as a counterbalance against the Holy Alliance who through the Troppau Protocol rejected any form of revolution and threat to the status quo. Therefore the Spanish crisis reflected the ideological divisions within the Great Powers as well as the British distrust for the French. In the spring of 1834 the Quadruple Alliance was signed between Britain, France, Portugal and Spain in defence of liberal institutions, but France was in a subordinate position to Britain as she could not

intervene in Spanish affairs unless invited to do so by the British. The British navy and Spanish army destroyed the absolutist force of Don Carlos in 1834, but he was able to return to Spain, renew his claim to the throne and raise a new army in the north of the country. The “Carlists” joined forces with the Basques who were fighting for regional liberties which complicated matters for the British and French as they had no desire to get involved in a protracted provincial civil war. They refused to send military aid to Spain following Queen Maria Christina’s appeals in 1835.

Other factors which may be referred to could include the following:

- internal weaknesses of the concert of Europe
- elsewhere the Revolutions of 1830–1831.

Candidates may consider these to be more of a threat (e.g. Belgium) than that posed by the Spanish Crisis.

Conclusions which may be drawn include:

As a result of the Spanish crisis of 1830–1835 Anglo-French co-operation sealed by the Quadruple Alliance of 1834 turned to hostile rivalry by 1836. The recriminations between France and Britain stemmed from Palmerston’s reluctance to allow France to restore her influence at Madrid by lending more effective aid to the liberal cause. However the Concert of Europe was not seriously threatened by the Spanish crisis as France exercised national self-restraint and respected the terms of the Quadruple Alliance. Despite the obvious ideological division between the forces of absolutism/conservatism and liberalism the members of the Holy Alliance (Austria, Prussia and Russia) did not involve themselves in Spanish affairs.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative D: Europe, 1825–1850

B: The Revolutions of 1848 and their immediate aftermath to 1850

Was Frederick William's refusal to become German Emperor in March 1849 the most important factor in the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament? Explain your answer.

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.

There are two main reasons why the Frankfurt Parliament failed. The first is that the Parliament did not gain the necessary support and loyalty of the individual states which culminated in Frederick William's refusal to become the Emperor of Germany. The second is that the Frankfurt Parliament was doomed to failure from its inception because it could not unite and heal the political division between the moderates, radicals and conservatives. Candidates can therefore agree or disagree with the question. However answers should consider both of the main reasons and argue which was the most important. The focus of answers should be on the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament not the course of the revolution in Prussia.

Frederick William's rejection of the crown marked the end of the Frankfurt Assembly. He refused to become the Emperor of a federal empire with a liberal constitution which would grant him limited powers. Therefore the Frankfurt Parliament had failed to find a national figure to become the leader of their vision of a united Germany. Other German princes followed Frederick's example and rejected the proposed German constitution and abandoned the Frankfurt Parliament. Thus one of the reasons why the Frankfurt Parliament failed was because although it possessed moral authority it did not have the means to assert itself in Germany (e.g. lack of effective administration, no military backup). This can clearly be argued through a brief examination of the Schleswig-Holstein question which seriously weakened the authority and prestige of the Parliament and welcomed a return to the status quo when Austria and Prussia refused to accept the constitution.

However, it can be argued that the Frankfurt Parliament was doomed to failure from the start as it was seriously weakened by internal divisions and a lack of mass support. Created by a middle class franchise the Parliament alienated the masses. Representatives were largely moderate and wanted a constitutional monarchy incorporating liberal ideas of limited democracy (e.g. the franchise, fiscal equality and freedom of the press, association and religion). Radicals were alienated and conservative representatives were horrified. Discussions were badly organised and protracted and made longer by the ineffectiveness of the leader von Gagern. In short Frankfurt was unable to take decisive action and missed the opportunity to fill the power vacuum that had existed in much of Germany in the second half of 1848.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914

A: The Balkans, 1870–1890

Explain the main reasons why the Balkan crisis of 1875–1878 threatened European peace.

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 uprisings and rebellions escalating across the Balkans from 1875 signified the threat of an emerging Balkan nationalism which would no longer be easily controlled. The crisis would mark the further disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, with little sign of responsive internal reform from Constantinople, but continued misrule and corruption. Most significantly, this destabilisation would highlight the divisions among the major European powers, especially the rival ambitions of Austria-Hungary (with her multi-racial empire) and Russia (with pan-Slavism promoting her military and commercial interests). Britain and France were concerned at the prospect of a further Turkish deterioration and a Russian advance, in terms of their Mediterranean interests. Germany wanted to avoid taking sides but would be forced to choose, ideally wanting partition, but this would be blocked by Britain. In the early months of the crisis, the great powers remained for the most part indifferent to the events unfolding in the Balkans. In Austria-Hungary and Russia, however, powerful voices were raised in support of a different approach. Austria-Hungary might acquire Bosnia-Herzegovina, while Russia might assist in the liberation of the remaining Slavs. Any such development was unacceptable to the British. Initially there was the diplomatic approach through the Andrassy Note and the Berlin Memorandum (except Britain) trying to instigate political reforms within the Ottoman Empire. This failed, as, despite an internal power struggle, Turkey recovered enough to massacre the Bulgarians and defeat Serbia. These atrocities forced the Bulgarian issue onto the European stage, and the great powers felt obliged to intervene to prevent a repetition. Then, after the break-up of a conference in Constantinople, Russia tried to control events by war, having negotiated Austro-Hungarian neutrality. With Russian forces advancing on Constantinople, war threatened on a European scale, but, in the end, this was avoided, partly because the powers took great pains to ensure

that their counter-parts knew exactly what their essential interests were, and how far they were prepared to go in their defence. After six months resistance at Plevna, Russia's military approach was eventually successful, leading to the Treaty of San Stefano. On the surface, this was a triumph with the creation of 'Big Bulgaria', but Russia's inconsistent approach and Ignatiev's unrealistic demands made renegotiation inevitable. Faced with the unanimous opposition of the great powers, not to mention the Serbs and Romanians, and menaced by the threat of war, the more moderate elements in St. Petersburg prevailed. Russia had no option but to accept the humiliation prepared for her by Bismarck. The Congress and Treaty of Berlin removed the threat of war, restored the balance of power but solved nothing, especially with Russian humiliation and Austria-Hungary's foothold in the Balkans.

A narrative account of events would be indicative of the lower attainment levels, especially unrelated detail on the Congress and Treaty of Berlin. At the higher levels, candidates need to do more than describe the crisis from 1875, but should provide a balanced selection of content to support an explicit assessment of the threat posed by the declining Ottoman Empire, and the implications for the Balkan states and the major powers.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914

B: The Balkans, 1890–1914

Examine the importance of events in the Balkans in the period 1908 to August 1914 in leading to the outbreak of a general European 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.

The main events in question focus on the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, the two Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, and the 1914 crisis following the assassination in Sarajevo. These events, which marked an upsurge in Balkan nationalism, need to be seen in the broader context of international rivalry, and cannot be separated from the increasing tension and ultimate conflict between two competing European alliances. Balkan nationalism threatened the stability of the multi-racial Austro-Hungarian Empire, and enabled Russia to sponsor and promote Serbia. German Weltpolitik highlighted the diplomatic tensions and increasing brinkmanship. Rivalry between the Balkan states themselves was a further complication.

The Bosnian crisis was triggered by the Young Turk movement, aiming to restore Bosnia to full Turkish rule. Negotiations were held between Austria-Hungary and Russia, anxious to secure their own positions, but chances of a conference were pre-empted by Austria's annexation. Finally faced with a German ultimatum, Russia and Serbia backed down, uncertain of support from Britain and France – despite the entente, Britain had no desire to let Russia control the Straits. The crisis caused diplomatic turmoil, ending Austro-Russian co-operation, with serious implications for the future, confirming Austria-Hungary's over-confidence with German support, and Germany, feeling the pressure of 'encirclement', no longer a moderating influence. Russia and Serbia were left humiliated and embittered, blaming the crisis on Isvolsky's unorthodox diplomacy, and accelerating Russia's military reforms. The annexation of Bosnia was significantly important, and would provide an ominous forewarning of the July crisis in 1914, provoking an over-reaction which would recall the bitterness of 1908, but for the moment, German support for Austria-Hungary, and a lack of support from Britain and France for Russia and Serbia ended the immediate crisis. In

contrast to 1908, the First Balkan war of 1912 revealed the major powers trying and succeeding to control events and maintain the status quo, as Germany and Britain defused the situation, playing a mediating role, and persuaded Austria-Hungary and Russia to accept compromise. However, after the Second Balkan War, instigated by Bulgaria, the military balance had changed. Once Austria decided to 'eliminate Serbia', it became difficult to prevent events escalating into European conflict.

The assassination at Sarajevo in 1914 would seem to be the most important event as the catalyst leading directly to war, provoking a chain reaction among the major powers as events finally run out of control. However, the murders cannot be seen in isolation. Candidates will need to explain why, for some powers, this was very much the 'last straw', by analysing earlier Balkan events and by linking these to the international context. Higher level answers will then be able to assess explicitly the relative importance. Less effective responses will tend to produce a narrative of events.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917–1929

A: Lenin and the consolidation of the Bolshevik State 1917–1924

Explain the main reasons why the Communists were able to win the Russian Civil War of 1918–1921.

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.

Candidates may treat the Civil War just as a struggle between the Reds and the Whites – the internal opponents of the Communists – or they may also include the war of foreign intervention, taking account of those foreign forces that fought on the Whites' side.

The Civil War was absolutely crucial to the survival of Communism. The Revolution of October 1917 had been a relatively small coup which left the Reds in control of a small part of Russia. They were bound to face opposition from a range of opponents who resented their seizure of power in Petrograd and Moscow. The following three years would determine the survival of the new regime. The war was a series of uncoordinated campaigns fought over vast areas. The Whites included left and Right wing opponents of the Bolsheviks. The Left included Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. The Right included former tsarist generals and dispossessed capitalists. There were also Kadets and other groups. Foreign armies of intervention, ostensibly there to try to keep Russia in the First World War and protect their equipment, but soon committed to the anti-Communist cause, came from 19 countries, including Britain, France, the USA and Japan. The Civil War was immediately followed by the Russo-Polish War, which did not end until 1921.

It is now generally accepted that the Reds had significant advantages in the War. The Reds had a unified leadership under Lenin. The Whites had several leaders, who did not cooperate and had their own agendas. Leading White figures included Generals Yudenich, Wrangle and Denikin and Admiral Kolchak. The Reds controlled a relatively small part of the Russian heartland at first, but it included the most populous areas and contained most of what functioning industry there was. They also had control of interior lines of communication and

many of the railways, whereas the Whites launched uncoordinated attacks from the vast periphery. Trotsky organised the Red Army and proved a brilliant and inspirational general. He was also ruthless in discipline and was very pragmatic, for example conscripting ex-tsarist officers to lead his new force. Red determination was shown in other areas. The ruthless policy of War Communism had many drawbacks, but it did procure food to feed the Red Army and did ensure that there was some war production. The Reds were fighting for their survival – if they lost they would be destroyed. Not all the Whites really knew what they were fighting for, only that they were fighting against the Bolsheviks. Few wanted the Tsar back, and he was largely a forgotten figure, and soon disposed of.

Not just the economy but everything was subordinated by the Reds to the war. There was a centralisation of Party control to ensure that orders from the centre were obeyed. Propaganda was widely used to paint the Whites as class enemies and operating against Russian interests, especially since they themselves were supported by foreign interventionists. The foreign armies were not fully committed – many of their soldiers were reluctant to fight, and their governments had many other preoccupations, so foreign forces were largely ineffectual.

Many ordinary Russians did not want to fight at all. Peasants did not want the tsar back, and they welcomed the fact that the Reds allowed them possession of the land. But they resented the draconian requisitioning under War Communism. There were large peasant armies or ‘Greens’, some led by anarchists or SRs, and they basically fought against both the “recognised” sides.

In the last resort many peasants, the bulk of the population, were probably more prepared to tolerate a Red rather than a White victory. At least the Reds promised them their land.

Like most civil wars, this was a bitterly fought but patchy affair, with atrocities on both sides. As in most wars also, the result was determined by a range of factors. Had the Whites been a coordinated force and better led, they might have been more successful, but unity was never likely. The Greens came closer to success than is often realised. The Reds benefited from factors such as strong leadership, but had many of their own difficulties to overcome. They won because of a range of factors, political, military, economic and psychological.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia 1917–1929

B: Stalin’s rise to power 1922–1929

Explain why Trotsky and Bukharin were defeated by Stalin in the struggle to succeed Lenin as leader of the USSR.

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 struggle to succeed Lenin was a long one. It began before Lenin’s death, in about 1922, and was not completed until 1928–1929, by when Stalin was clearly in control of the party and the USSR, and free to implement his own policies without serious challenge. Stalin had particular qualities and opportunities which he exploited to rise up the ladder. Trotsky and Bukharin were also major party figures, but failed to attain power or even retain influence, partly through their own errors and partly through other factors. It should be emphasised that the struggle for the succession to Lenin was a complex one. He had left no clear line of succession and there was no established procedure or leadership “position”. This fact, combined with major arguments about policy, resulted in political infighting which was complicated by the fact that factionalism within the party had been officially banned in 1921. Some individuals proved better able than others to take advantage of this situation.

Trotsky was a mercurial figure. He had been a Menshevik and was not committed to the Bolshevik cause until 1917, a fact held against him later. He played a key role in the October revolution, and then created the Red Army and was an important reason for the Red victory in the Civil War of 1918–1921. He held important positions, being responsible for defence and foreign policy in the Communist Government. He was an intellectual as well as a man of action, and also a brilliant orator. But he also had serious weaknesses. He had a reputation for arrogance, and importantly had no strong Party base and did not try to form one. His own power base was the Army, but he faced opposition even from within the Army, and other Party members feared a possible military coup. Trotsky also felt that his Jewishness might work against him, and declined important roles because of this. Even before Lenin’s death, Stalin and other leading figures were united against Trotsky.

Trotsky made crucial errors of judgment. In order to avoid charges of factionalism, he did not use Lenin's testament against Stalin after Lenin's death. He was seen as opportunistic, forming an alliance with his former opponents Kamenev and Zinoviev in 1926. Publications such as *Lessons of October* in 1924 contained strong attacks on his colleagues. He was not present at the centre of events at the time of Lenin's death and funeral. He was highly strung and fell ill at critical moments. Some of his policies such as "Permanent Revolution" were seen as inappropriate by many colleagues. His hard line "Left" attitudes on economics, involving a rapid drive towards industrialisation, were challenged by Stalin and others. Further attacks on the leadership seemed factionalist, and the increasingly isolated Trotsky was forced out of the Party in 1927 and eventually into exile. Although he remained an opposition figure speaking out against Stalin from abroad, any hopes of the leadership had long disappeared.

Bukharin was more popular than Trotsky. A long standing Bolshevik, he was close to Lenin and made an important theoretical contribution to Communist policy after the Revolution. He had supported War Communism but loyally followed Lenin's path of NEP, and then "Socialism in One Country". In the later 1920s he became the chief representative of the "Right". His proposed way of achieving industrialisation was to encourage the peasants to "get rich" under NEP, as a means of stimulating economic growth and providing capital for industry. He was opposed to the Left's desire for ruthless exploitation of the peasantry. Bukharin was much less skilled at infighting than his opponents, and although popular and influential as editor of *Pravda*, he allowed himself to be used by Stalin against the Left. Too late, once the Left was defeated, Stalin was able to turn on him and his supporters, and he was forced to resign from *Pravda* and the Central Committee in 1928. He lacked the capacity for infighting, and certainly was no match for Stalin.

Stalin himself had many advantages in the struggle for power. Although not an intellectual like some of his opponents, he had other qualities. Having been appointed General Secretary of the Party in 1922, he was the most powerful man in Russia, controlling the Party machine. He also controlled the sick Lenin and inherited his mantle as interpreter of Marxism after 1924. Stalin was fortunate in avoiding dismissal when Lenin's Testament was read to the Central Committee after Lenin's death, because there was a desire to avoid splits in the Party. Thereafter Stalin was able to use his increasing control of the Party machine to outmanoeuvre opponents and get his policies, presented as "reasonable" and centrist, accepted: for example "Socialism in One Country", which had considerable appeal. Stalin made use of others' mistakes, presenting opponents like Trotsky as opportunists, allying himself with the Right against the Left, and then turning on the Right itself.

Overall, Stalin proved himself more skilful at exploiting opportunities to promote himself and his ideas, or those which he took from others, and succeeded in outmanoeuvring two colleagues who were regarded as much cleverer than himself but proved no match for his own abilities in the circumstances of 1920s post-Leninist Russia.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative G : Germany, c1925–1938

A: The Weimar Republic c1925–1933

How important was the part played by President Hindenburg in the political developments in Germany from 1925 to January 1933?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on the political developments of the period 1925–1933 and must try to assess the part played by President Hindenburg in these. Balanced answers will also look at other factors affecting political change and provide some overall assessment of the importance of Hindenburg.

An examination of the part played by President Hindenburg in the political developments of 1925 to January 1933 might include:

- his election in 1925 which seemed to represent a desire to return to traditional conservatism. His known right wing, anti-parliamentarian, conservative values increased right wing expectations
- his failure to live up to the hopes of the more extreme right-wing (to restore monarchy) and his apparent determination to uphold the constitution which may have made him a stabilising influence in these years.
- his election gave the Republic greater “respectability” and may have reassured some of the more moderate conservative right wing elite groups and made them more prepared to support the Republic
- from 1930, his influence may be deemed more negative as he was increasingly influenced by fellow army officers and aristocrats, e.g. Schleicher, who was a member

of his old regiment and friend of his son Oskar. These influenced his appointment of Chancellors in the 1930–1932 period.

- he allowed the use of the Presidential decree (from the time of Brüning's Chancellorship) so subverting the democratic process
- he failed to give leadership when it was needed (post 1930) and instead allowed himself to be drawn into intrigue, dismissing Schliecher, on Papen's request, and appointing Hitler as Chancellor against his better judgement in January 1933.

Other factors affecting political change in this period might be expected to include:

- the anti-Republican attitudes still present in influential sectors of society and the continuing resentment of the elites-industrialists, landed aristocracy, the army, judges and civil servants to the Weimar Republic
- the terms of the Treaty of Versailles which were still in force and a rallying point for the discontented
- the problems of coalition government, particularly with 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. Moderate government had become increasingly difficult
- the growth of the Nazi Party which despite winning only 2.6% of the vote, 1928, made gains in northern rural areas and perpetuated political violence through the SA/ Communist street fighting
- economic problems with unsteady growth to 1929 and then the terrible effects of the Wall Street Crash, Depression and high unemployment
- the cultural changes associated with the Weimar Republic (laxer morals and standards of culture) which encouraged traditional hostility to new modernist values. This may have helped to polarise political attitudes to the regime.

Candidates should try to provide some balanced assessment of the part played by Hindenburg, probably concluding that, while he was a reasonably effective President to 1929, the position he was placed in after this would have been hard for any President. Nevertheless, his background and attitudes tended to make the chance of the democratic republic's survival worse rather than better.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938

B: The Nazi consolidation of power 1930–1938

With what success did Hitler deal with his political opponents from his appointment as Chancellor in January 1933 to 1938?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on the opposition to Hitler's government, 1933–1938 and will need to provide reasoned and supported appraisal of Hitler's success in overcoming his opponents.

The political opposition to Hitler's government included:

- members of all other political parties but particularly the Communists
- some elements of the working class who were more attracted by unionism and Communism
- some more radical elements within his own party (e.g. followers of Röhm, pressing for social revolution)
- sections within the army (esp. officers from the traditional elites, resentful of the "upstart")

Hitler's success in countering these threats might include:

- his strategy after January 1933, to exploit the Reichstag fire to discredit the Communists; his measures to seize control at the local level and remove the trade unions and other political parties. The abolition of independent state governments; the

restructuring of government and the purge of the civil service; the control over the police; the control of the media. This destroyed much political opposition as well as *potential* for opposition within the first two years of Hitler's rule

- the purge of the SA in the Night of the Long Knives (1934) which appeased some political opponents in the army and removed the troublemakers among Hitler's followers
- Hitler's assumption of the Presidency (approved by plebiscite 1934) and the oath of allegiance which also helped win over the army (as did rearmament policies)
- The establishment of a Nazi administrative machine, providing control over local government, (e.g. through the use of the gauleiters) which enabled political opponents to be identified. Action against the Communists and other political protesters was maintained through the use of the Gestapo and the terror apparatus, including the use of informants and the establishment of the first concentration camps
- Nazi control over education, youth movements and control over the workplace with the establishment of the Reich Labour Front which made any political opposition difficult to organise or maintain
- the dismissal of Blomberg and Fritsch which reduced the potential of the army to oppose and increased Hitler's own control over the armed forces, 1938.

For a balanced answer, candidates will also need to question the extent of Hitler's success:

- opponents were never fully removed (hence need for the SS to root out political troublemakers)
- the army's loyalty was still in question and potential for political opposition remained in 1938

Candidates are likely to conclude that Hitler never entirely succeeded in destroying the political opposition to 1938, but that demonstrations of dissent were extremely limited. This may be accounted for with reference to successful policies, particularly the economic recovery.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

A: Britain and Kenyan Independence, 1953 to 1964

Explain the importance of Mau Mau terrorism in bringing about Kenya's achievement of independence in 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 is on Mau Mau terrorism, but candidates will need to place this in the broader context of moves to independence in Kenya and should explain, not merely stress, its importance.

Mau Mau Terrorism:

- it created a State of Emergency. This was expensive in terms of the number of troops needed to enforce it. Economic cost became a significant factor in British policy making towards Kenya
- the Mau Mau may not have fully represented the Kenyan people. It was an action-group in that it represented the interests of the Kikuyu tribe. Many of its victims were black Kenyans from other tribal groups. Many of these non-Kikuyu were willing to cooperate with the British authorities
- it maintained the momentum of opposition against Britain and highlighted the case of nationalism internationally. Its experiences in the Hola Camp massacre, when a number of its members were murdered by the British authorities, had a significant impact on British and international opinion

- it forced the British to consider alternatives to the status quo i.e. through moves such as the Lyttleton Constitution. This established the principle that unchanged British control could not continue indefinitely.

Other factors behind the achievement of independence:

- **Macmillan:** His vision for Britain was one of increased involvement in Europe despite the false start in not joining the EEC in 1957. Candidates may argue that the role of Macmillan was one of huge significance in moving Kenya towards independence. The Mau Mau threat had been largely removed soon after Macmillan took office. His actions were determined by his pragmatic approach to imperialism. The simple question was, “does holding onto Kenya advance Britain’s economic and strategic interests?”. He concluded “no”. Kenya was an economic liability and it had no strategic value. Britain’s interests lay in Europe and through its alliance with the USA. Macmillan’s “wind of change” speech could be examined and its relevancy to pan-African nationalism
- **Non-violent alternatives:** Kenya had alternatives to the terrorism of Mau Mau. By 1960 two major nationalist groups were in place, KANU and KADU. These were developing into viable political alternatives to British rule. They were led by politicians whom the British believed would be co-operative after independence
- **Economic factors:** Macmillan conducted a cost-benefit analysis. The costs of running Kenya compared to the economic gains it returned to Britain demanded that independence was the only viable option. Candidates could develop some detail around the economic priorities Britain set for itself and consider these in terms of the contribution the Mau Mau made to creating this economic state

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

B: France and Algerian Independence, 1954 to 1962

How important was the collapse of the Fourth Republic in bringing about Algeria's achievement of 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 collapse of the Fourth Republic. Candidates should balance this event against other factors in order to reach a substantiated judgement.

The Collapse of the Fourth Republic

- the Fourth Republic was politically weak. There were 10 Prime Ministers before De Gaulle in the period 1952–1958. This enabled colons and extremist army officers in Algeria to resist any attempts to accept independence for Algeria as a solution for France
- the collapse opened the way for new personnel to restore political order and stability. The key figure in this was De Gaulle.

De Gaulle

- his vision for France lay in expanding France's influence in Europe, particularly in view of the Treaty of Rome (1957) and the creation of the EEC. Algeria rapidly became a political and economical liability for France. In January 1963 he said, "having given independence to our colonies, we are going to recover our own. Western Europe has become an American protectorate without even realising it".

- he showed real determination to push for independence once he had decided that was the only course he could follow. His resilience is seen through his ability to stand up to the many opponents he had. These included, by 1960, the army, the colons, the FLN – who were not willing to work with him towards any form of compromise in the move towards independence, international opinion which demanded a rapid de-colonisation as did many Frenchmen and the opposition to independence from within his own party
- De Gaulle's gradualism may be argued as an important tactic in the achievement of independence. He was able to co-operate with the army even when there were major subversive forces within it. When a military coup was attempted he was determined to restore loyalty and restore the authority of the French political system. He was a consummately shrewd and wily political leader and these qualities contributed greatly to his ability to balance his opponents.

Other Factors:

- **The Army:** The anti-terrorist tactics used by the army against the FLN contributed towards independence. They kept the FLN popular and made its work more able to undermine the stability of the Algerian state. The creation of terrorism and subversion within the army also contributed to the urgency De Gaulle faced in removing the threat by granting Algeria its independence. The army came very close to eliminating the FLN and had it done so then, candidates may argue, it could have successfully undermined the drive towards independence. Ironically the army's contribution was to accelerate independence rather than delay its achievement
- **The FLN:** This group's terrorism maintained the momentum of independence. De Gaulle had to deal with it. Despite the positive contribution of the FLN in terms of generating mass support for nationalism amongst an initially apathetic population, the FLN also undermined the process by adopting an uncompromising line when De Gaulle had already shown a real willingness to move towards talks. The FLN displayed obstructionist tactics which weakened De Gaulle's ability to accelerate independence
- **Public Opinion:** The continued struggle in Algeria placed great pressure on the government to take effective action. There was little support for the unqualified retention of Algeria. France existed in a weak political structure. Governments were not strong and the power of the politicians before the emergence of the Fourth Republic was limited. French public opinion was a significant factor in the drive towards independence.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915–1924

A: The accession to power of the Bolsheviks and Lenin’s regime

Explain the main reasons why civil war broke out in Russia in 1918.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to consider a range of reasons to explain the outbreak of the civil war. This might include reference to some of the following:

- Russia’s national minorities saw it as an opportunity to establish their independence from Russia, especially the Georgians and Ukrainians
- the desperate economic state of many parts of the Russia meant the fighting was simply a struggle for food. The supply lines had been broken during the war against Germany. The Bolsheviks failed to end hunger and this led to opposition to the new government
- Lenin was determined to end the war against Germany and negotiated a punitive peace. Some patriotic Russians opposed the Bolsheviks because of the betrayal of “Mother Russia”
- the starvation was made worse by the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Russia lost the main wheat supply area, the Ukraine. This was a particular problem in the large cities e.g. Petrograd
- open challenges to the Bolsheviks became more common. The SRs tried to seize control of the Moscow Soviet, there were assassination attempts on Lenin, and sporadic uprisings across the country, e.g. the establishment of an anti-Bolshevik Volga Republic at Samara.

- all this encouraged the Whites (anti-communists) to come out openly against the regime. They had some important military support from ex-Tsarists and could therefore fight the Bolsheviks, e.g. General Denikin in the Caucasus, General Yudenich in Estonia, and Admiral Kolchak in Siberia. The Whites had assistance from foreign powers from April 1918
- Lenin had crushed the Constituent Assembly and outlawed all other parties, e.g. the Kadets and SRs. These parties had been politically dispossessed and looked to recover their political influence through civil war
- candidates may well be aware of Dominic Lieven’s conclusion that Lenin actually wanted civil war in 1918. Lenin had made it clear, and he had support from some leading Bolsheviks, that he was not prepared to share power; even though some Bolsheviks and the other socialist parties such as the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries were, to avoid civil war.

There is no specific date that marks the start of the Civil War. In January 1918 the Bolshevik – Left SR coalition had set up a Red Army to counter the growing opposition to their government, but this Army did little before April 1918.

The white Army was gradually emerging with foreign support. In May 1918 events escalated when the Czech legion revolted and joined up with the White Army. In July 1918 the SRs left the coalition with the Bolsheviks, and began to undermine Bolshevik control by occupying key communication posts. The civil war that began by summer 1918 had been preceded by months of armed resistance including several attempts on Lenin’s life. Candidates should be aware that the civil war did not “break out” at one time, or for one single reason.

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 the problems facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1923 were more economic than political.

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 to consider the economic problems facing the Weimar Republic: the economic legacy from the Kaiserreich, inflation that eventually ran into hyper-inflationary spiral that began before WW1 but was worsened by wartime financial (mis)management, the impact of reparations, and the loss of resources in the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

Candidates also need to consider the political crises facing the new Republic. The right-wing opposition tended to blame all the problems of the new government on the liberal and democratic principles that underpinned the new constitution: principles the right-wing considered “unGerman”. The constitution was flawed but that does not adequately explain the opposition from the extreme right and left, while the democratic centre was unable to offer stable coalition government.

During the period 1919–1923 the political problems, worsened by economic conditions severely threatened the Weimar government. The Spartacist challenge in 1919 showed the opposition from the left was divided and disagreed on tactics, and never really threatened the Republic though there were short lived Soviet Republics, e.g. Bavaria 1919, and uprisings e.g. Saxony 1921. Opposition from the right was not always fully understood by the Republic. Modern historians have debated the significance of this left-wing opposition, questioning whether the language was more hardline socialist revolutionary but the intent moderate, except perhaps in Dresden and Leipzig.

The Freikorps flourished, the army refused to act against Kapp and the judiciary was lenient to the right. The wave of right-wing assassinations, particularly against signatories of the

Treaty of Versailles, e.g. Walter Rathenau, is evidence of this leniency. Hitler's prison sentence after the Munich Putsch was also very lenient.

The candidates need to try to link the economic and political problems facing the Weimar Republic so the answer acquires coherence. Better candidates may well consider the separate problems to be artificial, e.g. the Spartacists clearly tried to seize political power in Berlin 1919 to set up a soviet-style government to look after the interests of the workers.

The question encourages candidates to balance the economic and political factors, and to investigate the links between the factors. Examiners should reward candidates who use their knowledge of events to address all aspects of the question.

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

Examine the extent to which the problems facing the Liberal governments in Italy in the years 1918 to 1920 were more economic than political.

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 to consider the economic problems facing Italy at the end of the War. Wartime industry had boomed under strict central government control but this was not sustainable in peacetime. The economy was short of essential raw materials, effective export markets, and the domestic market was weakened by inflation and unemployment. There was antagonism between the majority of the population and the wartime profiteers, and between major industrialists and the petty bourgeoisie. The national debt had grown leaving a serious financial problem for the peacetime government.

Candidates also need to consider the political crises facing post-war Italy. Historians debate how politically stable Italy was on entering the war in 1915. Clark writes that Italy under the liberal government was unstable but Robson sees greater unity. Whatever the pre-war divisions, these were exaggerated by the strains of war. Giolitti had led Italy into war and found the country even more divided after the war. Opposition to the liberal governments 1918–1920 emerged from different sections of the population.

- many of the 5 million conscripted soldiers who suffered in the stalemate of war learned solidarity in the trenches, and came to see the Liberal government as irrelevant
- Nationalists were critical of the Liberal government’s slowness to enter the war, and subsequent failure to secure Dalmatia in the treaty of St Germain, so opening up further challenge for the Liberal government e.g. d’Annunzio and Fiume. The

emergence of Mussolini as an alternative political leader backed from 1919 by his blackshirts increased the problems facing the Liberal government.

- Socialists were inspired by events in Russia to strike and seize control of land and industry. Unemployment after demobilisation, the adjustment to peacetime economy and inflation fanned the flames of political opposition. A wave of strikes in the Biennio Rosso (two red years) added to the opposition.

These considerations do need to be balanced. Liberal government was not totally weak. Constitutional changes were brought in 1918 to make the country more democratic, but failed to strengthen Liberal coalition government because the Socialists and the Catholics did not co-operate with Giolitti.

Candidates need to try to link the economical and political problems facing Italy so the answer acquires coherence. Better candidates may well consider the separate problems to be artificial e.g. Fascism was a challenge to the Liberal government born out of the political and economic struggle with the Socialists.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870–1950

A: Population change in Britain, 1870–1945

Examine the importance of changing attitudes to marriage in contributing to a decline in the birth rate in the years 1870 to 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.

Candidates will need to balance attitudes to marriage against other factors affecting the declining birth rate. Material may include:

Importance of changing attitudes to marriage

- the growing use of contraception after the Great War which meant that marriage was no longer seen as an institution for procreation. This may be linked to female emancipation with reference to the work of Marie Stopes and of the rise in perinatal deaths in the 1920s as a reason for women to avoid becoming pregnant, as well as the declining hold of religion over marriage and sexual behaviour
- the decline of middle class incomes in the 1920s may have encouraged women to pursue careers and earn money rather than marry and have children
- the repeal of discriminatory employment legislation in 1919 enabled more women to pursue careers and no longer see marriage as their only future
- the continuing pressure on women to resign if they married meant that career women often remained spinsters and so a direct link could be made between female opportunities and the birth rate (but the number of women involved was small)

Other factors

- the persistently higher levels of unemployment experienced by Britain in the 1920s may be seen as leading to postponed marriages, as would the Great Depression after 1929
- the increased impact of legislation meaning that the cost of children rose as they could no longer earn until they were older
- higher standards of living brought a wish to limit family size – initially among the middle classes, but this increasingly spread to lower classes as education grew.

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

Examine the degree to which the actions of mill owners and workers explain the decline of the cotton industry in the years 1870 and 1950.

In your answer you are not required to refer to the periods 1914–1918 and 1939–1945.

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.

This question is asking candidates to set the decisions made by the cotton industry itself in context. Candidates may argue either for or against actions such as the retention of mule spinning pre-1914 as historical opinion is divided. Opinion is also divided over whether and by how much productivity levels changed between 1870 and 1914.

Between 1918 and 1939 the cotton industry failed to rationalise capacity in the face of sharply contracted markets, until the 1930s when it faced the trauma of the Depression. In 1924 the introduction of the Toyoda automatic loom exposed Lancashire to increased competition and therefore worsened the situation after 1919, when much of the Indian market was lost due to the disruption in supplies from Britain during the war. Competition between Lancashire firms led to price-cutting and a decline in profits and quality. Candidates may point to industrial disputes and the reluctance of government to intervene. Government intervention only came in 1936 with the Cotton Spinning Reorganisation Act. The Cotton Industry Reorganisation Act of 1939 is another example of government intervention delayed by industry bickering.

The alternative line of argument, i.e. that the industry was badly damaged by external factors, is likely to include a number of points. The negative impact of the two world wars on all staple industries is likely to be cited. Churchill's decision to over-value the £ Sterling on its return to the Gold Standard in 1926 made the cotton industry uncompetitive. The development of rayon also damaged sales of cotton.

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

With what success did the Ku Klux Klan try to fulfil its aims in the years 1919 to 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 are expected to consider a range of aims and evaluate success between 1919 and 1929. Candidates may consider the context and nature of the 1920s in order to explain the Klan's rise and successes. This might include:

- the rural versus urban division
- protestant versus catholic
- the Klan's anti immigration, anti Darwinism, return to normalcy background
- traditional standards versus revolution in manners and morals.

Aims might include:

- aims to increase membership and make the KKK into a national movement
- aim to stop blacks voting and intimidate them into remaining subservient
- aim to curb immigration
- aim for political power: both state and national.

Successes and their limitations might include:

- their popularity connected with creed, messages of moral piety and their targets of blacks and Catholics which were popular with some people
- success was because Klan bigotry fitted locale, especially in the South

- they appealed to blue collar workers by giving them a sense of importance
- people felt they belonged through the wearing of ceremonial outfits of white sheets and hats. Burning crosses came to symbolise Klan activity. These could be seen for miles around and came to symbolise success
- immigration was curbed through Quota Act of 1924 but it is arguable as to how much this had to do with the Klan
- some success is evident through the number of lynchings and the level of intimidation that was achieved in the South. The voting numbers of blacks remained very low especially in the Deep South
- there was a limited success in terms of political power at state level e.g. Governor but there was no federal power
- success was limited to the early part of the decade, arguably due to uncertainty over immigration and general fears of the times
- success was limited in terms of geographical spread since it was more popular and successful in intimidation within the Deep South than anywhere else. It was a movement that had a limited appeal for the intelligentsia especially in the North and Far West
- a period of decline occurred after 1925 when the Indiana Grand Dragon was imprisoned, and a public trial revealed corruption. Ultimately prosperity in 20s destroyed the Klan's appeal
- the cities remained outside the appeal of the Klan. Most candidates will conclude that the KKK did not really fulfil the aims of their leaders.

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

How effective was the opposition to the First New Deal in the years 1933 to 1935?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers are expected to consider a range of opposition to the New Deal. Candidates may consider the left and right of the political spectrum and the reasons for their opposition and alternatives proposed, e.g. left – more government intervention, greater distribution of wealth, right – less government intervention to let the economy regulate itself.

Different groups also had their own specific reasons for opposing the New Deal:

- Conservative critics, e.g. business people and Republicans opposed the New Deal because of too much taxation and government regulation. They did not like deficit financing of relief and public works. However much they complained, however, they were not in power and so could do little directly to influence the path that Roosevelt chose to take
- the American Liberty League didn't like New Deal because it stopped individual initiative and made some people too reliant on welfare payments
- some critics said business was too favoured because of the National Recovery Act and favoured industrial needs at the cost of workers
- farmers/labour unions and individual entrepreneurs complained that the NRA set prices too high and favoured large producers over small businesses. Roosevelt did take some notice and in the Second New Deal there was an attempt to help the workers

- Supreme Court opposition: Federal courts felt there was too much power in the Presidency and so questioned the constitutionality of the legislation. This was the most successful type of opposition because the Supreme Court had the power to strike down Roosevelt's legislation. This it did and so Roosevelt and the democrats had to come up with new legislation i.e. the Second New Deal
- the AAA was attacked for cutbacks in production, e.g. killed pigs and dug up cotton when people were starving and ill clothed. Tenant farmers and sharecroppers didn't receive payments especially if they were Afro-American. Landlords still dispossessed sharecroppers i.e. new legislation didn't work properly. Some changes occurred through the Second New Deal but it is arguable how much FDR listened
- Demagogue attacks; Father Coughlin/radio programme complained there were not enough changes to the banking system – banks should be nationalised. Francis Townsend/old people. Huey Long/New Deal was too conservative and offered alternatives, e.g. share our wealth. Thunder on the left: called for radical measures, e.g. collective bargaining and greater distribution of wealth. There was some success here, which can be gauged through the popular support for the radio shows and Huey Long. However, these were short lived and were therefore not that successful in changing or influencing the direction of the New Deal.

Roosevelt's plans therefore followed more ideas of the left wing as time went on, so it would appear that ideologically opposition had some impact. Therefore each political wing had some influence but really the greatest success was with the Supreme Court on the First New Deal.

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

Was the need for a structured system of control the most important reason why William introduced a system of military feudalism into England? 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 should focus on the importance of William's need to exercise royal patronage and the use of the system as a method of control and government, but there are other aspects to consider. These include military needs. At the highest levels answers will show understanding of the interaction of the various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned well-supported conclusion. They should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples and are likely to refer to chronicles where necessary.

- **Political factors**
Land was given in return for service and this was the reward he had promised his followers. The main beneficiaries were the leading Norman families who had supported William in 1066 with military resources and more importantly, in some ways, ships. These included Odo, Robert of Mortain (his half brothers), fitzOsbern, fitzGilbert – a small group of less than 50 men held 37% of England. This was an important aspect of the granting of royal patronage in return for much needed support both before and after the conquest.

The system also acted as a form of government and was familiar to William from Normandy. It brought in revenue in the form of incidents (wardship, relief) and Aids. Scutage was later to be an important aspect. In addition, the feudal courts of manor and honour were important to allow the system to function and the control of his great

vassals was an important aspect of ducal and royal power – attendance at the Curia Regis underlined this.

Military factors

- The nature of the conquest meant that William needed an army, but could not afford to finance and supply a purely royal force that was large enough (estimates range from 4000-6000 men) for his needs. Military quotas based on the land holding patterns of his tenants in chief (both ecclesiastical and lay) were at the heart of the system. The quotas appear to have been arbitrary at this stage.

The apparent timing of its introduction suggests that the need became paramount as threats of rebellion and foreign invasion grew. Orderic Vitalis notes the change within the first phase of conquest from Hastings to c1071. At first William was prepared to use influential Englishmen but after the fall of Edwin and Morcar, more land was distributed to provide military protection, particularly in the north.

The system incorporated castles held by appointed castellans and these were used as a method of extending the conquest, both through pacification and colonisation (Holderness, the Pennine crossings, North Wales), as defence against native rebellion (York, Durham) and to guard against invasion (Sussex rapes).

Overall, it set up a structured society that served royal interests – the Domesday Book underlines the importance of both the military and financial functions, and the Oath of Salisbury when all important rear vassals did homage to the king (1086) demonstrates its use as a method of ensuring control. Military feudalism as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (1086) notes increased the power of the monarchy; every vassal was a link in the chain that led to the king.

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

How important was the part played by lay patronage in the monastic revival in England in the period 1066 to 1135?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

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

Answers should consider the nature of changes as well as the agents of that change and place England within the context of the wider European reform movement. At the highest levels, answers should show understanding of the interaction of various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned, well-balanced conclusion. The range of relevant factors will include the effects of Normanisation, of increased patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries as well as the effects of the new Orders. A range of well chosen factual examples should support answers.

During this period the number of religious and religious houses increased significantly (houses from 60 to c250-300).

Relevant factors include:

- the impact of the Conquest
- effects of Normanisation
- the work of individuals and their relative importance
- the effect of the new orders.

Development could include:

- the debate concerning the need for reform
- initial spoliation and impact of quotas
- the attitude of the Normans to monasticism and the impetus given by lay patronage with precise examples
- the effect of the work of Lanfranc and Anselm; bringing England into the mainstream of continental reform
- the impact of the new orders, especially the Benedictines and the Cistercians and the value of lay sponsorship of these.

Likely to be considered for comparative importance:

- the role of royal patronage
- the negative effects of enforced change
- the impact on native practices, attitudes and hagiography
- change through time shown by the increasing popularity of monasticism in western Europe.

This was not all one way and there was cultural interchange on an increased scale. The effect of an Archbishop from Normandy, Norman abbots on 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. The religious vocation was no longer limited to a choice between the solitary existence of a hermit and the somewhat aristocratic ambiance of a Benedictine monastery. Now also, there was a much wider range of ideals and practices fusing the eremitical spirit of primitive monasticism with the concept of a community.

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

With what success did Henry VII deal with the challenges to his security between 1487 and the end of 1499?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is Henry VII's security from the time Henry had first consolidated his position by his victory at Stoke in 1487, until 1499 with the execution of Perkin Warbeck. Answers will be expected to explain a range of "challenges" – including the Pretenders, foreign support, the Cornish rebellion of 1497 and the possibility of disaffected groups within the nobility. Answers should focus on the whole period between 1487 and 1499, although it cannot be expected that coverage will be comprehensive or equal. Some answers will emphasise certain challenges more than others. Successful answers will be based on a direct assessment; rigid narrative description will be of little value.

The key words "With what success?" obviously require analysis of Henry's policies and actions and assessment of how effective they were – but there is also scope for discussion of the question of how 'serious' the challenges were in relation to Henry's success. Some answers may argue that Henry did not need to be very 'successful' because the dangers he faced were trivial and easy to deal with. Others may differentiate effectively between the seriousness and urgency of various 'challenges' – perhaps arguing that the Yorkist cause got little support from within England and Wales and that Henry was more worried about foreign interference; or that regional problems such as Cornwall (or Scotland and Ireland) were more of a worry than the Pretenders.

Answers may include material on Simnel and the battle of Stoke but it would also be appropriate to treat 1487 as a starting point and assess the threats that still remained from 1487 onwards. The 'challenges' might include:

- 1487 – defeat of Lambert Simmel and his Irish and Burgundian backers at the Battle of Stoke
- 1487–1489 – French invasion of Brittany
- 1491 – appearance of Perkin Warbeck in Ireland (and continuing links with Irish nobility in succeeding years)
- diplomatic and financial backing from Margaret of Burgundy (and, potentially, from the Emperor or even Spain)
- attempted invasion by James IV of Scotland in 1497, in conjunction with Warbeck (who had married a Scottish noblewoman, Katherine Gordon)
- 1497 – Cornish rebellion; surrender of Perkin Warbeck
- 1499 – links between Warbeck and the Earl of Warwick, and the final decision to execute Warbeck.

As noted above, there is much room for alternative approaches. It might be argued, for example, that there was never a credible threat to Henry's security and that Henry's "success" was easy and straightforward – or that he never felt safe and was obsessed with protecting his throne from his challengers right up to 1499 and even afterwards (the Earl of Suffolk was still a potential problem until the Archduke Philip handed him over in 1506). As usual, the key requirement is a relevant assessment, supported by selected specific evidence.

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

Examine the degree to which Wolsey was responsible for his own downfall.

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 specifically on Wolsey's fall. Answers may legitimately use 'long term factors' contributing to this, going back well before 1529 to find relevant evidence about Wolsey's flaws of character, or the nature of his relationship with the king – but this must be directly applied to explaining what happened in 1529 – biographical detail on Wolsey's career will have scant value. As so often, the core of the question is an assessment of relative importance – how far was it Wolsey's own fault; how much was it due to "other factors"? In this, it is probable that many answers will see the chief "other factor" as being the King – again, in depth analysis of the relationship between the two men *could* be relevant and appropriate, but only if it is applied to explaining Wolsey's fall. Be wary of answers which are aimed at a different question, perhaps along the lines of "the master or the servant", and which have only slender links to the downfall.

Direct answers will be along three main lines of argument:

- yes, Wolsey was to blame – he was too powerful, too greedy, made too many enemies, and finally made fatal policy errors over the royal divorce
- no, Wolsey was not to blame – he just worked for an impossible boss (and was schemed against by his enemies, including Anne Boleyn)
- no, Wolsey was not to blame – he was defeated by unlucky circumstances. (e.g. if Catherine of Aragon had produced a healthy male heir instead of five daughters only one of whom survived, it would all have been different – there are many other such "ifs".)

The short-term events culminating in 1529 could include:

- the Amicable Grant of 1525, which made Wolsey deeply unpopular and got him accused of extortion
- May 1527, when Wolsey was given the task of using his influence as Cardinal to negotiate an annulment of Henry's marriage
- June – September 1527, when Wolsey was in France to negotiate a treaty, giving rivals at home opportunity to intrigue against him
- 1528 – long complex negotiations to try to secure the divorce
- 1529 – Wolsey charged with *praemunire*, stripped of wealth and offices
- 1530 – arrest and death.

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**

Was Puritanism more of a threat to James before 1611 than after 1618?
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.

Good answers are likely to provide some kind of definition of Puritanism and make comment on how by its very nature it was a potential threat to James's position as Supreme Governor and therefore as monarch.

Candidates will need to outline the issues that made Puritanism a potential threat in both periods and provide some judgement about which period witnessed the greatest threat.

For 1603–1611 the following issues will form the basis of coverage: the Millenary Petition, the Hampton Court Conference, Bancroft's Canons, the appointment of Abbot and the 1611 authorised version of the Bible.

For the period 1618–1625 the main focus will be on foreign policy and Puritan opposition to it. Answers which argue for either period in terms of which posed the greatest threat are equally valid.

Candidates may contrast James as new king before 1611 and the hopes of Puritans given his Presbyterian context, with the later period which might be considered more threatening because foreign policy broadened the Puritan platform, especially into parliamentary opposition. The later period might also bring in comment on the Book of Sports and Arminianism in terms of Puritan reaction to James. At this level some may also point out the limited real threat posed by Puritans because by their very nature most were moderate and James's policy actually meant that most were able and willing to remain within the Church and recognise his authority as Supreme Governor and monarch.

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 achieve his political and religious objectives in Scotland in the years 1603 to 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.

James's objectives should be outlined in both politics and religion. In relation to both there should be consideration of how far James achieved what he set out to do. Candidates may question the notion of a planned policy and look at the nature of James' rule.

James's objectives include: maintaining control of Scotland, a gradualist approach to Union after the initial failure of his formal plans and his religious policy where he sought to extend royal control.

Details of his method of his ruling and policy which will be used to illustrate answers include: use of the Scottish Privy Council; postal service; the role of Dunbar; James's own knowledge; management of the Scottish Parliament; dealing with the clans and aristocracy, most visibly shown by the Statutes of Iona (or Icomkill) and the execution of Lord Maxwell for murder in 1613. All of this was part of the strengthening of central government that James had been pursuing from the 1580s. It can be argued that by 1625 James had made the Scottish crown stronger than before and certainly given more control over the 'frontier' regions of the kingdom.

There may be greater detail with regard to religion where James's policy became more forceful after 1617 and resulted in some real tension post-1621 which added to the political grievances. Rothes and Balmerino opposed Privy Councillors, bishops and courtiers who supported the Articles of Perth and heavy taxation.

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

Was lack of foreign support the most important reason for the failure of the Jacobite revolts in 1715 and 1745? 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.

In both 1715 and 1745, the Jacobites were led to believe that there would be substantial French support for the cause, but in neither case did this materialise.

In 1715, the Old Pretender was based in Paris, and there were definite indications that Louis XIV might be willing to grant at least unofficial support to the Stuart cause, if only because of the bad feeling remaining from the War of Spanish Succession. This undoubtedly encouraged the Old Pretender and his supporters to make preparations for an invasion. However, the death of Louis XIV in September 1715 and the rise of the Orleans Regency altered the situation substantially as a Hanoverian Britain might well supply support for the Duke of Orleans in any possible future conflict with Philip V of Spain over succession to the French throne; anticipated French support for the Jacobites, therefore, did not materialise. In 1745, despite Anglo-French hostilities in the War of Austrian Succession, France made no real attempt to support the Young Pretender; the French had made an abortive attempt to cross the English Channel in the spring of 1744, foiled by bad weather, and the Jacobites might well have expected that they would at least have supplied some diversionary focus in 1745.

Candidates should contrast this with various other reasons for Jacobite defeat in both 1715 and 1745. The Old Pretender's role in 1715 was less than impressive, both in terms of his belated arrival in Scotland and his stubborn refusal to renounce Catholicism. Jacobitism was never popular in England, where the Tories were discredited throughout the entire period as

the Whigs worked hard to ensure the survival of the Hanoverian regime; growing prosperity and complacency served to limit Jacobite prospects south of the border. The British army coped well with the threat both in 1715 and 1745, despite initial slowness in 1715. The Earl of Mar's leadership of Scottish Jacobites was unimpressive in 1715, and the Young Pretender's leadership in 1745, whilst at times inspirational, was flawed by indecision.

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

How important was Robert Clive’s military contribution in establishing British influence in India by 1767?

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 to draw on details of Clive’s career in support of an argument assessing his part in the establishment of British control in India by 1767. Though initially a junior clerk with the East India Company in Madras, he gained military experience during the relief of Madras in 1748 and went on to play a prominent role in the capture of Arcot in 1751. He returned to India as a Lieutenant-Colonel in the employ of the East India Company, and Governor of Pondicherry, just before the outbreak of the Seven Years’ War. His main objective was to destroy French influence, making alliances with native rulers as appropriate. After the ‘Black Hole of Calcutta’, Clive defeated the Nawab of Bengal, Siraj-ud-daulah, and French supporters at Plassey (June 1757).

This began a period of substantial British political and military involvement in India, with the new Nawab, Mir Jafar, expecting that Clive would ensure continued British military support. In return, Mir Jafar granted the company the right to collect taxes in certain parts of Bengal. Clive had to suppress rebellions against Mir Jafar, and in practice became the real ruler of India.

Clive destroyed the French base at Chandernagore in Bengal (1758), before driving them out of the Sarkars (1759). Later successes involved defending Mir Jafar against the Nawab of Oudh, and routing a Dutch attack in Bengal (both 1759). Clive returned to Britain in 1760 confident that French influence in India was almost over, and that full British control of Bengal was imminent. He returned again to India in 1765 due to the continuing instability, and as Governor-General was to establish the concept of ‘dual government’ in Bengal; this was hardly an unqualified success, and led to corruption among native officials. Clive returned to Britain in 1767 following a breakdown.

In addition to the clear military impact of Clive, candidates should also identify the following ways in which Clive contributed to the establishment of British influence in India:

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

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

Examine the extent to which the new Poor Law of 1834 was based on the wish to cut the costs of poor relief.

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 to examine the premise of the question that the New Poor Law in part mainly reflected the desire of the Whig government to satisfy the new middle class electorate's desire to see an end to the spiralling costs of poor relief. They will need to balance this argument against other possible reasons for the reform.

The 'other reasons' may include:

- the influence of Benthamism/Utilitarianism. The Poor Law embodied some of the Benthamite principles, at least as they were interpreted by Chadwick who was Secretary of the Poor Law Commission
- the need for improved administration and centralisation to overcome corrupt practices and injustice
- to meet Malthusian concerns regarding population growth
- to curb the threat posed by escalating numbers of poor, as seen, for example, in the Swing Riots (1831)
- to help the most needy and curb immorality, vice and laziness.

Candidates are likely to challenge the underlying assumption of the question but answers must show supported argument in favour of a factor, not just a list. Better answers will show the inter-linkage of factors and provide well substantiated judgement.

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

In the years c1820 to c1841, was pressure for reform from inside the Anglican Church stronger or weaker than pressure for reform from outside it? 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.

Inside pressure may include:

- the interest in religion stimulated by the *Tracts For The Times* and the major role played by Pusey
- academic debate among bright graduates in the Church of England – until the 1870s 50% of Firsts were ordained into the ministry
- The Oxford Movement itself and the impact of priests such as John Henry Newman and Keble
- intellectual debate about the role of the Anglican Church in publications such as Gladstone's *The Church in its Relations with the State* (1838)
- the influence of the Clapham Sect
- the Gorham Decision which forced the Church of England to remain a broad church allowing debate from within.

Other pressures may include:

- Wesley and the Methodists

- the work of the Ecclesiastical Commission (partly due to the perceived threat from Catholicism and Non-Conformity)
- the key role of evangelical writers in increasing the output of Christian publications
- Catholic Emancipation, 1829 and Newman's conversion to Catholicism, which sent shockwaves through the Church of England and cast a theological cloud over those inside the Anglican Church who wanted to maintain the High Church traditions of Anglicanism.

It is just possible that candidates may adopt a broader view and consider the influence of the Anglican Church on all political, legal and social reforms between 1820 and 1841. This is entirely legitimate and answers should be marked according to the generic mark scheme.

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 social reforms changed the relationship between the state and its citizens in the years 1906 to 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 are expected to consider the extent to which the reforms changed the relationship between the state and its citizens in this period. From 1906–1914 government social reforms changed the relationship by placing more reliance on collective action by the state in contrast to individual and voluntary actions. Some see the beginnings of the welfare state during this period. In 1914 and 1915 the Liberal government began further intervention in the lives of citizens caused by the necessities of war.

Gladstonian Liberalism had emphasised individual freedom, responsibility and ‘self-help’, together with strict limitations on state expenditure. New Liberalism recognised the role of the state in social issues and implemented this in government after 1905. Politicians like Lloyd George and Churchill used state action to attack poverty and unemployment. The need for action was encouraged by the findings of Booth and Rowntree, and the revelations of poor health and fitness in recruits for the Boer War. The concept of help from the cradle to the grave by the state and government was at last born. The Liberal governments continued to promote individual liberty, but this co-existed with the new state promotion of measures to improve conditions for the ‘multitude’ and especially the poor. Such measures had to be paid for and therefore involved increased government expenditure and higher taxation. Answers should show competent knowledge of the major welfare reforms of the Liberals before the First World War and how these affected the lives of citizens especially the old, young, and unemployed. In particular Lloyd George introduced groundbreaking legislation (for Britain) with pensions and National Insurance to alleviate poverty for the elderly, sick, and unemployed. Compared with later measures these were limited in eligibility and ‘generosity’,

but at the same time were innovative and not without significant opposition, much of it because of the changed role of the state.

Lloyd George also promoted redistribution of wealth by progressive taxation (1909 Budget) of a kind not seen in Britain previously. Churchill was responsible for intervention in the sphere of work by assisting the unemployed to find work through the introduction of labour exchanges and regulating wage levels in the sweated industries. In the early years of the Liberal government measures for children's welfare were introduced (school meals, medical inspection, the Children's Charter). The Liberals were also trying to enhance their appeal to the working class electorate and were conscious of rivalry from the new Labour Party, which advocated 'socialism' involving extensive intervention by the state and government to benefit the working classes. This partly explains the introduction of improved conditions for British seamen, the 1906 Workmen's Compensation Act, the Trades Disputes Act, limiting the miners' working day and the Shops Act. New Liberalism attempted to focus on the 'larger community interest'.

Although not necessary, some answers may mention that during the 1906–1914 period there was also complementary political reform, which changed the relationship of the state and particularly government with its citizens, as did social reform. The constitutional crisis led to the supremacy of the elected House and legitimate government being strengthened. M.P.s were paid from 1911. Some responses may argue that the action taken against suffragettes, such as forced feeding and the 'Cat and Mouse' Act, were new state measures taken against political activists (even out-of-line with the welfare thrust of most other Liberal measures).

Although the major extensions of state powers during the First World War came after May 1915, there were some significant wartime measures introduced by the Liberal government before then. The most important was the Defence of the Realm Act (DORA) in August 1914. Although it was not used extensively during the early months of the war, it gave the government greatly increased powers. There were also early Acts to reduce the amount of drinking. Women were encouraged to enter the munitions factories and do other war work with significant measures for their welfare being introduced. Overall from 1906–1915 the state's relationship with its citizens changed extensively. Many candidates will argue that the increased powers of the state affected the lives of most of the population through social reform, but answers must be balanced and show some awareness of the limitations of change.

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

How important is opposition from the Ulster Unionists in explaining why Irish Home Rule did not come about during the years 1895 to 1914?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should focus on the opposition of the Unionists, but also consider other reasons for the failure of Home Rule being enacted during this period in spite of its promotion by the Irish Nationalists, the Liberal Party and especially the Liberal government from 1912–1914. Although the Liberals remained committed to the introduction of Home Rule for Ireland after the failure of the Second Home Rule Bill in 1893, there was no prospect of achieving it until a Liberal government was again in office and also in a position to overcome the majority opposing Home Rule in the House of Lords. That position had to be accepted by the Irish Nationalists under Redmond at Westminster and there was little prospect of any more extreme party or group, such as Sinn Fein (founded 1902) or the I.R.B. in Ireland itself ending the union with Britain during this period. Ulster Unionism became far more militant when the increasing prospect of Home Rule becoming reality emerged. It was given considerable support by the Conservative Party. Militancy after the Liberal government came to power in 1906 was on a different scale from that of previous Ulster/Protestant opposition and particularly so from 1911-12 onwards. From those years the opposition of the Unionists became a key factor in preventing the advent of Home Rule in Ireland. Election of a Liberal government with a huge majority in 1906 was regarded as a threat in itself. There could be another attempt at Home Rule. However, the threat became much more of a reality as a result of the constitutional crisis, the 1910 Election results and the Parliament Act. After January 1910 the Liberal government had a dependency on Redmond and the Irish Nationalists for a Commons majority. The price of support was a renewed Liberal commitment to Home Rule. The Second Home Rule Bill (1893) had been defeated only in the Lords. That obstacle could be overcome in a period of a few years following the parliament Act of 1911, a period however which gave time to the Unionists to become stronger in terms of ability to resist.

Following pressure from Redmond, a new Home Rule Bill was introduced in April 1912. Like the previous Bills it was moderate in that some Irish M.P.s would still sit in Westminster, and though the Irish had responsibility for most internal affairs, the British government retained considerable control. The Irish Nationalists were enthusiastic but not the republican groups such as Sinn Fein. However, the most significant and strongest opposition came from the Ulster Unionists. The Third Home Rule Bill was due to be implemented in 1914. Unionism had developed from the late 19th Century, but became far more militant and determined when faced with the real prospect of Home Rule particularly under the leadership of Carson and Craig. They wished to maintain the Union but threatened to establish an Ulster government if necessary. They set up the Ulster Volunteers and instituted the Solemn League and Covenant in 1912. The last meant for Carson an imposition of discipline among the Protestant Unionists and demonstrated complete determination to resist Home Rule and ‘Rome Rule from Dublin’ – with force if necessary. They also gained the support of Bonar Law and much of the Conservative Party, even for armed insurrection if Home Rule were to be passed by the British Parliament. Civil war looked likely especially after gun running by both the Ulster Volunteers and the Irish Volunteers. The Asquith compromise of exclusion of Ulster for six years was not accepted and the Curragh Mutiny of 1914 helped the Unionists. Militancy remained, but was not as obvious with the outbreak of the First World War.

Better answers will explain explicitly a range of reasons (with development) for Home Rule not becoming a reality during the period with a focus on the role of Ulster Unionism. In essence there was a real prospect of Home Rule being achieved by the British government from 1906 and particularly after 1910. However, Ulster Unionists and Protestant resistance to the point of using arms, strong and determined leadership, support to an extent of both the Conservative Opposition (especially Bonar Law as leader) and British Army officers were crucial. Responses may also refer to the gradual emergence of a more extreme (and armed) Irish nationalism, which openly rejected just Home Rule for Ireland and claimed complete independence. However Redmond’s position and policy were not seriously threatened in Ireland before the outbreak of the First World War. That event almost certainly saved Ireland from the prospect of civil war in 1914 with the consequent Liberal government decision to postpone implementation of Home Rule for the duration. With initial support for the war effort in 1914 in general from both Protestants and Catholics, Unionists and Nationalists, it did seem there might be grounds for an eventual peaceful compromise. (Subsequent events, which are not required in answer to this question, were to determine otherwise.)

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

Examine the extent to which Britain in 1750 was a backward country with limited potential for growth.

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 requires candidates to examine the main economic indicators of Britain in 1750 and to make judgements on two issues. Firstly, whether or not Britain was backward economically, for example in the organisation of agricultural markets and the development of industry. Secondly, what was the identifiable potential for growth? This may include an awareness of the limitations of, for example, the transport network and banking system.

Evidence of backwardness

There is evidence that the British economy was not well advanced in 1750:

- agriculture dominated production; much of the produce was sold in local or regional markets. Most manufacture was undertaken during slack times in agriculture
- the infrastructure in terms of the road network was very patchy although the roads immediately around London and the major cities of commerce were relatively well-developed. Transport was organised very much on a regional basis. Water transport was favoured for long distance haulage for bulky goods
- the banking system could be described as backward. Much investment was undertaken by local attorneys acting as intermediaries

BUT signs of change include:

- whilst the major investment and development of turnpikes occurred after 1750 the evidence from the West Riding suggests that where there was a clear need roads were turnpiked as early as the 1740s – this was the result of investment by the cloth merchants of Wakefield and Leeds. Similar developments can be attributed to Wedgwood and Wilkinson. It is clear that, where the need existed merchants and producers were prepared to invest for development
- the period prior to 1750 did witness an increase in the levels of capital formation, perhaps to the point of 10% of national income identified by Rostow as necessary for ‘take off’. This investment can be seen in farming and in transport and textiles. The majority of capital was ‘working’ or ‘circulating’ capital, which was managed mainly by the merchants, the Bank of England, London private banks, and the country banks. Whilst a number of ventures failed to develop it is difficult to argue that expansion was retarded by the limitations of the system of credit.

Potential for growth

The potential for growth was great in 1750.

- this can be demonstrated both by the investment which was occurring in agricultural improvements and in industry. Major landowners and those who wished to acquire status were investing in land, through purchase, engrossment and improvement. This can be seen clearly in new methods, not only in crop rotation but also in improvements in land through drainage and the use of a variety of fertilisers. Large landholdings enabled more profit related enterprise. Tenants faced higher rents to encourage innovation. Crop yields and output – weight of animals grew
- much of the out-put of proto-industry, tin toys, small arms, hosiery and cloth was destined for the export market where foreign currency could be earned. Where such goods were sold on the regional market they were also sold at a higher value
- the producers who benefited from increased production were able to create further wealth by their investment in great houses and the purchase of luxury goods. The growth of the urban middle classes is also evidence of this.

Evidence against potential for growth

- however, it should be remembered that England had a considerable minority of its population who consumed more than they produced. Gregory King placed the number who detracted from the wealth of the population at about 33% in his survey of 1688
- the poor consumed a considerable amount of the wealth of the country through the re-distributive effects of the poor law.

Overall

The overall conclusion is likely to be that despite the limitations observable in 1750 the potential for wealth creation meant that the infrastructure could be developed and manufacture increase. Candidates may refer to the work of Pat Hudson or Maxine Berg in their analysis of the importance of manufacture in the mid-eighteenth century. They are likely to be aware of Kenneth Morgan's work in considering industrialising Britain. This has been a keen area of debate and candidates may also refer to the somewhat outdated 'take-off' theory of Rostow.

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

Examine the view that in the years 1780 to 1830 the standard of living of the urban working classes deteriorated whilst that of the workers in the countryside remained the same.

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 the difference in the experience between those living and working in the towns and those in the countryside. The traditional standard of living debate focused mainly on the experience of urban dwellers and considered the impact of wage/price changes and the problems of living conditions for the wage dependent. There was some consideration of those employed in agriculture in the areas surrounding the manufacturing towns. The revisionist debate has explored the issues more broadly, recognising the development of a wage dependent proletariat in the countryside.

Urban Working Class

- recently discussion has focussed on qualitative rather than quantitative data and has demonstrated that living conditions in towns deteriorated due to overcrowding and poor sanitation. Evidence from Chadwick's report demonstrates a very clear distinction in the life expectancy of a labourer living in Manchester compared to a labourer living in Rutland. The difference of approximately 20 years may be the result of much higher infant and child mortality in urban areas but it is not the whole explanation
- urban dwellers may have had much higher wages than agricultural labourers, but both were subject to erratic employment and underemployment. The urban dwellers had to buy all of their food

- food in towns was usually sold by employers through a token system; not only were prices high but also the food was usually adulterated
- as the percentage of people living in urban areas grew so the overcrowding and the quality of life became more desperate
- the development of technology in the mills and factories may have improved working conditions as the machinery became both safer and more sophisticated. However, at the start of the period working conditions both in the home and the factory were poor, mainly due to the increasing emphasis on profit, which permeated both domestic and industrial manufacture
- mortality was high in domestic manufacture where the living and working space were one and the same. Conditions in the early mills were deplorable, the hot, damp atmosphere led to lung conditions and the long working hours and the age of the child apprentices compounded the dangers of unguarded machinery.

Rural working class

- in the countryside, enclosure of the common fields and, later, the restrictions on poor relief meant a negative material change in the lives of the working classes
- people in the countryside were spared the worst excesses of a lack of sanitation experienced in urban areas and as a result life expectancy in rural areas was significantly higher than that of urban areas
- rural dwellers may not have been able to afford a better diet than their urban counterparts but the food was generally unadulterated and agricultural labourers, prior to enclosure, were able to grow some and to supplement their diet by poaching etc.
- there was a deterioration in terms of employment in the countryside, which was a result of enclosure and the disappearance of the common lands. Seasonal and underemployment were increasingly the lot of the majority of agricultural labourers. Machinery such as the threshing machine may have increased production, but it deprived agricultural workers of employment, which had a negative affect on their working conditions.

Candidates should be aware that the evidence on which any analysis of this topic is based is very sketchy. Consumption is based on commodities, which were subject to custom duties. Wage data is very limited as is material related to unemployment and external observers rather than those actually experiencing the conditions offer most descriptions of living and working conditions. Historians who comment on this period tend to have a strong political agenda about the benefits, or otherwise of capitalism. The Optimist historians which might be quoted are Ashton and Hartwell, whilst the pessimists would include Hobsbawm and E.P. Thompson. Both sides have focussed mainly on the issue of wages/prices, consumption and employment, although the pessimists along with the revisionist historians such as Horrel and Humphries have also considered conditions.

Overall, candidates are likely to argue that the two are inextricably linked but that over the period for urban dwellers working conditions improved whereas living conditions deteriorated, in the countryside both seem to have deteriorated.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848

A: The Significance of the 1832 Reform Act

Examine the degree to which humanitarian ideas influenced the nature of the Whig Reforms in the years 1833 to 1835.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates are asked to consider the influence of humanitarian ideas with reference to the three Whig reforms identified in the specification, namely the 1833 Factory Act, the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act and the 1835 Municipal Corporation Act.

The question directs candidates towards one motive, the growing influence of humanitarian thinkers and campaigners both inside and outside Parliament, although this will need to be balanced against other motives for a full answer.

Details on humanitarian influence might include:

- humanitarian attempts to prevent the exploitation of children in the 1833 Factory Act. Children under nine were banned from working in the factories, those aged between nine and thirteen had their hours limited and two hours of compulsory schooling had to be provided. The act certainly was not passed for any political reasons, as the newly enfranchised middle-class factory owners, natural allies of the Whig governments, would lose out by the measure. 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. However, the reality of the 1833 Factory Act was that unscrupulous owners easily circumvented the Act, as there were only four unpaid overseers for the whole country. As such, the Act was influenced more by humanitarian principles in its conception than its application.

An absence of humanitarianism and other motives might include:

- it is difficult to see humanitarian influence behind the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act. The commissioners were utilitarians, not humanitarians; the principle of less eligibility made the workhouse the very last resort for any right-minded person, where humiliating and degrading conditions existed. Husbands were separated from wives, regardless of age, work was hard (picking apart old ropes etc) and at Andover inmates were found to be eating ground up bones. Instead the Act represented the views of commissioners like Chadwick, Bishop Sumner, Bishop Blomfield, Bourne and Lewis, all leading disciples of Jeremy Bentham who believed in the greatest good of the greatest number. The narrow conception of the causes of poverty that the Benthamites accepted was hardly humane. They believed that the vast majority of poverty was caused by idleness and therefore the idle poor should be removed from the community, receiving relief only in workhouses, where conditions should be worse than outside to encourage people to work. This idea of ‘less eligibility’ was a utilitarian principle. The uniformity of the system also bore the stamp of Bentham’s followers. The Act might also be seen as a response to the needs of the newly enfranchised middle-class who wished to pay less local rates. The effect of the Act was to reduce the bill for poor relief from £7 millions to £4.5 millions
- the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act was a rationalisation of local government, applying the same uniform principles to local government as had been applied to national government by the 1832 Reform Act. A uniform franchise, representation for new cities (cities could apply for corporation status) and the destruction of previous Tory dominance were all first seen in the 1832 Reform Act. The uniform principle and the extension of the franchise to the deserving middle-class also bore the stamp of utilitarianism.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848

B: Chartism, 1838–1848

Examine the degree to which Chartism was a threat to political stability in the years 1838 to 1848.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The Chartist campaign peaked in 1838/9 with meetings and a petition to parliament, in 1842 with a second petition, the rejection of which led to strikes and riots, including the Plug riots in Lancashire and finally in 1848 with a third petition following a rally at Kennington Common in London.

Candidates need to provide material to support a judgement that the Chartists were or were not threatening. There should be a clear understanding of what is meant by a ‘threat’ to stability in the context of 1838–1848. Arguments that governments may have fallen, that uprisings may have led to serious outbreaks of violence, that governments may have been forced to accede to the demands of the Chartists, that the monarchy felt threatened are all reasonable, but are not exhaustive. Quality of analysis and selection are the key to determining what is acceptable.

In many ways Chartism was not a serious threat:

- government actions swiftly crushed uprisings – arrests of leading Chartists in 1839 and 1842, armed response to public meetings in Newcastle in 1838, riots in Lancashire and South Wales in 1839 (20 killed in the Newport Rising), use of the army in Wolverhampton in 1842. The use of troops transported swiftly by railway and the use of urban police forces after 1839. Furthermore, many objected to the violence of the Chartists and support was lost to the Objections to the Anti-Corn Law League

- the government's success in undermining support with social legislation – the repeal of the Corn Laws ensured cheap food, whilst a Factory Act restricted hours of work for women and children
- it was always likely that Chartism would implode – the divisions in the movement between physical and moral forces and between different leaders (e.g. O'Connor, Lovett, Frost), the lack of a m/c alliance with the w/c after 1832 (apart from a brief period in 1842 when m/c non-conformist radicals supported the movement, the campaigns threatened the m/c who had won the vote in 1832)
- the reformed House of Commons was still dominated by aristocratic interests, yet felt safe enough to reject the first two petitions
- other powerful counter-attractions for the dissatisfied (Ten Hour Movement, Anti-Corn Law League, Trade Unions).
- as the economy improved, Chartism lost support.

These arguments should be balanced with some appreciation of the general and specific threats the movement offered.

- geographical extent of Chartist support – Lanarkshire, West Riding, Midlands, South Wales, Black Country, North East, the Potteries, London
- the fact that these regions were the important industrial centres and the possibility of industrial conflict, notably in the sabotage of the plug plots during the second phase of Chartism
- sheer scale of those signing the charter, attending meetings, e.g. Kennington Common in 1848
- the way Chartism tapped into the radicalism of pre-1832, and drew on the radical tradition of both Britain and Europe. The Commonwealthsman newspaper ran articles in praise of Oliver Cromwell, whilst posters advertising meetings in Leicestershire in 1842 talked of liberty, equality and fraternity. Both therefore had sinister connotations of regicide
- the strength of Chartist culture – the network of schools, libraries, churches and discussion groups where politics were debated and Chartism gained mass support
- the way Chartism drew strength from the economic problems of the period
- the diverse nature of the movement which incorporated other movements agitating for factory reform etc.
- the dynamism of O'Connor and the other leaders
- the extreme radicalism of the Charter, which aimed to dismantle the existing political system at a time when the door of change had been left ajar

- the violence of the Newport Rising, 1839 and the severity of the sentences for Frost and Williams suggest a government running scared.

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

How important was the part played by public opinion in the development of plans for a “welfare state” in the years 1942 to 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 public attitudes and social groups supporting the idea of the ‘welfare state’; and a range of their reasons and motives for doing so. Answers should also focus on the whole period between 1942, when the Beveridge Plan was formulated in the midst of war, and 1945, when the ‘Labour Landslide’ took place. Some answers will differentiate effectively between the war years, when the Churchill coalition was planning for the future, and 1945, when the Labour Party was pushing its own agenda and the newly elected Attlee Government was attempting to fulfil its promises in the face of practical difficulties and some political opposition.

There may be answers which make effective use of ‘long term’ factors going back way before 1942 to contrast the attitudes of the ‘Hungry Thirties’ with changed views emerging during and because of the war, but this must be carefully applied to the question. As usual, description of the “background” for its own sake will be of little value. (Nor is coverage pre-1942 a requirement. many excellent answers will concentrate exclusively on the key years 1942–1945).

The idea of a ‘welfare state’ can be defined in various ways. Answers may focus above all on the idea of a national health service and perhaps discuss the elements of opposition as evidence that public opinion was not entirely united. Opposition came from several areas, including the medical profession, sections of the Conservative Party and its anti-socialist supporters. Some of these elements did not openly oppose the welfare state but were at best lukewarm.

“Public Opinion” was a key theme of Britain’s war effort. From 1940 onward, there was a sustained government propaganda campaign to rally the nation and promote the idea of fighting for a better future. (Low’s cartoons are a vivid example of this; as were many feature films and public statements by leaders such as Churchill and Beaverbrook.) The arrival in the government of several Labour politicians such as Bevin, Morrison and Attlee was also a key factor. This provided the setting for the Beveridge Plan (candidates should know Beveridge was a Liberal!) and a general readiness to accept more direct state intervention. Answers should also deal at least briefly with the influence of the Beveridge Plan on the actual election campaign and voters’ response in 1945.

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

Examine the extent to which Winston Churchill himself was to blame for his political isolation in the years 1929 to 1939.

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 analyse and evaluate the reasons for Churchill's years in the political wilderness. Churchill was not only out of office for most of the period when the Conservative dominated National Government was in power, but was also regarded by MPs, much of the press and the public generally as a marginal and isolated political figure. By 1935 he could expect little support in the Commons. During debates on the Abdication Crisis in 1936 he was literally shouted down and even in 1939 other anti-Appeasement groups were reluctant to be too closely associated with him. Good answers may differentiate between the mid 1930s when Churchill's reputation was at its lowest and the later period of 1938–1939 when he began to win wider support, eventually returning to the Cabinet. By the winter of 1939–1940 he had become a very prominent figure, not just because of his post at the Admiralty, but because of his radio broadcasts, speeches, newspaper articles and general energy and enthusiasm. Even then it was far from certain that Churchill would become Prime Minister in May 1940.

Candidates might well argue that Churchill did bring much of his isolation on himself in the 1930s. From 1929 onwards he became the most prominent critic of the leadership of his own party – first Baldwin then Chamberlain. They might point to his die-hard opposition to Baldwin over granting Dominion status to India and his criticism of Conservative policy on India from 1929–1935. Not only did this debar him from office but also his increasingly virulent speeches lost him the support of much of the Conservative Party and of the public. Churchill's emotional support for Edward VIII in the Abdication Crisis alienated George VI and Queen Elizabeth and contrasted with the calmer, more realistic view of Baldwin. As with India, Churchill failed to save Edward VIII and nearly destroyed himself politically.

Over his opposition to Appeasement too candidates might also argue that he isolated himself at least until 1938–1939. Until early 1939 there were convincing arguments in favour of Appeasement as a way of dealing with Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and this policy was popular with the public. Candidates might argue that Churchill's demands for rearmament and his warnings about Germany were actually based on incorrect figures. As late as 1938–1939 even admirers thought either that he was brilliant but wrong, or that he 'rather enjoyed war' too much. They might also point out – though this should not be expected – that his association with major blunders earlier in his career such as the Dardanelles 1915 and the return to Gold in 1925 as well as his belligerent attitude during the General Strike 1926, had severely damaged his reputation with a wide section of the public.

Equally candidates might well argue that there were political and personal reasons why MacDonald, Baldwin and Chamberlain kept Churchill at arm's length. It may be pointed out that Lloyd George as well as Churchill was marginalised in the 1930s. MacDonald, Baldwin and Chamberlain saw Churchill as a potential threat to their leadership and to their control of the Cabinet. Many candidates will probably argue that over the appeasement of Nazi Germany Churchill was eventually proved right and his opponents wrong and therefore that it was not Churchill, but Baldwin and Chamberlain, who were really to blame for his isolation. Candidates may well argue that despite his sometimes exaggerated statistics on German air power his fundamental argument was correct and so too were his criticisms of Munich and Appeasement generally. Well-read candidates may also defend his position regarding India pointing out that attempts to appease Indian Nationalists were no more successful in the long run than attempts to appease Germany.

There are many books on Churchill, both favourable and more critical, and some candidates may well refer to Gilbert, Randolph Churchill or Charmley. If well done such references could be highly effective and be duly rewarded but such historiographical material is not a requirement.