



General Certificate of Education

History 5041

Course Essays (HS03)

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – January 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.

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**

With what success did the military orders in the 1180s meet the ideals of their founders?

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.

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.

The original ideals of the orders will be clearly defined; the Orders developed as the living personification of the crusading ideal and religious enthusiasm. Analysis may stress the roots of the Hospitallers in 1070 and their original caritative role and the militarisation of the Hospitallers. Also, the ideals of the Templars as a brotherhood created in 1119 to secure the pilgrim roads to the Holy places, but also as a remedy for the issue of manpower shortage. Answers will consider as part of the ‘ideals’ a range of ways in which the military orders contributed to the defence of the Crusader states in the 1180s, including castles manpower and dedication. Students will analyse the contribution of military orders within the context of the geographical and manpower problems faced by the Crusader states.

Analysis of success will look at their positive influence in the 1180s. It may focus on the military abilities/martial spirit of the orders, their elite status and numerical contribution. They may also consider their popularity in western Europe, forming an important channel for funds to Outremer, the link between their corporate wealth and the development of their role into castle building in particular, their inspirational role and the manner in which they made permanent the crusading ideal and expressed the martial/religious ethos of the period. Positive analysis may stress that the Hospitallers’ ideals of charity and care for pilgrims were met by their great hospital in Jerusalem which served up to 2000 patients and provided medical care on an ambitious scale. The orders provided a vital military force, they protected pilgrims, their castles guarded pilgrimage routes, the orders maintained pressure on the

Muslim enemy, raiding from their castles and they fulfilled an important political role as advisors to the King. They played a key role in the defence of the Holy Land, their commitment and discipline inspired others and led to financial support for the beleaguered kingdom. At Cresson and Hattin they laid down their life for Christendom. In the recovery of the Kingdom after 1187, the castles of the Templars and Hospitallers were a key element in the recovery of Christian control.

By the 1180s there were clear themes which suggested the Military orders had strayed from their original ideals involving the care and defence of pilgrims visiting the Holy Land. Contemporary criticism focused on their political involvement and military concerns. William, Archbishop of Tyre saw them as a force of disintegration and lawlessness, refusing to obey the King of Jerusalem. The militarization of the Hospitallers from the 1160s onwards led to concern they were abandoning their early ideals. At the Third Lateran Council of 1179 the papacy reminded the Hospitallers that their first duty was to the poor.

Evaluation of success will focus on their place in the increasing weakness and near collapse of the states in the 1180s, their rivalry, their corporate independence and difficult relationship with secular and religious authority within Outremer, especially the crown; their greed and their fanaticism and the Muslim response they provoked. Students' analysis and criticism may focus on the failure of the orders to fulfil their mission to defend the Kingdom, in particular in the battle of Hattin in 1187 but also in other battles such as the Springs of Cresson. Hospitaller castle building and growing concern with the defence of the Kingdom led to financial crisis and contemporary criticism. Students may also highlight the orders' leading role in the disunity which so weakened the kingdom of Jerusalem, with the Templars siding with Guy and Sibylla while the Hospitallers were closely associated with Raymond of Tripoli. The impact of rivalry between the orders may be analysed; for example, the disastrous impact of the losses at the Spring of Cresson in May 1187 were the result of dispute between Gerard de Ridefort and the Marshall of the Hospitallers. Power politics saw their ethos diluted, while King Richard himself spoke of the pride and arrogance of the Templars. Master Gerard de Ridefort personified ambition and worldly concerns rather than a religious vocation.

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

How important was the Rule of St. Augustine in the success of the Augustinian Canons?

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.

At the highest levels answers will show understanding of the interaction of 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.

Answers will consider a range of reasons for the success of the Augustinian canons. This should include the events surrounding their formation. Reference may be made to a variety of aspects, in particular the attraction of the rule of St. Augustine but also the cost of Augustinian foundations, the practical nature of such foundations and royal patronage, religious enthusiasm and the knightly classes.

The Augustinian Canons proved very popular; 274 houses were founded in twelfth century England, mainly in towns. These were often small – six canons were seen as a reasonable number. Royal patronage was of importance, King Henry I and his wife popularised the Augustinians in England, creating at least 40 houses.

Augustinians were regular canons; clergy organised into a body, priests living a monastic style of life to maintain discipline and celibacy but continuing with their pastoral duties. The Augustinians developed from the reform movement. The reformers sought to discipline clergy through imposing a regular life in a community – to separate the clergy from worldly entanglements. The order also developed from the twelfth century popularity for the *vita apostolica*, a communal religious life led in imitation of the apostles. To some this ideal stressed the need to evangelise, to take Christ's message into the world in active pastoral work.

In analysing the key issue of the importance of the rule students may focus on its flexibility and adaptability. The rule of St. Augustine was more flexible than the rule of St. Benedict used by Benedictine and Cistercian monks. It was based on a letter by Augustine of Hippo, dating from the 4th century. The letter was brief and general which left different communities open to interpret its guidance according to their needs. The rule allowed a quasi-monastic life for priests. It included poverty, chastity and obedience but the liturgy was shorter than in monasteries, the diet was more generous and study was commended in place of manual labour. Augustinian priests then could fulfil various functions; they ran parish churches, hospitals and castle chapels – charitable or pastoral aims. Such was the rule's flexibility that others lived monastic contemplative lives of isolation and austerity – Premontre in the forest of Coucy or Llanthony in remote Monmouthshire.

For balance students may develop the practical nature of the canons and their small size, this attracted patrons of modest means, thus opening religious patronage to new social groups, the knightly and merchant classes. To such patrons the Augustinian canons were popular because they were practical – the order was seen as ‘Martha’ compared to the Cistercian monks’ ‘Mary’, fulfilling pastoral duties for lay people, working in the world, preaching, running schools and hospitals, serving as confessors – pastoral duties in the cure of souls. Robert D’Oilly, sheriff of Oxford endowed Osney Abbey in 1129 at a cost of only £20 per year, a modest endowment from a minor aristocrat and the people of Oxford. The canons served the castle and the local churches. Southern estimates Augustinians cost as little as £3 per year, Benedictine monks needed more than three times this figure. Above all, they were popular because they were ‘ubiquitously useful’. They provided staff and clerks for the castle, a place of burial and masses for the soul of their patrons, places of retirement for the sick and aged, for lepers and the blind. They appealed to practical men.

Reforming bishops spread the canons by turning their cathedral clergy into a community – for example, Bishop Anselm and the chapter at Lucca. The order proved popular with bishops because unlike other monastic orders the Augustinians remained subject to their local bishop's supervision. Archbishop Lanfranc founded St. Gregory's Canterbury to serve the hospital and teach.

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

Explain why religious issues were so important in bringing about the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion in 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.

Answers should consider a range of explanations for both Catholic and Protestant willingness to become embroiled in lengthy wars. The emphasis should be on ‘importance’ and not just in providing a list of points. The very fact that there were two opposing religious groups made conflict likely. Answers should have some understanding of the importance of religious belief in the lives of 16th century people and identify some of the issues between and affecting Catholics and Protestants, for example:

Longer Term:**Protestants**

- the Huguenot movement had grown rapidly in France and the first synod was held in Paris in 1559. By 1561, many were more open in their worship – this threatened Catholics
- by 1562 there were 2150 churches (although this only represented 10% of the population)
- Henry II sometimes used protestant mercenaries to fight for him and so Protestantism became more difficult to suppress in France
- Calvin saw France as a legitimate target for encouraging conversion to his brand of Protestantism; French refugees in Geneva maintained links with France; ordinary French people and merchants disliked the semi-feudal control of Catholics and

journeymen/artisans; the literate (often printers) and artisans were exposed to propaganda. As support for Calvinism grew, so did the potential for conflict with Catholics.

Catholics

- relations with the Pope were poor; Gallican crisis 1551 etc. caused relations with Rome to deteriorate over issues of the appointment of bishops (and Henry II's refusal to allow bishops to attend the papal court)
- dissatisfaction with the behaviour of Catholic clergy – usual problems of absenteeism, pluralism, e.g. in 1559 60% of French bishops had not been present in their dioceses in the preceding 12 months
- Catherine de Medici's Colloquy of Poissy 1561 failed to generate agreement between the two groups; she aimed at peace, not toleration but wanted a doctrinal compromise that would please both parties
- Catherine de Medici was perceived as being ultra-reliant on the Catholic Guises although she may well have been hoping to use them simply as a counter balance to the Huguenots.

Short Term:

- 1562: Edict of January (St. Germain) failed and led to Massacre of Vassy; this in its turn led to the first civil war
- by this time the Protestants had strongholds in places from La Rochelle to Lyon (the Protestant crescent) and their numbers were growing to a more critical mass
- L'Hopital, the King's chief Lawyer, was a humanist; he was responsible for the Edict of January in 1562 but it was unsuccessful; sporadic sectarian violence broke out culminating in war.

Religious issues therefore operated at every level – politically, economically and socially. Divisions grew deeper and the crown was unable to control them. However, they were not necessarily the only factor – noble ambition and the weakness of the crown were significant. However, answers should focus mainly on explaining importance of the divisions rather than the balance between differing factors.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*****B: The Role of Individuals and Ideas in the French Wars of Religion**

How important were the organisation and beliefs of the Huguenots in explaining the length of the conflict between Catholics and Huguenots in France in the years 1562 to 1598?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Differing beliefs and organisation generated mistrust and the potential for conflict: the two sides (Catholic and Protestant) had become entrenched in Europe by the 1560s against a background of violence and conflict; this was reflected in France although events were initially less violent.

- the development of Calvinism as a belief system generated serious differences between Catholics and themselves, e.g. views on the mass/church services, accessibility of the scriptures, role of priests and elders, consistories/synods etc. compared with hierarchical Catholicism. Calvinists had seized opportunities to establish churches in important centres such as Paris, Angers etc. which threatened catholic sensibilities
- clientage systems offered a unique network (i.e. organisation) for spreading the Huguenot faith etc. (as it did for Catholics)
- the Huguenots made extensive use of missionaries sent to the south and west; possibly 2m or 10% of population in these areas were Huguenots; in 1559 they held first synod in Paris, generating a hierarchy of regional consistories and provincial synods
- in some towns an even larger percentage of the population were Huguenots; thus challenging both the Catholic Church and the political establishment
- peace-making attempts often failed because the Huguenots did not consider their freedom to worship (where agreed) was adequately safeguarded

- Catholics were still the majority, thus making it less likely that Huguenots would feel confident that they would be left in peace
- powerful families, e.g. the Guises, remained Catholic and wanted the monarch to persecute Protestants, introduce the Inquisition etc.
- Both sides used printing (pamphlets) to promote their cause and fuelled the conflict, encouraged opposition and martyrdom, stiffened resistance.

Other factors also contributed:

- the failure of the peace of Amboise in 1562, e.g. it imposed restrictions on Huguenot worship which continued to provoke conflict, e.g. many designated areas were remote and inaccessible
- political rivalry for the throne, e.g. Guise v. Bourbons was already an issue but accentuated by religious differences
- the ambitions of some individuals, e.g. Catherine de Medici's fear of Coligny led to the Massacre of St. Bartholomew but was exacerbated by local mob violence; reports that the king wanted the Huguenots killed provoked attacks, e.g. in Rouen and led to the Fourth Civil War
- Catherine de Medici's ambitions for her children and the collapse of effective and respected government, especially in the reign of Henry III, led to greater Huguenot fears regarding their safety
- economic failures fuelled discontent in cities and the countryside; prices rose and nobility got into debt; wealthy merchants/townsmen bought up land and offices and nobles vented their anger on peasants; peasant rebellion became a regular feature of country life
- external threats, e.g. Spanish troops occupied large parts of North France in the 1580s
- political theory may have encouraged/exacerbated some issues, e.g. Hotman's 'Franco Gallia' 1575 stressing importance of Estates-General in government; Du Plessis-Mornay's 'Vindiciae contra Tyrannos' stressing that people were born to freedom and that monarchs rule only with the consent of the people; Beza's 'The Rights of Magistrates' which considered the idea of a limited monarchy.

There is little doubt that a range of factors explained the 'disturbances' and that different issues may have predominated at different points in time. Candidates who try to identify and explain this should be given credit. Good candidates should be able to differentiate between beliefs and organisation. Strong organisation supported those with Huguenot beliefs and the two factors were therefore linked **but** the ambitions of others, family rivalries etc. made use of the religious dissension i.e. strong organisation enabled the conflict to continue over the period indicated.

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 opposition of the nobles in explaining the failure of John Law's *Système*?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

An equal balance between the reasons for the failure is not expected and good answers may well see the reasons as interlinked. Relevant use can be made of details of the *système*'s implementation and its significance for the aristocracy but description is not the primary focus of the question.

Noble opposition:

- the actions of the privileged: the financiers and wealthy tax-farmers attempted to break the Banque Royale, but failed, worsening their resentment. They set up an “antisystem” Company offering higher rates of interest than Law, forcing him to outbid them. The privileged participated in the wave of speculation – 500 livres shares touched 18,000 by 1720 – and chose their moment to withdraw from the market. Very few of the nobility were ruined by the bursting of the Mississippi Bubble, many made huge fortunes – e.g. the Duc de Bourbon, lending credence to a conspiracy theory
- their reasons: the bankers, e.g. Paris-Duverney Bros. and Tax-farmers had vested interest in the Crown's debt and existing taxation system, as did many Parlements as rentiers and lenders of capital to the Crown. All of the privileged were horrified by some of Law's further proposals, e.g. all-class taxation; suppression of many minor venal offices. Resentment of some of the Court nobility of all of the Regent Orléans' policies, e.g. the Duc de Maine and his supporters over the setting aside of the Regency Council by Orléans, other nobles over the ending of the Polysynodie in 1718. They united with other privileged groups to criticise and undermine Law's scheme. Criticism of the Protestant foreigner Law's rapid rise to prominence and office as Controller General, e.g. Unigenitus; the judges resented Orléans' actions against them, e.g. the

1718 Lit de Justice; restrictions of the Right of Remonstrance; the arrest of Parlements; the exile of Parlement to Pontoise in 1720.

Other Factors

- the immediate reason can be seen as the wave of speculation ending in the bursting of the Mississippi Bubble in 1720 and the resulting loss of confidence in the markets
- the huge increase in the circulation of paper money in 1717 had led to inflation which affected all classes in society; abrupt deflation which affected holders of fixed capital, especially the middle classes, whilst the repayment of loans rather than interest would diminish the income of lenders and rentiers
- Law himself: his reputation as a roué and gambler; the flaws in his system: failure to limit the issue of paper money had led to inflation; over-stressing the success of the Trading Companies fuelled speculation; linking the Trading Companies to the Banque Royale meant that both were brought down in the collapse; the over-ambitious speed in implementing the system
- Orleans, as only a Regent, lacked a degree of authority
- the enormity of the Crown's debt.

A conclusion might be that although there were a number of factors the nobility, above all, had the influence and financial importance to use their resentment of Law and thus to be of decisive importance.

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

How important was Cardinal Fleury's cautious approach in explaining the success of his domestic policy?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The main focus of answers should be on reasons for Fleury's success in the full range of domestic policies. Some challenge to success is possible but not at the expense of the main focus. Foreign policy is not a required part of the Specification but it could be cited as a reason for avoiding domestic reform.

The caution of Fleury can be demonstrated in many areas of government and policy:

- Fleury was careful to hold office only as a Minister of State rather than First Minister
- in his dealings with the Parlements, withdrawing challenging Edicts and seeking to compromise
- Fleury's deliberate and cautious policy in finance produced the only balanced budgets in the eighteenth century
- Fleury was careful in his management of the Church: his reaffirmation of the Church's tax privileges; in upholding Unigenitus whilst preserving the "rule of silence" over its implementation to appease the Jansenists
- he did not undertake any fundamental reform despite appreciating its potential benefit
- he took care to ensure that the intendants continued effective representation of the Crown in the provinces

- stability in the economy, and even its improvement, was aided by Fleury continuing to support the Bureau de Commerce set up in 1722, re-imposing heavy tariffs, echoing the earlier policy of Colbert and Law, as a secure economy meant contented middle and upper classes.

Reasons for Fleury's caution:

- in financial affairs caution was essential after the upheavals of the Regency's financial experiment to restore confidence, e.g. making regular payments on royal debt; policy and retrenchment
- to avoid confrontation with privilege: e.g. re-establishing the power of the Tax-Farmers; by the effectiveness of Orry as Controller General from 1730–1745 produced the only balanced budgets of the eighteenth century. There might be comment on caution as damaging here: no fundamental reform of the system left the monarchy dependant on an inefficient tax basis and loans a weakness illustrated in the limited war of the Polish Succession when Orry had to revive the *dixième*.

Foreign policy is not an issue covered by the specification but some candidates might comment on Fleury's cautious and adroit diplomacy which aided the preservation of peace, ensured that military expenditure was manageable and avoided any loss of confidence in the Crown's foreign policy, all of which contributed to domestic stability.

Other reasons:

- conversely the skill and determination of Fleury can be argued as more significant than caution and supported by: his ability to choose and support effective ministers such as D'Aguesseau, Maurepas, D'Angervilliers and, above all, Orry as *Contrôleur-Général*; Fleury's compelling of 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. Fleury remained firmly Gallican in his dealings with the Papacy, even though he was a Cardinal, but he was also firmly if quietly anti-Jansenist, e.g. ensuring the removal of the last of the Jansenist bishops and abbots
- the religious controversy over Jansenism died down after 1731 as its *convulsionnaire* phase (claims of miracles/emotion and disorder at a Paris cemetery) lost it some support, especially of Parlement which did not criticise the closing of the cemetery
- economic prosperity was stimulated more by flourishing overseas trade and private enterprise rather than by any government initiative. An increased population meant a cheap labour force
- there was no group with sufficient reason and power to challenge the authority of the monarchy and Divine Right was not yet seriously questioned.

The conclusion might be that domestic success rested on a range of factors, not always within the compass of eighteenth century government, but that the caution and determination of Fleury did ensure the preservation of the status quo and of the authority of the Crown as well as enhancing its financial stability.

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

Examine the extent to which the 1830–1831 Revolutions in France and Italy affected international relations between the Great Powers in the years to 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.

The focus of answers should be on the impact of the revolutions on the Great Powers. The best answers will make some overall comparison between the two revolutions. The greater impact of the French Revolution as opposed to the Revolutions in Italy is explained by the place of France in Europe. The Italian Revolutions failed and their impact was not felt across Europe, but confined to Austria and France.

Impact of French Revolution of 1830

The revolution had alarmed the Eastern Powers and revived memories of the 1789 Revolution. Russia, Austria and Prussia still regarded France as the main danger in Europe and feared that the new regime might wish to expand. The replacement of Bourbon Charles X by the Orleanist Louis-Philippe was regarded as a challenge to the Vienna Settlement. Austria wished to send troops to intervene, the rest of Europe did not. Britain welcomed the change of regime in France and established an entente, whilst Russia refused to recognise the new French King until January 1831. This destroyed the co-operation between France and Russia that had come about from the shared interests of intervention in Spain and in support of the Greeks. Metternich used the Revolution in France to strengthen Austrian links with the eastern autocracies and the Holy Alliance. The rift between Austria and Russia, caused by the Greek Revolt, was forgotten and the eastern pact of Münchengrätz (1833) reaffirmed the Holy Alliance and the Troppau Protocol. Louis-Philippe's liberalism strengthened the liberal, constitutional powers and furthered the ideological cleavage between the Great Powers.

Impact of the Italian Revolutions of 1831

The 1831 revolutions of Modena, Parma and the Papal States had a direct impact on Austria, who through the Vienna Settlement had secured the restoration of Habsburg rulers and the Pope. However the revolutions were uncoordinated and expected French help to overcome Austrian rule. France agreed to stay out of Italy as long as French honour was not hurt and Austria sent troops to crush the rebellions in March 1831. However when Austrian troops occupied Bologna, a Papal territory, France reacted by sending troops to Ancona in the Papal States. It was a symbolic gesture, but it showed that there was little goodwill between France and Austria in this period.

Conclusions

The French Revolution was responsible for the re-alignment of the Great Powers far beyond the effects of the Italian Revolutions. The new French regime strengthened liberalism, alienated the eastern powers and widened the ideological gap between autocracy and constitutional monarchy. The hostility between Austria and France demonstrated in the Italian states was a result of the French Revolution of 1830, not those of the Italian states in 1831.

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

Was the disunity of its leaders the most important factor in the failure of the French Second Republic to establish effective government between 1848 and the end of 1850? 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.

Bourgeois and moderate Republican fear of ‘Red Republicanism’ led by Ledru-Rollin was one factor in the failure of the Second Republic in France and an example of how divided the Republican movement was. Other factors include the recovery of French conservatism and the rise of Louis Napoleon as a symbol of order and stability.

Revolutionary disunity

Radical republicans led by Ledru-Rollin presided over a number of radical reforms which alienated moderate republicans and middle class opinion. These reforms included the introduction of universal manhood suffrage, the attempt to impose a 45% direct tax on income and the establishment of the ‘National Workshops’. The ‘National Workshops’ became a focus of middle class resentment and the government’s attempts to expel unmarried men from them and to close them down caused a violent clash between the radicals and conservatives in the June Days. The defeat of the Parisian insurgents by General Cavaignac represented the defeat of the radical republican movement. Marxist historians argue that the June Days illustrates a clear divide in French society between the bourgeoisie and working classes and that many middle and lower-middle class Parisians were prepared to support the repression of the working classes because they feared for their property and lives. Candidates who argue that Republicanism in France was tainted with horrific memories of the bloody First Republic and was therefore feared by the propertied classes are clearly worthy of the higher levels of attainment.

Recovery of French Conservatism

It can be argued that the Second Republic failed because of the rapid recovery of French Conservatism. Louis-Philippe and the monarchy had been overthrown but the forces of conservatism survived in the form of the Church, Army and aristocracy. The introduction of universal manhood suffrage did not have the desired effect that the Republicans wanted. Radical and socialist candidates only managed to secure approximately 100 out of 880 seats, the rest were monarchist/conservative. In the elections for the President of the Second Republic in December 1848 Ledru-Rollin received only 370,000 votes compared to the 1,448,107 votes of General Cavaignac and the 5,434,226 votes of Louis Napoleon, thus representing a triumph for the forces of conservatism.

Louis Napoleon as a symbol of order and stability

As a member of the Bonaparte dynasty he was able to draw upon the greatness of his uncle's legacy. Napoleon Bonaparte had returned France to greatness and order after the First Republic and it was hoped that his nephew Louis Napoleon could do the same in 1848. Louis Napoleon's election manifesto of December 1848 pledged the reduction of taxation, unemployment, the expansion of private enterprise, freedom of the press, and the protection of the educational rights of the Catholic Church (*Loi Falloux* March 1850), all of which appealed to the conservative elements in French society.

Conclusions

Disunity of the Revolutionaries gave the forces of conservatism the opportunity to overcome their weaknesses which were revealed in the Revolution of 1848 and which allowed the Second Republic to be created. Radical republicanism was feared by moderate republicans and conservatives and therefore the Republican movement was fatally divided. The recovery of conservatism was aided by the loyalty of the army and growing middle class fear of republican violence (June Days), high taxes and attacks on property. This created a natural support base for Louis Napoleon as a symbol of much needed leadership and 'law and order'. By 1850 Louis Napoleon had secured the government of France and was preparing his *coup d'état*.

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

How important was the Congress of Berlin in maintaining peace in the Balkans in the years 1878 to 1890?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The Congress of Berlin seems to have been the keystone in averting conflict in the Balkans, yet its success was largely artificial as problems were merely postponed rather than being solved. It was essentially a fragile settlement as almost every territorial arrangement disappointed one or more states and contained the seeds of future Balkan wars.

Factors stressing the importance of the Congress:

- last of the old-style congresses run by a small group of the great powers
- initial success in defusing the international crisis following the Treaty of San Stefano after the Russo-Turkish War, checking the prospects of Russian dominance in the Balkans by breaking up an enlarged and Russian controlled Bulgaria
- a balanced settlement with gains for most powers –
 - Austria-Hungary: the right to occupy, though not to annex, Bosnia-Herzegovina
 - Britain: acquired Cyprus
 - Russia: gained southern Bessarabia, Kars and Batum
 - France: agreement to pursue Tunis
 - Independence confirmed for Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria
- personal success for Bismarck and Disraeli in achieving ‘peace with honour’.

Limiting factors:

- the Treaty actually satisfied no one, providing only a temporary and limited solution and the source for future unrest in the Balkans, with a lack of Turkish reforms, and increased Slav nationalism and Russian bitterness. It marked a humiliating diplomatic defeat for Russia, breaking the Dreikaiserbund, and Austria's gain of Bosnia-Herzegovina contained the seeds of future disaster, with open revolt as early as 1882
- significantly important was Bismarck's carefully balanced network of alliances, from the first Dreikaiserbund through to the Reinsurance Treaty
- the Bulgarian Crisis beginning in 1885 confirmed the limitations of the Congress of Berlin and the fluid nature of Balkan issues
- Russia was especially galled that her war with Turkey ultimately benefited both Austria-Hungary and Britain. Peace was maintained because Russia turned to the Far East from 1890.

The Treaty has been defended on the grounds that no major war occurred for 36 years, and that it had avoided war between the great powers in a very complex area that has presented baffling problems in the twentieth century. However, the Congress merely put issues 'on ice'. Some historians see the Congress as the beginning of the end for European peace with the lasting deterioration of Russo-German relations and the inception of the long-lasting Dual Alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary.

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

How serious a threat to peace in the Balkans was the Bosnian crisis of 1908–1909?

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.

Apart from the Bulgarian Crisis of 1885, events in the Balkans had been reasonably quiet since the Treaty of Berlin of 1878. The Austro-Russian agreement of 1897 to maintain the status-quo had put the situation in the Balkans ‘on ice’ for a further decade, although the decline in Austro-Serb relations, especially following the change of leadership in Serbia in 1903, looked ominous.

Evidence to support a serious threat:

- the Bosnian Crisis itself was triggered by the Young Turk movement, aiming to overthrow the reactionary regime of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, and to achieve a more liberal and efficient regime and restore Bosnia to full Turkish rule. This certainly had serious implications for some major powers, notably Austria-Hungary – all previous settlements had been based on the assumption that Turkey was weak. Were Turkey to become strong again – and liberal – new problems would arise
- Austria’s unexpected unilateral annexation shocked other major powers and ‘struck at the roots of all good international order’
- the German ultimatum of March 1909 was a scarcely veiled threat of military action causing further diplomatic turmoil and ending chances of co-operation
- the crisis promoted Austria-Hungary’s over-confidence with German support, leaving Russia and Serbia embittered and humiliated – Russia now accelerated military reforms

- the crisis provided the first clear evidence of the two competing alliances which would fight the First World War
- the annexation of Bosnia provided a serious forewarning of the crisis in 1914 in all its essentials.

Evidence which could be set against this:

- initially a bilateral diplomatic agreement seemed to have defused any chances of a serious crisis
- the seriousness of the crisis only escalated because of the confusion caused by Iswolsky's (Russian foreign minister) unorthodox diplomacy as he carried out unofficial negotiations with other powers, especially Austria-Hungary
- the crisis was contained because Russia received no increased support at all from Britain and France (Britain remained wary of Russian encroachment towards the Mediterranean) – the Triple Entente was clearly not secure
- this crisis was no more than a single incident on the general downslide towards war
- candidates are likely to judge the seriousness of this crisis in the light of other Balkan events, e.g. the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, and the final crisis of 1914.

Although relations between Austria-Hungary and Germany on the one hand, and Russia and Serbia on the other hand were now potentially explosive, war had been avoided in 1908 and the crisis had given rise to little in the way of serious military preparations.

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

Examine the extent to which the New Economic Policy, from March 1921 to Lenin's death in January 1924, resolved the difficulties created by War Communism.

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.

War Communism created many difficulties for the Communist regime, although it won the Civil War between 1918 and 1921. War Communism was not a coherent policy but essentially a series of measures introduced by the Communists in 1918 to replace State Capitalism. Under War Communism all aspects of life were brought under state control. Centralisation meant the decline of the semi-autonomy of local soviets. Workers' control in factories gave way to Communist control. Production was geared to war needs. However, war, disruption, shortages of labour, communications difficulties and so on led to a considerable decline in production. Money began to lose its value and barter became common. Some Communists regarded this as ideologically desirable, representing the beginning of socialism and a step on the way to a moneyless Communist society. But the reality was that War Communism was more a pragmatic response to difficulties, not a considered policy. Even more serious possibly was the decline in food supplies. The Government requisitioned grain. Many peasants resisted the requisitioning squads. Production seriously declined and there was violence and eventually famine. Lenin realised the dangers even before rebellions such as the Tambov Revolt and the Kronstadt Rebellion of March 1921, when previously Bolshevik supporters rebelled for free soviets and an end to Communist autocracy. The rebellion was crushed, but at the Tenth Party Congress soon afterwards, Lenin introduced the NEP. The economic basis was that private business was again tolerated, although the "commanding heights of the economy" such as the mines and railways remained nationalised. Peasants were taxed, but were allowed to keep any surplus and sell it on the open market.

Not all difficulties were resolved. Lenin admitted that NEP was a "retreat" to save his regime from a major revolt and ruin, although he also wrote that the compromise with capitalism was

a logical half way house on the way to socialism. Many Communists despised the compromise and the growth of entrepreneurs and speculators, who gained from the new freedoms. Peasant enterprise was also rewarded, with the growth of kulaks or rich peasants. Lenin was too powerful and idolised to be openly opposed, but he did accompany the NEP concessions with a ban on factionalism at the Tenth Party Congress, so that ordinary Party members could no longer debate policy, and remaining opponents of the Bolsheviks were suppressed.

Economically the NEP did appear to be increasingly successful by 1924. Production went up again. However, this may have been as much due to the cessation of civil war and some sense of normality as much as to the NEP. The more rapid growth of agricultural production compared to industry created the “Scissors” crisis of 1923 and a disparity in prices with the threat of imbalance in the economy. There began a vigorous debate about NEP and the path to industrialisation which was to go on long after Lenin’s death and became bound up with the political struggle to succeed Lenin as leader. Other aspects of War Communism remained: the centralisation of power in the Party, the machinery of repression represented by the Cheka.

The regime was certainly more secure under NEP and a sense almost of normality returned. However, although the economic ramifications of War Communism had to a large extent been rectified, the economy had still only barely recovered to the pre-1914 position. The future direction of the USSR had yet to be resolved.

Summary

Problems of War Communism

- lack of overall planning/coherence
- disruption of Civil War
- inflation, shortages etc.
- lack of discipline/leadership in enterprises
- peasant hostility to requisitioning.

Changes brought about by NEP

- improved production with end of requisitioning and semi-return to private enterprise, and end to Civil War
- ideological disagreements about the principles of NEP – Lenin’s concept of “strategic retreat”
- continuation and consolidation of Communist dictatorship
- NEP as short-term remedy before the drive to socialism.

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

Examine the degree to which opposition from the Left hindered Stalin’s rise to power in the years 1922 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.

The struggle for the succession to Lenin was complex. 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. Clearly Stalin was the major winner, since he was effectively in power by 1929. He had several advantages. Even before Lenin’s death in 1924, Stalin was the most powerful man in the USSR. As Party Secretary he controlled the Party machine and was also a member of other important bodies like the Politburo. When Lenin was ill, Stalin controlled access to him. He benefited from the 1921 ban on factionalism which made it difficult for opponents to speak out publicly against him. Lenin was worried about Stalin’s autocratic tendencies and advocated his removal from office in his Testament. Fortunately for Stalin, his colleagues agreed that the Testament should not be published after Lenin’s death, in the interests of Party unity. Stalin also benefited from the fact that his rivals underestimated him, regarding him as less intelligent than themselves, not an intellectual and an outsider, a Georgian. Stalin used these advantages and his own luck to defeat opponents both on the Left and the Right.

Most of Stalin’s efforts before 1928 were devoted to undermining the Left. The Left contained formidable opponents: Trotsky because of his contribution to the Soviet victory in 1917 and in the Civil War, and Zinoviev and Kamenev because they were prominent Old Bolsheviks and held important Party positions. There was also personal hostility between Stalin and the Left, especially Trotsky, going back to the Civil War. Stalin took on the Left in various ways. He promoted the policy of Socialism in One Country, developing Russia’s own strengths, which appeared to make more sense than Trotsky’s more cosmopolitan approach of promoting world revolution. Stalin presented himself as a man of the centre,

apart from the intrigues of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev. Despite the views of opponents like Trotsky, Stalin was an able speaker and manipulator. The Left should have been formidable opponents, but they helped to undermine themselves by infighting and lack of consistency.

Stalin certainly outmanoeuvred his rivals. 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 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 judgement. 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. Stalin basically defeated the Left by allying himself with the Right, notably Bukharin, and then calmly adopted the Left's policy of rapid industrialisation. There is no evidence that Stalin had a clear plan to acquire the leadership. However, he must have realised that the greatest threat to his own power came from the Left, and therefore he tackled the left first and used the more moderate Right to help in the process.

Zinoviev and Kamenev were leading representatives of the Left, but they regarded Trotsky as their chief enemy and allowed themselves to be used to undermine Trotsky. However, by the mid 1920s they were allies with Trotsky in the call for rapid industrialisation, the Left's policy. Their formation of the United Opposition made them vulnerable to the charge of opportunism in 1926, and Stalin used his allies (at the time) on the Right to discredit them, and Zinoviev and Kamenev were forced out of office.

N.B.: Although this question focuses on the Left, candidates *may* explain how Stalin used the Right as temporary allies against the Left before turning on the Right in the late 1920s.

Bukharin was *de facto* the leading representative of the Right. He 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. Although this

policy had a certain logic, it could be portrayed as dangerously unmarxist. Bukharin 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. Having effectively defeated the Left by 1927, Stalin was already in a strong position, and the weaker Right saw the danger to their own position far too late to save themselves. By 1928 the Right was effectively isolated and relatively easy meat for Stalin.

Overall, Stalin proved himself more skilful at exploiting opportunities to promote himself and his ideas, or those which he took from others. He succeeded in outmanoeuvring colleagues on both Left and Right who were regarded as much cleverer than himself but allowed themselves to be picked off and proved no match for Stalin's abilities in the circumstances of 1920s post-Leninist Russia.

Summary

Stalin's strengths in drive for power

- positions of strength in Party organisation
- personal and tactical skills
- weaknesses of Lenin and of opponents.

Tactical errors and personal failings of the Left

- Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev
- Ideological divisions, Socialism in One Country; Permanent Revolution; speed of drive to industrialisation
- Shifting alliances between representatives of the Left.

Possibility (not compulsory) of considering role of the Right

- the role of Bukharin in these events.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative G : Germany, c1925–1938

A: The Weimar Republic c1925–1933

How important was the impact of mass unemployment in the years 1929 to 1932 in bringing about the collapse of the Weimar Republic?

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 economic crisis in Germany 1929–1933, and in particular the rise in unemployment and its effects. They will need to examine the impact of the high unemployment levels with regard to both the response of the governments and the growth of extremism. A balanced answer will also need to look at other influences on the collapse of the Republic in order to assess how important the unemployment issue was.

Relevant material on the impact of mass unemployment may include:

- 6 million (a third of workforce) unemployed by 1932 – effect on business/trade and psychological impact
- unemployed more ready to condemn the whole democratic system and believe the extremists, who promised better times
- governments appeared to be doing little to help – because they were coalitions which could not agree on action – because they feared inflation – because restrictions on the Reichsbank (under Dawes and Young) prevented monetary increases – because it was almost impossible to borrow – because governments did not know what to do
- the break up of Müller’s coalition of SDP, DDP, Centre Party and DVP in 1930 (the last Weimar government to have a majority in the Reichstag), was over the budget deficit created by the demand for unemployment benefits

-
- the appointment of Brüning as Chancellor, and his use (with Hindenburg's permission) of article 48 (emergency decree, undermining the power of the Reichstag and democratic government) was an attempt to get the economic situation and the mounting unemployment under control but public works schemes (1932) were introduced too late
 - "Presidential government" continued under Papen and Schleicher in 1932, 5 major national elections, including 2 dissolutions of the Reichstag in 1932, all working to increase German disillusionment with a failing democratic system
 - the growth of non-democratic groups (especially Nazis but also Communists) in the Reichstag followed loss of confidence in Weimar Propaganda – offering the promise of full employment. Extremists could flourish more easily in the dire circumstances of 1929+
 - Hitler's promotion to the Chancellorship in 1933 through intrigue with Papen against his rival Schleicher was made possible because of the increase in Nazi votes and the desperation of Hindenburg for stable government in the face of mounting unemployment
 - the unemployment crisis helps account for the willingness of Hindenburg and the right to allow Hitler free reign with the Enabling Act and a ban on other political parties. They believed that Hitler could offer the "strong" government needed as an answer to Germany's problems.

For a balanced answer, candidates will also need to examine other factors leading to the collapse of the Weimar Republic:

- the long-term problems of a Republic that was launched in a limited revolution and was beset by difficulties from both right and left from its inception 1918–1919. The "legitimacy" of the Republic was always a fundamental problem and the lack of tradition of democratic government and weak liberalism made its acceptance difficult
 - the reliance on the army stemming from the Ebert-Groener pact and the need to restore order 1918–1919 helped perpetuate the long term authoritarian tradition
 - the preservation of the right wing elites (especially the civil service and judiciary) in government and the election of Hindenburg as president 1925 reinforced anti-democratic tendencies
 - the imperfect constitution which left the President with considerable powers (especially article 48) and involved a system of proportional representation (although it was not until 1933 that Weimar democracy was officially at an end, the concept of democratic government had been gradually undermined since 1930 as the leaders of government – Hindenburg and his Chancellors from Brüning onwards developed a system of authoritarian government in defiance of the Reichstag)
 - the legacy of Versailles, the loss of territory and reparations which created an underlying political hostility to the Republic as well as additional economic burden
 - the existence of alternative anti-parliamentary political groupings such as Nazism and Communism. Note that the Nazi appeal extended far beyond the ranks of the unemployed and included elites, businessmen and farmers (whose plight pre-dated 1929)
-

- Nazi propaganda, the leadership of Hitler and the appeal of Nazism, which, with its nationalist (right wing) message, might have succeeded in destroying parliamentary government even without the growth of unemployment
- Backstairs intrigue and not a popular vote brought Hitler to power. (Had unemployment been the main issue, the KPD should have benefited more).

Answers may conclude that the unemployment of 1929+ was only a catalyst which precipitated political collapse or, alternatively, it may be alleged that without the huge surge in unemployment after 1929, the Republic was heading for stability and survival.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938

B: The Nazi consolidation of power 1930–1938

Examine the extent to which opposition both from the SA and from the German Army hindered Hitler's consolidation of power in the years 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 power of the opposition of the SA and Army to Hitler's government, 1933–1938 and will need to provide a reasoned and supported appraisal of the degree to which this hindered Hitler's plans. To balance the answer candidates may consider other important elements of opposition and/or Hitler's drive which rendered opposition weak/useless.

Material on the threat to Hitler's power posed by the opposition from the SA might include:

- SA demands for a social revolution threatened the unity of the Party
- Hitler's need to retain and extend support from the army, elites and big business was threatened by SA activities and demands
- the ill-discipline of the SA was an embarrassment once Hitler was in power
- Rohm was a rival leader and the SA harboured potential trouble makers.

BUT action against the SA can also be as an unnecessary demonstration of Hitler's power – a way of testing how far he could go.

Material on the threat to Hitler's power posed by the opposition from the Army might include:

- the early reluctance of the army to endorse Hitler's rule – hostility to SA, officer dislike of the "upstart"
- the power of army was derived from its elite status and control of arms. Threat was seen in its hostility to the Hossbach memorandum (1937).

BUT Hitler's assumption of the Presidency (approved by plebiscite 1934) and the oath of allegiance also helped win over the army (as did rearmament policies) and the dismissal of Blomberg and Fritsch reduced the potential of the army to oppose and increased Hitler's own control over the armed forces, 1938.

To balance the answer candidates may refer to other important elements of opposition such as members of other political parties (especially the Communists) and the trade unions, and/or they may examine the weakness of all opposition to the regime. Useful material might include:

- Hitler's strategy after January 1933, abolishing the trade unions, political parties and independent state governments and purging/controlling the civil service, police and media. By destroying much opposition and the *potential* for opposition so rapidly, Hitler had little to fear from either the SA or the army
- the Nazi administrative machine, with local gauleiters, the Gestapo and the terror apparatus, including the use of informants prevented any opposition from threatening Nazi rule
- Nazi control over education, youth movements and control over the workplace with the establishment of the Reich Labour Front made opposition difficult to organise or maintain and as the regime became more established, opposition from the army was bound to become less effective and influential. New recruits had been taught to be loyal Nazis and there were fewer outsiders prepared to listen.

Candidates are likely to conclude that Hitler never entirely succeeded in destroying opposition. The army's loyalty was still in question in 1938 and the potential for political opposition remained. However, the removal of the SA ensured Hitler had the loyalty of the Party and by 1938 demonstrations of dissent were extremely limited.

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

Was the failure by Britain to establish effective power-sharing the most important factor in the achievement of Kenyan independence in 1963?
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.

The focus of this question is on the reasons for the achievement of Kenyan independence and particularly upon the impact in that process of the failure of Britain to set up an acceptable power sharing compromise which might have undermined Kenyan nationalism. Central to this is the issue of the nature of British rule in Kenya.

British rule

- the role of the white settlers and their economic dominance of Kenya could be examined. Their dominance in the legislative process was maintained despite the continued demand for a wider power sharing process. The Kikuyu tribe were the most disaffected group in this
- the British, before about 1958, were determined to retain control of Kenya as part of their economic development programme and there was little inclination to move towards serious power sharing options which would have significantly reduced the direct control of Britain in Kenya. Reference could be made to individual Colonial Secretaries and the attitudes of traditional British Conservatism
- the Lyttleton Constitution did recognise a degree of change was necessary and it was a partial response to the Mau Mau crisis. Details of this apparent shift towards limited multi-racial power sharing could be examined and the flaws could be considered. It was, for example, an imbalanced option which offered only limited access to the native

black Kenyan political leaders. It did little or nothing to alleviate the demand for further change and independence.

Other factors

- **The Role of Mau Mau Terrorism:** the effectiveness of this as a determinant in the decision to move towards independence could be considered. The economic costs to Britain were significant as was the destabilising effect of the terror. However, Mau Mau was always a narrow form of Kenyan nationalism based on the interests of the large Kikuyu tribe. By 1958 its impact had been significantly reduced as many of its members were in detention
- **International issues:** the 1956 Suez crisis had undermined Britain's confidence in its ability to maintain a strong colonial presence. This humiliation illustrated the dependence Britain placed upon its relationship with the USA, an anti-colonial power
- **Economic issues:** Britain's economic priorities were, by the late 1950s, shifting away from colonial exploitation and towards Europe. The attempts to develop a stronger economic relationship with colonial territories for Britain's interests had failed and the direction of trade was no longer pointed towards colonies. In effect retention of Kenya had little economic advantage and this was a crucial factor in the move towards a new political attitude in Britain
- **The role of Macmillan:** this is a significant element of the response because Macmillan acted as the catalyst and facilitator of independence. Reference could be made to the "wind of change" speech and his recognition of the significance of Pan-African nationalism in the context of Kenyan independence. Macmillan's political appointments are also important, e.g. the Colonial Secretary, Iain McCleod. Macmillan's recognition of the relevance of empire to Britain's essential economic and strategic needs was significant in the process leading to Kenyan independence.

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

Examine the extent to which the actions of the French army contributed to the achievement of Algerian independence in 1962.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the reasons for the achievement of Algerian independence with particular reference being made to the role of the French army in that process. Candidates should balance this contribution against the other factors which contributed towards independence.

- **The Army:** reference could be made to the attitudes of the military leadership towards colonialism, particularly in the context of their defeat in Indo-China and the implications of this for Algeria. The army was willing to use a form of state terrorism in response to the nationalist terrorism of the FLN. This created martyrs which only served to swell the ranks of the FLN rather than achieve the objective of deterring terrorism. The army did have considerable success in reducing the effectiveness of the FLN. After the Battle of Algiers there was little structure left to the FLN. From 1958 the army leadership became increasingly right wing and was perceived as a major threat to the political stability of France. Thus the contribution of the army was both positive and negative in terms of its contribution to the achievement of independence.

Other Factors

- **The FLN:** this terrorist organisation developed greater strength in the period 1952–1958. It became an efficient terrorist movement and forced France to commit large numbers of troops to Algeria. There was a wave of international opinion generated by the FLN actions. The issue of Algerian independence was always in focus and this did affect France's international image. Despite its success the FLN became significantly weakened from 1958 after the Battle of Algiers. De Gaulle was careful to limit their role in the independence negotiations

- **De Gaulle:** his contribution to independence was very significant. His early support for the army was gradually replaced by a commitment to Algerian independence. He had the political will and the vision and determination to carry this through. His objective was to establish French power and influence in Europe. Algeria was a distraction from this and it threatened the stability of France, particularly when the army developed an extremist right wing group, the OAS.
- **Other Political attitudes:** before 1958 there had been little attempt, beyond force, to bring Algerian nationalism under control. A succession of political leaders, including Pierre Mendes-France, Jacques Soustelle and Edgar Faure submitted to the growing influence of the army. The army was profoundly anti-nationalist.
- **French Public Opinion:** increasingly the French public began to put pressure on the government. As more French soldiers were killed or injured in Algeria there was a growing sense that France should withdraw. It is difficult to assess the impact and influence of such opinion but it certainly existed.

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**

Assess the extent to which Lenin fulfilled the programme he put forward in his April Theses of 1917.

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.

Lenin's "April Theses" outlined his demands for peace and the transfer of power to the Soviets. The "April Theses" are usually summarised as "Peace, Bread and Land". Candidates might separate out the three elements and assess how far each had been achieved, or they might consider the three together as part of Lenin's wider programme. Either approach is equally valid.

Lenin's programme included:

- the need to overthrow capitalism (now the middle class Provisional Government) and hand power to the proletariat and the peasants
- the need to set up a system whereby goods were produced and distributed by the Soviets, particularly bread
- the need to end involvement in the Great War, regarded as a "predatory imperialist war"
- the need to nationalise all land by confiscating all privately owned estates and handing them over to the local Soviets for reallocation.

Candidates may show understanding that Lenin made these promises in April 1917 immediately after his return from exile. At this time the Bolsheviks were not tightly

organised and disciplined and Lenin's leadership was disputed. Any assessment of Lenin's achievements by the time of his death in January 1924 needs to bear in mind that he did not make his promises on the back of a careful and agreed Bolshevik analysis of the situation.

Between October 1917 and February 1918 the Bolsheviks passed a large number of decrees to transform Russia into a communist society. The first decrees issued by the Congress on the day after the revolution concerned peace and land.

- early in November 1917 Lenin issued a decree for a “just and democratic peace” and Russian soldiers were ordered to stop fighting. Early in 1918 delegates from Russia and Germany met at Brest-Litovsk
- workers took over factories and the railways, the banks were nationalised and in the countryside private ownership of land was forbidden. All estates were confiscated without compensation for the previous owners and the land was shared out among the peasants.

The other main promise was to provide bread but this proved difficult. It raised the question about how to manage the economy. The Bolsheviks wanted to set up a centrally planned economy, but the workers had taken local control of their own factories. The Bolsheviks had to adapt economic policy through several stages: state capitalism, war communism and NEP. As Bolshevik economic policy changed so the production and distribution of goods would be interrupted, often with catastrophic consequences.

The most important reason for the shift from state capitalism to war communism was serious food shortage. In June 1918 a new People's Commission of Supply (Narkomprod) was set up to organise committees of peasants to collect grain and transport it to the cities and towns. The committees were backed up by the Cheka. The start of requisitioning led to famine. The 1921 harvest was 50% of the 1913, and it is estimated some 7.5 million died in the years 1918–1921 from famine.

As Lenin worked to preserve the Bolshevik revolution and deliver his “April Theses”, he faced constant challenges to his authority from within the Bolshevik party, from other political groups in the country and from other nations.

- the Bolsheviks' growing political isolation in Russia led them to take measures against other political parties. When the newly elected Constituent Assembly met in January 1918, the right SRs refused to ratify the decrees on peace and land. The Bolsheviks disbanded the assembly the next day. They became more dependent on the Cheka from this point
- divisions within the party were obvious over the terms of the peace. Lenin, Kamenev and Stalin wanted to agree to the punitive terms imposed by Germany, but Trotsky wanted to reject the terms and fight a war to spark other communist revolutions across Europe. This division forced compromises
- anti-Bolshevik forces formed a coalition called the White Guard which included SRs, Kadets, ex-army generals, Tsarist sympathisers, and was aided by foreign support (GB, France, Czech, some US and Japanese troops). The civil war ended by September 1920
- Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan had declared their independence 1918. After 2 weeks of bitter fighting in March 1921, the Bolsheviks reclaimed and annexed the territory

- another war developed on the Russo-Polish border and continued 1920–1921. It was ended at the Treaty of Riga, March 1921
- uprisings, e.g. the Tambov revolt 1920 and the Kronstadt Rebellion, March 1921 provide further evidence that peace was hard to achieve.

By Lenin's death the Bolshevik party had changed enormously from the party that took control in October 1917. To survive it had grown massively but decision-making had become more and more concentrated in the hands of a few men who relied on terror and banned factional debate. The civil war had forced the pace of change. Candidates may well argue that Lenin's promises before he took power were far removed from the political reality by his death.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

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

B: The establishment of the Weimar Republic

How important are the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in explaining Germany's economic crisis of 1923?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on the economic crisis of 1923 and should offer an explanation of the hyperinflation and economic dislocation experienced in that year which balances the effect of the terms agreed at Versailles against other factors.

Relevant material which links the Treaty of Versailles to the economic crisis may include:

- the loss of economically valuable land, major raw material supplies and population resources which made it harder for the Germans to rebuild their economy (e.g. 48% iron ore, 16% coal, 12% population)
- the political de-stabilisation provoked by a treaty that was considered unjust and which undermined faith in the government and made individuals more likely to panic
- the decision to impose reparations (actually implemented in 1921) and to set them at too high a level – £6,600 million – payments amounting to 2% of Germany's annual output
- the consequent French occupation of the Ruhr in January 1923 which was linked to the treaty which had made provision for the allied powers to occupy the west bank (and a few right bank areas) of the Rhineland to ensure compliance with the Treaty's terms. This action reduced Germany's resources further.

Candidates will also need to examine other causes of inflation:

- the post-war German economy was hit by the drop in demand for war-time products and mass demobilisation (apart from loss of resources at Versailles)
- assuming, ultimate victory, the German government had funded the war from borrowing and printing money rather than by taxation causing inflationary problems
- defeat had left Germany with a huge budget deficit which was exacerbated by the granting of war pensions and extended welfare benefits (in addition to the demand for reparations)
- inflation was exacerbated by further borrowing and the printing of yet more money (rather than increased taxation and reduced spending) to meet internal needs in the aftermath of war
- the government was unable to handle the Ruhr invasion. Further increases in government spending followed as workers were encouraged to adopt “passive resistance” and rely on welfare payments
- by 1923, confidence both within Germany and abroad had collapsed and the government’s economic policy (probably intended, at least initially, to benefit the economy by stimulating mild inflation) was in tatters.

Candidates may argue for the importance of the Treaty of Versailles, and in particular the war guilt clause which justified Germany’s payment of reparations, or they may take the view that the treaty was not primarily to blame for the country’s troubles. In this case, they may put the blame on some other issue such as the occupation of the Ruhr. A sophisticated argument might stress that it was not the Ruhr occupation itself but the government’s response to it which brought about the crisis. Such an argument might also comment that reparations, which were primarily paid out in goods, actually stimulated the German economy and that trying to comply with the Treaty’s terms ensured there were no major unemployment problems in Germany between 1919 and 1923.

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 political instability in Italy in the years 1918 to 1920 was the result of Italian involvement in the First World War.

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 Italy’s post-war situation, balancing the strains caused by the war against other factors which contributed to political instability. To answer this well, candidates will probably need to look back to the situation before 1918 (bearing in mind that 1915 is the start date for the topic), but the main focus of answers should be on the years 1918–1920.

Relevant material which links the First World War to the political instability may include:

- the way Italy entered the war (belatedly and divided politically with Salandra negotiating separately and Giolitti wanting neutrality)
- the way the war was conducted (hesitantly and ungloriously). The defeat at Caporetto (October 1917) was a major defeat and huge psychological blow
- in the face of war the government seemed ineffectual and the army command (e.g. General Cadorna) helped undermine the political system, blaming defeats on the government
- low rations, low pay and lack of modern equipment undermined morale
- the Government response to defeat (and the later victory at Vittorio Veneto in October 1918) – promising major reforms and a brighter post-war world, raised expectations which were subsequently dashed

- the government's attempt to blame defeats on pacifists and socialists, led to greater restrictions on the anti-war labour movement and increased the hostility of the Socialist Party
- peasants who did not understand the war were angered that they were forced to fight while industrial workers (in wartime industries) were allowed to stay at home. Their return led to further demands for land – accompanied by land seizures – which politicians did not know how to handle
- the industrial economy (e.g. metals, engineering, shipbuilding, cars) was boosted but levels of activity could not be maintained with the return of peace. A lack of raw materials, export outlets and internal demand meant lay-offs, falling profits and increased discontent which manifested itself in bitter worker/employer relations. Again these were reflected in the political arguments as to the best way forward
- returning soldiers railed against the injustice of those who had profited from war while their officers found it hard to adjust to post war life. Such were ready to join Fascist squads to fulfil their desire for action
- the middle class self-employed who had lent money to the government during the war became bitter as they saw the value of their savings hit by post-war inflation. They were ready to support politicians who offered to restore stability
- the actual cost of the war – 148 billion lire (twice all government expenditure 1861–1913) with 600,000 war dead, massive debts, a huge increase in the cost of living and the demobilization of over 2 million soldiers added to political problems
- the post-war peace settlement satisfied no one and was deemed a 'mutilated victory' (no Dalmatia, Fiume or colonies in Africa or Middle East)
- the occupation of Fiume by d'Annunzio (September 1919–December 1920) showed how force might be used to try to achieve political aims and emphasised the inadequacy of the government.

Candidates will also need to examine other causes of political instability:

- division had existed even before the war (North/South; rich/poor; industrial/rural; catholic/liberal/socialist/nationalist)
- the Communist revolution in Russia in 1917 had inspired the Socialists
- the flu epidemic hit hard and had killed nearly as many as the war
- the weak Liberal governments in which PSI (Socialists) refused to co-operate with the PPI (Catholic) found it impossible to create a working coalition as they resorted to trasformismo-style politics. The PPI were split between conservatives and reformers and the PSI between revolutionaries and reformers
- a wave of unemployment and Socialist-inspired unrest (the Biennio Rosso – two red years) proved impossible to control and attempted Government reforms (e.g. bread subsidies, 8 hour day, reform of taxation) failed to satisfy the radicals and frightened the elites

- in such circumstances Fascism (pro-elite/nationalism/action/anti-socialist) offered an alternative way forward. It took off in late 1920 in rural areas of north and central Italy as industrialists backed Mussolini to secure protection.

Candidates may argue that the war was the main cause of the instability of 1918–1920 or they may suggest another factor was more important. They could for example, emphasise the existing instability in 1915 (drawing on the views of Clark and Robson), put the blame on post-war leaders, Orlando, Nitti and Giolitti who failed to curb the unrest or on the Socialists or Fascists (although it should be remembered that the Fascists were still relatively weak in 1920 and failed to win a seat in the elections of November 1919). Credit any argument which is supported and balanced.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

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

A: Population change in Britain, 1870–1945

How important was contraception as a cause of population change in Britain between 1870 and 1945?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

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

- the growing use of artificial contraception amongst the middle class after 1918, as advocated by Marie Stopes in “Married Love” proved more effective than the “natural methods” pre-1914
- the increase in working class women after 1920 finding means of natural contraception as well as growing awareness of artificial contraception
- the fear of repeated pregnancies due to very high peri-natal death rates between 1919 and 1939 due to poor diet encouraged contraceptive precautions
- the distribution of condoms during World War One to British soldiers.

Reasons suggesting contraception was not particularly significant:

- the fall in death rates was as marked as the fall in birth rates
- the improvements in public health especially in support for pregnant women, e.g. maternity clinics in Birmingham, after the Great War suggest that more women were able to rear healthy (live) children

Other factors affecting population change might include:

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

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

How important was the impact of war in the decline of the cotton industry in the years 1870 to 1950?

In your answer you need not refer to the periods 1914 to 1918 and 1939 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.

Reasons why the impact of war would be seen as critical:

- the loss of markets such as India were due to the First World War. The increase in duty on imported British cotton during the First World War helped the Government of India to raise the money necessary to fund military expenditure
- Japanese competition was stimulated by Britain's failure to maintain dominance during the First World War leading to the introduction of the Toyoda automatic loom by Japanese manufacturers in 1924. The impact of Japanese competition may be quantified by estimates of approximately two-thirds of lost British sales going to Japanese manufacturers
- the low investment in the 1920s were due to low profits and high interest rates caused by the massive expansion of the British National Debt during the First World War
- renewed competition in the 1950s from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong followed by the Second World War
- the weakness of Sterling after 1945 and especially from after 1947 (related to loss of power in the Second World War)
- Indian independence in 1948 (related to loss of power in the Second World War).

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

- the growth of alternative fabrics such as Rayon in the 1930s which Courtaulds did develop too
- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton
- the refusal of the weavers to adopt the more looms system in 1931
- detail may be provided on the rate at which the £ returned to the Gold Standard in 1925 (most commentators agree it was overvalued by 10%)
- the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936
- only £2.8 million out of the £12 million available under the 1948 Cotton Industry (Re-equipment Subsidy) Act was used by the mill owners
- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany had introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941

A: America, 1919–1929

Examine the extent to which communism was a genuine threat to US society 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.

Candidates may explain the context of fear of communism through the Palmer Raids which were carried out against suspected reds.

Anxiety over Communism had its roots in a variety of causes:

- post war xenophobia
- post war economic depression c1919
- Bolshevik revolution of 1917
- WASP anxiety as the dominant culture which Palmer fed on worked to defend this against the ‘Reds’.

The Palmer raids heightened tensions and made people fearful of communists:

- press exacerbated tension with coverage of supposed communist revolution
- arrival of large numbers of immigrants exacerbated the situation because they were different and possible Communists
- resentment that immigrants worked for less money, were different, lived in ethnic groups in cities such as New York, Chicago etc.

Candidates may mention that no ‘Reds’ were found nor was there a revolution. Also that Palmer was a very ambitious man and may have been looking for a way to develop his career.

Some communist activities continued after the raids.

Was there a genuine threat?

- Presidents of the USA did view Communism as a threat because it was a polar opposite to American capitalism. They were also caught up with tension in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution and following Civil War
- there is very little evidence to suggest a genuine threat
- some Communist activity was associated with the rise of unions
- the boom of the twenties meant trade unions did not thrive. Also people were caught up with the rise of prosperity and could see that the ‘American dream’ worked
- some immigrants were Communists but posed very little threat because they had no political power.

It is therefore very debatable as to how much of a threat really existed.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941

B: The New Deal, 1933–1941

How important were the Alphabet Agencies in bringing about economic recovery in the years 1933 to 1941?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Alphabet agencies were so called after the initials used and this could be explained in the introduction.

- answers are expected to cover a range of what they were and did such as AAA, TVA, CCC and NIRA
- AAA – farming and farmers were encouraged by this to stop growing so much and prices were guaranteed
- TVA – Tennessee Valley Authority showed what could be done in a very backward part of the USA with the development of hydro-electric power
- CCC – job creation schemes were developed for the unemployed
- NIRA – help for industry
- each played a part in the initial recovery but the Supreme Court curtailed some of their activities when declaring them unconstitutional so they had a limited life and influence
- some candidates may wish to argue that the first 100 days of the banking crisis were more important, when confidence was restored to the banking industry because the US could not operate without a sound currency

- some candidates may wish to argue that Roosevelt played a decisive role in the recovery process through his management style and fireside chats and in the confidence he was able to instil
- the Second New Deal also played an important part in aiding recovery because federal relief was significantly expanded and the legislation struck down by the Supreme Court was replaced
- the outbreak of War in Europe and the recovery of European economics helped to stimulate industry through increased demand and so finished the recovery phase.

Therefore it could be argued that the alphabet agencies were only part of the solution. Also, some alphabet measures were longer lasting than others, e.g. TVA, but on the other hand this was only a very specific area of the US.

HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1087

A: The Introduction of Norman Military Feudalism, 1066–1087

How important was the part played by knights in the system of military feudalism in the years 1066 to 1087?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Norman rule was initially based on force and the enfeoffments/subinfeudations that followed Hastings were designed to support this. The Normans were dependent on knight service to:

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

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

- Maintain the conquest

To answer the king's military requirements and to protect the new order against rebellion it was estimated that William required 4000-7000 knights – an obligation he was unable to meet personally. Quotas were issued c1072 (Evesham Abbey).

They were fighting men armed, trained and equipped to be part of a mounted army on a continental pattern.

Knights were at first part of a military household (familia). These were usually young and unmarried with the advantage of swift movement. These were first seen as part of monastic quotas (Westminster Abbey 1086).

As immediate danger receded knights were enfeoffed but this was less evident in unstable regions (the north) where families remained the pattern for longer.

The King respected the privacy of the honours and the number enfeoffed depended on the individual barons as numbers conferred prestige.

- Castle guard

The regular work of the knight was to accompany his lord, campaign for at least 2 months at his own expense and give 40 days a year to training and castle guard.

The importance of castles is relevant here as emphasis on castle guard shows (Windsor).

Some served permanently as castle garrisons and were eventually given estates nearby (Montacute).

- Limitations

Knights' fiefs later crippled the economic position of a barony.

Barons came to rely on knights mainly for financial benefits (aids, relief).

Cavalry were seldom deployed in large numbers for fear of destruction.

(Hastings was an exception.)

William could also rely on other troops (the Fyrd).

The growing centrality of siege warfare and the importance of castles meant that a large cavalry force was relatively unimportant (siege of Norwich castle).

Limitations on service made them less effective and as they formed only part of the army. The need to fund a mercenary army – most of who served as infantry – led to demands becoming more financial than military (scutage, Domesday book).

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 Norman Conquest in bringing about monastic change in England in the years 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 would be required pre-1066. Answers should focus on the degree of change and/or continuity afforded by the conquest and the influence of monastic reform in Europe generally at this time. At the highest levels answers will show understanding of the extent of change and continuity in English monasticism across the whole period. The range of relevant factors will include Lanfranc's reforms, effects of patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, the effects of the introduction of new Orders, spoliation and the imposition of feudal service as well as racial tensions and culture clash. A range of well-chosen factual examples should support answers.

- in the first generation after the conquest, changes occurred that affected both the discipline of the monasteries (Lanfranc's reforms) and their personnel (Normanisation). Some abbeys also lost lands transferred to Norman houses (Le Bec) or to knights in order to meet the impositions of feudal service (Abingdon). Strains were caused by the maintenance of military households (Wulfstan of Worcester) and there were violent clashes as a result of the imposition of new practices (Glastonbury)
- the second generation viewed themselves more as 'Anglo-Norman' and monasteries benefited from an increase in both royal and aristocratic patronage. Refoundations were made after the harrying of the North (Jarrow, Monkwearmouth, Whitby) that continued the monastic traditions in this area. The introduction of new Orders (Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinian canons) led to an upsurge in those joining orders, as

well as to the economy – a particular benefit of the Cistercian foundations in Yorkshire. There were changes in the layout and design of monastic churches, which now followed the Decreta of Lanfranc (Rochester, Evesham, Durham) rather than the Regularies Concordia (Winchester)

- Latin replaced the vernacular but annals were maintained through later writers (Orderic Vitalis, Eadmer, Simeon of Durham). By preserving the past, a degree of continuity was maintained. There was continuity of English saints (Swithun, Cuthbert, Edmund, Werburgh) and hagiographers rewrote the lives of such saints for new audiences (Augustine, Edith of Wilton, Wulfhilde of Barking)
- English monasticism also experienced cultural interchange on a wider scale than previously. The effect of an Italian archbishop from Normandy, Norman abbots – and monks – in the wake of the conquest and the impact of Bernard of Clairvaux can be balanced against the role of Englishman Stephen Harding in the constitution of Clairvaux (Carta Caritatis) and Bernard’s secretary William, returning to plant Cistercian monasticism in the North
- in the first generation after the conquest, there was spoliation of English houses, removal of native ecclesiastical leaders and their replacement by Normans, racial tensions and culture clash, the introduction of new practices, rebuilding, the imposition of *servitia* and the endowment of Norman monasteries with English lands. But English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of English and Norman culture, the introduction of new Orders and being drawn into the mainstream of European reform. Nevertheless English saints still protected their churches, attracted pilgrims and provided mausolea.

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

Examine the extent to which the Cornish Rebellion of 1497 was a threat to the authority of Henry VII.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the security of Henry VII's position in the 1490s and specifically on the Cornish Rebellion of 1497. Answers will be expected to explain a range of factors that caused concern for Henry; with some differentiation of the "extent" of his concerns. The assumption that the Cornish Rebellion was a serious threat can, of course, be challenged. Many answers may argue that Henry was almost totally in control, especially by this stage of the reign, and that he was not worried to any great degree. On the other hand, there were many dangerous aspects of the rebellion, linking together regional discontent, Ireland, Perkin Warbeck and outside interference from foreign interests.

Answers should be based on a balanced assessment of a range of factors relating to the threat faced by Henry VII in 1497. Many adequate answers will assemble their arguments rather as a list, supported by suitable evidence relating to the main events but lacking in assessment. Higher quality answers will show more evaluation and differentiation, selecting perhaps fewer factors and making a discriminating choice of those which were more dangerous for Henry and those of lesser significance. There is a wide range of possibilities:

- the whole context of the reign made Henry seem vulnerable; he was never free of anxieties about consolidating his position
- the Cornish Rebellion involved a range of classes and social/economic issues and Henry badly needed to feel he had popular support

- the Cornish problem arose at a time when Henry's relations with Scotland were very difficult – there was a danger of a kind of war on two fronts'
- the rebel army reached Blackheath and at least on the surface seemed to threaten London (and to spread to other regions than Cornwall)
- Perkin Warbeck's involvement linked Yorkist pretenders to a rebel army and seemed to combine two dangerous threats
- Warbeck had support from both Ireland and Scotland
- should Henry fail to snuff out quickly the threat from Warbeck and the Cornish rebels, it was almost inevitable foreign powers would intervene
- Henry crushed the rebellion ruthlessly and soon had Warbeck executed – this showed how rattled he had been by the revolt (unlike the way he treated Simnel much more leniently in 1487).

The above list is not prescriptive. Answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive and may make effective use of selected factors. Equally, the above list implies strongly that the rebellion was a significant threat – many answers will take a different view, arguing that it was easily dealt with.

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

With what success did Wolsey pursue the ambitions of Henry VIII in foreign 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.

The focus of this question is on the degree of success achieved by England's foreign policies during the 'Age of Wolsey' – and on the relative importance of the contributions of Wolsey and the King himself (though this issue is secondary. Answers should not be dominated by the 'master or servant?' debate). The question covers a lengthy timescale, from 1513 to 1529 – one feature of better answers may be differentiation of change over time, perhaps discriminating between successes earlier in the reign and the unravelling of Wolsey's policies and reputation in the late 1520s, especially his perceived failures in the negotiations for the royal divorce, or between occasions when Henry was backing Wolsey as opposed to other occasions when he undermined him.

Rigidly descriptive material on Wolsey's foreign policies will not be productive. Better answers will define precisely what Henry's hopes and "ambitions" really were, and how far Wolsey succeeded in bringing them to fulfilment. There is much scope here for a selective approach, balancing specific examples of successes and failures in policymaking; or separating out those "ambitions" that were realistic and achievable from those that were not.

With so many issues that could be included over this period, answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive. The following list of foreign policy issues is indicative and not prescriptive.

Henry's ambitions from the beginning:

- maximising his personal glory and image
- seeing England become accepted as a significant power in Europe
- regaining England's lost lands in France.

Henry's aims on specific issues:

- success in relations with Scotland
- success in relations with the Papacy, especially concerning the divorce

Wolseys' foreign policies:

- relations with France following the 1514 Treaty of St. Germain and the accession of Francis I and the French victory at Marignano
- alliance with Spain and the Emperor to oppose France
- setbacks in 1516 losing Spanish support after the Treaty of Noyon, and in 1517, losing the alliance with the Empire after the Treaty of Cambrai
- successes in 1518–1521, with the 'universal peace' at the Treaty of London and the recovery of Tournai and French pensions for Henry and Wolsey, followed by the prestige showpiece of the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520 and then the Calais conference of 1521
- setbacks in 1522–1523 with the unsuccessful war against France
- failure to exploit the opportunities provided by the defeat of France at Pavia in 1525 (and problems caused by the Amicable Grant)
- attempts to construct the League of Cognac and to act as the 'arbiter of Europe', 1525–1527
- from 1527–1529, the increasing domination of England's foreign policy by Henry's diplomatic campaign for acceptance of the royal divorce

As usual, the most effective answers will be those presenting a direct and balanced assessment, supported by precisely selected evidence.

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**

How important was foreign policy as a factor in the increased threat which Puritanism posed to James I after 1618?

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 how foreign policy issues affected relations between James I and his puritan subjects and should, in particular, consider where Puritan concerns posed a threat to the Crown. Candidates will probably need to draw on some earlier material in order to examine what might be meant by the Puritan ‘threat’, and the extent to which relations were good/stable before 1618. However, the main focus of answers should be firmly on the post-1618 period. Foreign policy issues will need to be balanced against other factors which made Puritanism a greater threat in these years.

Relevant material on the effect of foreign policy would include:

- the impact of the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. When the Bohemian Protestants rose against the Catholic King, James hoped to prevent war while limiting Spanish interference. However, he was reluctant to wage war in support of his son-in-law, the Elector Palatine who accepted the offer of the crown of Bohemia, so angering Puritans who felt the Spanish/Catholic threat should be countered at all costs. Frederick’s defeat at White Mountain (1620) and the Spanish conquest of the Eastern Palatinate soured relations further, particularly since James actively pursued a Spanish marriage for his son, Charles – hoping thereby to exert some pressure on Spain – but giving the appearance of having pro-Catholic sympathies. So, although James’s foreign policy was based on his hatred of war, religious conflict and financial and strategic considerations, the Puritans perceived it as pro-Catholic and “threatened” him by discussing matters which he deemed his royal prerogative.

- James's promise of Catholic toleration (to ease the marriage negotiations) exacerbated the divide. The Puritans called for war against Spain as Gondomar tried to negotiate a marriage deal. The threat reached a head in the 1621 Parliament's protest in favour of privilege. The puritan threat meant that James could not get the money he needed from Parliament. When Prince Charles and Buckingham travelled incognito to Madrid in 1623 and tried to win concessions over the Palatinate in return for suspension of the penal laws against Catholics, a promise of pardon to recusants, and a guarantee that the children of a marriage would be brought up as Catholics, the Puritans reacted with great alarm. They believed the Church was in danger from the advance of Catholic powers intent on reversing the Reformation and believed it their duty to challenge the King
- although James abandoned the Spanish marriage in favour of a French one (which gave him the needed help for the Palatinate), the Puritans were no happier. The marriage terms included full toleration for Catholics in England and freedom of worship for the Queen (Henrietta Maria). Although the marriage took place shortly after his death, James's reign ended in disharmony with the Puritans and he failed to get the subsidies he wanted in the 1624 Parliament.

Overall, the Puritan attempt to influence foreign policy may be seen as having serious political repercussions for the authority of the crown. The Puritans' challenge to matters of Royal Prerogative and their attempt to "hold him to ransom" by refusing subsidies must also be seen as threatening.

Other relevant factors which added to the threat from Puritanism after 1618 would include:

- the Book of Sports, 1618 which suggested an apparently casual attitude to Sunday observance. Some Puritans refused to read this from their pulpits and were dismissed
- the growth of Arminianism and James's support for Arminian bishops which angered the anti-Catholic Puritans. The Puritans feared its influence on the King and more particularly on his son and heir Charles, and his adviser, Buckingham, both of whose pronouncements and actions must bear some responsibility for the breakdown in relations between Crown and Puritans. Although Abbot remained Archbishop of Canterbury, he fell out of favour and more influential was William Laud, Bishop of Bath and Wells and an Arminian. From 1624, Laud was Buckingham's chaplain. This upset the peaceful balance that had existed since 1604
- the Puritan strength in the 1621 and 1624 parliaments. In the challenges mounted in the parliaments of James's later years, the Puritan perspective became difficult to distinguish from the overall thrust of Protestantism and general fears of Catholicism through the royal marriage. The Puritan view appeared more threatening as it seemed to be shared by a broader sweep of society. The Commons called for an enforcement of Penal Laws against Catholics and angered James by discussing prerogative matters
- James's behaviour was contradictory. He supported the Calvinist view at the Synod of Dort (1619), but promoted Arminians – perhaps to maintain balance within the Church, or because he needed their support over foreign policy. He also found aspects of their theology appealing and they supported Royal authority. This sharpened Puritan awareness and made them more ready to counter any move they feared would undermine the strength of Protestantism
- James issued the 1622 Direction to preachers and 1625 Sabbath Act to try to counter the growing Puritan threat. This suggests desperation – resorting to compulsion and

indicates the increased pressure he was under. James badly overestimated the Puritan challenges to his authority and this helped turn Puritanism into a broad political protest movement

- Montague's book (*A New Gag for an Old Goose*) which challenged several crucial points of puritan theology had been passed by James's censors and became the focus of Puritan attacks on Arminianism in the 1624 parliament.

In conclusion candidates may pick on one factor to explain the increasing breakdown in relations between Crown and Puritans, or may provide judgement based on the interlinking of a number of relevant factors. Many will emphasise the essentially limited nature of the threat posed by the Puritans, while acknowledging that these later years saw more tense moments than the earlier part of the reign. The apparent threat posed by the Puritans can be countered by the inherently moderate and conservative nature of most English Puritans. Candidates may note that there was no Puritan rising and whatever words were exchanged, James remained in control. Nevertheless it is unlikely that foreign policy issues can be entirely dismissed as the cause of an increasing threat from 1618

HISTORY

UNIT 3 COURSE ESSAYS HS03

Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640

B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603–1641

How effective was James VI and I as ruler of 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.

Candidates should outline what James's objectives for his rule in Scotland were, how they were implemented and then make assessment based on how far they can be regarded as a 'success'. Effectiveness should also be examined in relation to the problem James had to deal with as an absentee King. Contrast can be made with Charles as ruler.

In assessing James's effectiveness candidates may consider:

- maintaining control
- gradualist approach to union
- extension of royal authority through religious policy

Detail will come from:

- use of Scottish Privy Council
- postal service
- role of Dunbar
- management of Scottish Parliament
- policy towards clans and aristocracy

General argument that he was a success may be balanced by the tension increasingly created by his religious policy from 1617.

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

Examine the extent to which the 1715 Jacobite Rebellion threatened the British government.

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.

There is some evidence to suggest that the '15 Rebellion constituted a serious threat. 1714 had seen the accession of a 'foreign' and unpopular Hanoverian dynasty; leading Tory politicians like Bolingbroke were actively negotiating with Jacobite interests; the Earl of Mar, Jacobite commander at the beginning of the crisis, was supported by 18 Scottish lords and 5000 men, compared to only 1500 government troops in Scotland at that time.

However, Mar's indecisiveness, particularly after the inconclusive battle of Sherrifmuir, resulted in lost opportunities to take the initiative. Other Jacobite commanders, such as Forster and Derwentwater, can be similarly criticised. Bolingbroke lost his nerve, his main contribution being to associate the Tories with treason for many years to come. However, there was no real evidence of Jacobite support outside Scotland and parts of Northern England. The death of Louis XIV and the onset of the Regency in France limited the prospect of French support. Strong links were also beginning to emerge between the Whig government and the Hanoverian regime; by 1715 both saw the support of the other as a key factor in the retention of power, and both were therefore firmly opposed to increased Jacobite influence.

The role played by the Old Pretender was less than impressive; although firmly convinced of his right to the English throne, he lacked both the skill and determination to achieve this objective. His stubborn refusal to renounce Catholicism not only destroyed any chance he might have had of succeeding Queen Anne directly in 1714, but also increased the determination of many to support the Hanoverian cause.

Points suggesting a major threat:

- unpopular Hanoverian dynasty
- Tory collaboration with Jacobites (e.g. Bolingbroke)
- Jacobite military superiority in Scotland.

Points suggesting only a limited threat:

- Mar's indecision
- lack of Jacobite support in England
- shift in support by incoming Regency government in France
- firm link between Whig government and Hanoverian dynasty, together with Tory decline
- unimpressive role of Old Pretender.

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

How important was the contribution of Robert Clive to the expansion of British control in India in the years 1757 to 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 should concentrate on the period from 1757, but reference to earlier aspects of Clive's career should not be penalised. He had risen from a junior clerk in the East India Company to become Governor of Pondicherry on the outbreak of the Seven Years' War. His main objective during the war was to destroy French influence, making alliances with native rulers as appropriate.

News of the 'Black Hole of Calcutta' in 1756 gave Clive the excuse to head for Bengal, and enter into conflict with the Nawab, Siraj-ud-daulah. The latter, together with some French support, was defeated at Plassey (June 1757). This began a period of substantial British political and military involvement in India, with the new Nawab, Mir Jafar, expecting continued British military support, and granting the company the right to collect taxes in certain parts of Bengal in return. Clive had to suppress rebellions against Mir Jafar, and in practice became the real ruler of India. Clive turned his attention firmly on the French, destroying their base at Chandernagore in Bengal (1758), and driving them out of the Sarkars (1759). Further successes included defending Mir Jafar against the Nawab of Oudh and routing a Dutch attack in Bengal (both 1759). Clive returned to Britain in 1760, confident that French influence in India was effectively over, and that full British control of Bengal was imminent. He returned again to India in 1765 due to the continuing instability. As Governor-General, he established the concept of 'dual government' in Bengal, a system which soon led to corruption amongst native officials. A nervous breakdown resulted in Clive's return to Britain in 1767.

Candidates may identify some or all of the following ways in which Clive contributed to the establishment and development of British influence in India:

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

For a balanced answer candidates should also identify other factors which contributed to the extension of British influence in India at this time (weaknesses of/rivalries between various native princes, preoccupation of France with European issues) before reaching judgement on the importance of Clive’s role.

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 system of poor relief introduced in 1834 succeeded in fulfilling the objectives of the Whig government.

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 identify what the objectives of the Whig government were and assess the new system in relation to these. The following points may be included in support of the proposition that the 1834 Poor Law amendment Act did meet the Whig objectives:

- the new Poor Law 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
- the harsh rules regarding the separation of families fulfilled the desire to reduce the numbers of poor and deter them from seeking relief
- the abolition of outdoor relief was an important step towards uniformity of relief, at least in theory, which was intended to ensure that the poor did not migrate towards parishes with more generous relief committees. This fitted the Whigs' Benthamite/Utilitarian principles.

It could be argued that individuals, such as Chadwick or Malthus, or other factors were more influential:

- Chadwick's goal was a centralised system under the oversight of a central commission although this partly fitted the Whigs' objective of improving administration, in practice it became a narrow and rigid means of control
- the New Poor Law was heavily influenced by Malthusian concerns regarding population growth who felt the old poor law encouraged large families. Some Whigs

had accepted these arguments but their objective was not fulfilled. The population continued to grow

- the Swing Riots (1831) were a cause of reform and the Whigs hoped thereby to reduce unease, but in practice the agitation against the New Poor Law was equally disturbing
- Whig hopes of significantly reduced expenditure in the Poor Law were not entirely fulfilled. The costs of building workhouses and quelling unrest meant there was no immediate drop in costs.

If the Whigs believed their measure would reduce the incidence of poverty, they were mistaken. The greater stability and improvement in living standards which developed from the 1840s was far less to do with the Whigs' Act than with the greater economic diversity engendered by the coming of the railways. It is likely that most candidates will conclude that the 1834 Act, at best, met only a limited number of the Whigs' objectives.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 COURSE ESSAYS HS03

Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841

B: Religion and Politics in England and Ireland c1820–c1841

Why was the issue of Catholic Emancipation so important in the 1820s?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the issue of Catholic Emancipation – the right of Catholics to sit as MPs at Westminster. Roman Catholics had traditionally been denied equal political rights with members of the Church of England because of fears that Catholics placed loyalty to the Pope above their loyalty to the British Crown. However, by the 1820s, there were a number of reasons why Catholic Emancipation was on the political agenda, and granted in 1829:

It was important for religious reasons:

- The rapid growth in Catholicism in the 1820s seemingly posed a threat to the established Anglican Church. Reformers, such as Pusey, within the Church of England were anxious to strengthen the Anglican Church and feared the Catholic challenge.

It was important for political reasons:

- the Tory Party was divided on the issue and many devout Anglicans were highly suspicious of those inclined to favour repeal. Pro-emancipation Tories such as Canning were known as “liberal Tories”
- Peel’s position was threatened as he became convinced of the need for Emancipation in contradiction of his past promises
- The granting of Emancipation might also be seen as a threat to the monarch as Head of the Anglican Church.

It was important for social reasons:

- the landed aristocracy also owned substantial estates in Ireland where their influence would be undermined.

It was important for Ireland:

- the situation in Ireland was volatile and the activities of O’Connell demanded some response. The issue came to a head in 1829 when O’Connell won a seat in a by-election and Wellington’s government was forced to grant emancipation out of fear of civil war in Ireland. This was seen as betrayal by the Ultra Tories and was contributory to the Party’s disintegration and the emergence of parliamentary reform as a major issue in the 1830s.

The best answers will consider a range of reasons for the importance of this issue and offer some assessment (balance) of their relative significance.

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

Examine the extent to which the Liberal governments of 1906 to 1915 were more concerned with achieving national efficiency than alleviating poverty.

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 should be on both the drive for greater national efficiency and the alleviation of poverty by the Liberal governments during these years. Responses can justify one rather than the other, but essentially the two objectives were inter-linked and tackled together by legislation. The most significant means of achieving greater national efficiency came from welfare reforms designed to alleviate the extent and consequences of poverty. New Liberalism in particular had both national efficiency and welfare as objectives in the social and industrial reforms which were introduced. This should be illustrated in a clear way.

The drive to national efficiency was derived not only by New Liberalism's theoretical collectivist (state action) approach, but also by practical considerations in the early years of the 20th century. These included:

- evidence of poor initial military performance in the Boer War
- revelations about the physical (and educational) condition of recruits
- *Report of Physical Deterioration* of 1904
- deteriorating relations with Germany before 1914
- requirements of physically fitter men for the navy, and particularly for recruits for both the standing and potentially required volunteer armies.

During the First World War, especially from the spring of 1915, the drive for national efficiency led to:

- military training on a much wider scale
- new licensing laws
- dilution to increase efficiency in industrial output
- new and increased welfare measures, e.g. for female munitions workers.

On the other hand New Liberalism, of which Lloyd George and Churchill were important practitioners, had as a major objective the alleviation of poverty. Their motivation was derived by factors such as:

- the reports on the extent of poverty by Charles Booth (London) and Seebohm Rowntree (York)
- humane and religious concern about poverty itself
- political rivalry from the new Labour Representation Committee/Labour Party.

Before 1914 some measures were aimed principally at alleviating (and/or reducing) poverty:

- Workmen's Compensation Act
- Old Age Pensions
- National Insurance.

Other measures for children more clearly combined welfare and national efficiency reforms:

- school meals
- school medical inspections
- "Children's Charter" including health and care of children, juvenile courts and borstals, ban on sale of tobacco to those under 16.

Other improvements also were, in varying degrees, about national (economic) efficiency as well as welfare:

- improved conditions of work for merchant seamen, miners, shop workers and those in the sweated trades (e.g. tailoring, lace-spinning, and box making)
- introduction of Labour Exchanges, but with the emphasis on national efficiency in bringing employers and particularly potential employees together effectively
- increases in taxation of the wealthy in Lloyd George's 1909 'People's Budget' which were aimed at providing revenue to improve national efficiency and alleviate poverty through a fairer system of taxes to pay for welfare reforms, especially pensions.

Some of the above factors and evidence should be balanced to present coherent arguments about the relative merits of concern of the Liberal governments with regard to the twin objectives of greater national efficiency and the alleviation of poverty. Better answers may question the motives of the Liberal governments, e.g. the extent to which social reforms derived from the potential political threat of the emerging Labour Party as against ideological, humanitarian, economic or military considerations. They may also assess the effectiveness of the reforms in relation to either achieving improved national efficiency or alleviation of poverty, e.g. limited eligibility for receipt of the pension, National Insurance benefits hardly implemented until 1913 and failure to deal with slum housing.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 COURSE ESSAYS HS03

Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921

B: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland c1895–1921

Explain why, in the years 1912 to 1914, the Ulster Unionists were more successful in their aim of preventing Home Rule for Ireland than the Nationalists were in their aim of achieving it.

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 should be on the reasons for both Ulster Unionists' success and the nationalists' failure during 1912–1914. There may be introductory material on the religious, political (and economic) divisions in Ireland, and the failure of the First and Second Home Rule Bills, but this should be brief.

There should be explanation of the reasons for the determined resistance of Protestant Unionists. These included:

- the sense of being British, not Irish (in direct contrast to the nationalist feeling of being Irish, not British)
- the sense of unionism, which had intensified since the late nineteenth century particularly after Gladstone's two attempts to introduce Home Rule, to maintain the union with Britain
- loyalty to the monarchy and British institutions
- perceived threats to political and especially religious freedoms under Catholic hegemony ('Rome Rule')
- fear of loss of Protestant supremacy in Ireland
- threats to the economic and land ownership status quo

Answers should indicate the main ways in which Home Rule was resisted and the significance of major developments. These can include:

- the leadership of Carson and Craig
- emergence of stronger opposition in Ulster itself as the Third Home Rule Bill progressed under the new constitutional arrangements during 1912–1914
- the Solemn League and Covenant (determination to resist by force)
- formation and arming of the Ulster Volunteers
- support from Bonar Law and the Conservative Opposition in the Commons as well as the Lords
- failure of Asquith's 'Six Years Exclusion' proposal (and other attempts at compromise)
- the Curragh Mutiny
- the Larne gun running
- the outbreak of the First World War which led to the postponement of the implementation of Home Rule for the whole of Ireland for the duration.

The nationalists in the end (autumn 1914) failed to achieve Home Rule despite the fact that, following the two General Elections of 1910, the Liberal government was dependent on Irish Nationalist support for a Commons majority over the Conservative/Unionist Opposition. The price extracted by Redmond was a Home Rule Bill, once the powers of the Lords had been reduced to delaying relevant legislation under the 1911 Parliament Act. Home Rule was eventually passed in 1914, but not implemented. The nationalists 'failed' for several reasons, which included:

- dependence on the Liberal government which was unable to implement Home Rule before autumn 1914 – under the Parliament Act the Third Home Rule Bill took two years to overcome opposition in the Lords
- attempts by the government to compromise with the Conservatives and Ulster Unionists
- sympathy of the British Army (especially officers) in Ireland with the Unionist cause (seen clearly in the Curragh 'Mutiny')
- relatively weak leadership of the Irish Nationalists at Westminster and in Ireland by John Redmond
- relative weakness of the Irish Volunteers compared with the Ulster Volunteers
- interference with the gunrunning at Howth by the British authorities (whereas that at Larne by the Unionists went unhindered)
- outbreak of the First World War in August 1914 meaning postponement of implementation of Home Rule

- government seizure of the ‘opportunity’ offered by the outbreak of the First World War to postpone Home Rule in a situation where civil war in Ireland (and possibly in Britain) looked very likely in summer 1914.

The situation of complete confrontation had come about principally because of the Unionists’ refusal to contemplate Home Rule of any kind. Support by the Conservatives (and Bonar Law in particular with his possibly unconstitutional statements) was also highly significant. In the end in 1914, it was not ultimately Unionist opposition which prevented implementation of Home Rule, but postponement due to the outbreak of the First World War. However, answers should be balanced in explaining the reasons for Unionist success from 1912–1914 with those for nationalist failure.

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 had established an infrastructure suitable for industrial growth by 1750.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Focus of the Question

The question asks candidates to examine the extent to which Britain had developed the necessary infrastructure to enable the development of an industrial economy by 1750. Candidates should focus mainly on banking and the transport network, although it is legitimate for a discussion of markets, labour force and regional specialisation to occur. The better answers will make a clear distinction between the features of an industrial and agrarian economy.

Elements which suggest that Britain had developed the necessary infrastructure:

- there is evidence of an increase in the institutionalising of capital accumulation and investment. The London and country banks were critical in facilitating short term loans and discounting bills of exchange for merchants. For industrial development to take place there had to be an increase in money in circulation. The amount increased from £10 to £15 million between 1688 and 1750 and bank notes increased from £2 to £5 million
- legislation was passed on six occasions to improve the state of roads for wagons and the transport of heavy goods and from 1706 a number of private turnpike acts were passed to improve the quality of roads, principally around London
- there is evidence of a development of regional specialisation in Britain by 1750. This can be identified through the growth of proto-industrial organisation. The markets for

textiles, hosiery, lace and small metal wares – tin toys, buttons, and small arms were extra regional. Merchants organised the sale of goods both nationally and to export markets overseas. Although a large element of production was carried out by small independent producers there is evidence of putting out and the development of a workforce with specialised skills.

Elements which suggest that Britain had not developed the necessary infrastructure by 1750:

- the main source of finance for investment and industry came from agriculture and was commonly used by the land owner, either to diversify or to finance projects which would support their existing sources of wealth. Much investment was undertaken by local attorneys acting as intermediaries for individuals who wished to lend money to secure an annuity
- the road network was extremely limited. Only roads around London and the major centres of commerce were able to sustain the bulk transport of goods. The main phase of turnpike construction came between 1750 and 1800 when 1,600 trusts were formed. Water transport was used for long distance haulage for bulky goods as it had been since the middle ages
- production was dominated by agriculture and the majority of production was bought and sold in local markets with the exception of the London market. The majority of the population was employed in agriculture. Out-put per person was insufficient to sustain a labour force not engaged in the production of food. Those involved in proto-industrial production were based in the countryside and were required to work in the fields at key pressure points. Although enclosure by Act of Parliament began to increase from 1740 there was limited evidence of the widespread regional specialisation witnessed after 1750.

Overall

Whilst Britain was developing in terms of wealth creation and laying the foundations of the structures need from an industrial economy these were not well developed by 1750. Development can be seen in proto-industry and in the growth of extra-regional markets especially in overseas export markets but neither the skill base, transport system nor banking system were those of an industrial economy.

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 extent to which historians have disagreed about the importance of ‘real wages’ in the standard of living of the working classes in the years 1780 to 1830.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Focus of the Question

This question focuses on the central theme of the standard of living debate that is whether real wages increased or fell during the period 1780 to 1830. Candidates would be expected to be familiar with both the argument of the optimists and the pessimists and the data on which they base their arguments. However the key term ‘importance of’ is deliberately chosen to allow candidates to address the more recent arguments, which stress the importance of women’s black economy contributions and the qualitative material.

The extent to which real wages were important

- real wages have been used by both optimists and pessimists to argue either for an improvement in the standard of living during the period of industrialisation, or for a deterioration. The key data on which arguments are based relate to wages and consumption. Both optimists and pessimists use wage data from skilled workers, those most in demand in the industrial period, farm labourers and some day-wage data. This is then compared with price of foodstuffs from markets and from large-scale purchasers such as the Royal Household. It is argued by both groups that spending power and therefore consumption is the main determinant of the standard of living; whether a male breadwinner has sufficient income to support his family. The national significance in terms of economic growth cannot be underestimated as in 1800 wages accounted for about 45% of the national income

- both optimist and pessimist historians place great emphasis on hard data and in particular the indices, such as Phelps Brown Hopkins and only by this method can change be demonstrated over time and correlated against other factors such as mortality and health. Many of the disputes between those who argue for an improvement, and those who see deterioration, have been concerned which dates are chosen as the starting and finishing points of the assessment.

The extent to which real wages are not important

- most of the data for wages is fragmentary and the prices for goods are wholesale. It is not possible to use this to estimate consumption particularly when employment itself was subject to the effects of the weather, market down turns and the seasonal nature of demand
- the wage data is dominated by that of male employment and there is little attempt to assess the contribution of women who may have supplemented the family income through taking in washing, skivvying and minding children. It is not possible to assess what contribution was made by poaching, prostitution and theft; all of which were rife
- pessimists also place greater emphasis on the quality of life, which examines not just the hard data but patterns of unemployment and housing/sanitation. There is convincing evidence that for the majority of urban workers – those at the forefront of industrialisation, these elements worsened
- wage/price data and indices are a very crude mechanism to chart changes especially in an economy, which was so regionally diverse.

Overall

The importance placed on real-wages by Ashton and Hartwell and, to a lesser extent Hobsbawn and Thompson, has been significantly questioned by more recent historians such as Jane Humphries. The importance of real wages has declined in the context of more qualitative evidence and historians are less secure in an over-arching analysis.

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 parliament changed, in terms of composition, powers and the nature of the laws it passed, as a consequence of the constitutional crises and the Reform Act of 1832.

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 changes to parliament which came about as a result of the Reform Act of 1832 and the reform crisis of 1831/1832 whereby three attempts to pass a reform bill engendered extensive rioting, a stand-off between Lords and Commons and the forcing of the King to threaten to create new peers to get the bill passed. The Bill became law in June 1832 when the Lords backed down.

Candidates are specifically directed to assess three aspects of the parliamentary changes which came about: the changes in the composition of the body of Parliament, its power (in which they would be expected to consider the relative powers of its constituent parts) and the legislation passed. Changes will need to be balanced against those elements of Parliament which remained the same and better answers would be expected to make reference to more than just the House of Commons in their appraisal.

Relevant material which provides evidence that the **composition of Parliament** was changed would include:

- the newly enfranchised and disenfranchised boroughs ensured a better balance of representation in the Commons between North and South, industrial towns and landed areas
- the loss of rotten boroughs and some pocket boroughs undermined the aristocratic control of the Commons

- the composition of the Commons became more reflective of the middle-classes enfranchised in 1832. The Tory dominance of the previous 50 years (when they governed for all but three years) was broken and they governed only twice in the period 1832–1848 (under Peel, 1843–1835 and 1841–1846 – and Peel himself was from an industrial background)
- although its composition was unchanged the Lords had faced the threat of change and this was sufficient to keep that House quiescent for the next 60 years.

Relevant material which provides evidence that the **powers of parliament** were changed would include:

- the Prime Minister would no longer be the Monarch’s choice subsequently confirmed by election. Instead the winner of elections became Prime Minister. (William IV had been forced to appoint Grey in May 1832 when his own choice Wellington was unable to command a majority.) Queen Victoria was forced to accept Peel in 1841 when she wanted Melbourne
- the House of Lords suffered a serious defeat and the Tory majority had been forced to accept a choice between the loss of their power for good or acceptance of a bill that was destructive of their interests
- the power of Parliament was weakened in that it was seen to ‘give in’ to outside pressure and the passing of the act weakened arguments in favour of resisting subsequent change on principle.

Relevant material which provides evidence that the **nature of laws** changed would include:

- the Reform Act ushered in an “age of reform” as the Whigs adopted the view that the government needed to act to reform society and the economy. The 1833 abolition of Slavery, the compulsory registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths (1835), the Mines Act of 1842, the 1833 Factory Act, 1835 Municipal Corporations Act and 1848 Public Health Act might be cited
- legislation seemed to respond to the demands of the new electorate. The 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act was a response to the demand of the middle class Poor Rate payers that that costs were too high; the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act transferred local power to the same middle classes. Even the 1833 Factory Act responded to the middle class factory owners’ concerns by giving lenient terms and minimal inspection.
- The repeal of the Corn Laws was the key example of government acting decisively against the interests of the aristocratic land owners.

Candidates will also need to examine evidence of the limits to change:

- the Monarch was not wholly neutered, as the extension of Melbourne’s primacy 1839–1841 makes clear. The ‘bedchamber crisis’ saw Peel excluded from power for a further two years
- the House of Lords survived to fight another day. They continued to provide Prime Ministers (Earl Grey and Viscount Melbourne) and the majority of government Ministers. They had not lost their veto (which continued to 1911)

- the British Landed Elite remained dominant. Lord John Russell was also Prime Minister in this period and about 60-70 pocket boroughs continued to exist. Deference and family interest remained strong and were possibly strengthened by the Chandos Clause. Political control remained with the aristocracy through managed elections (no secret ballot), and the costs of standing
- the South remained over-represented; there were few “industrial MPs” in major office and they were not even a majority in the Commons until the end of the century; the same two political parties and the same basic structure was preserved
- the House of Commons retained its conservative outlook. In 1841, 71% of MPs came from the landed elite. The working class were excluded from the franchise and the Commons rejected the Chartist petitions of 1839 and 1842 and refused to accept that of 1848.

Candidates may argue for the importance of change or continuity. Some may allege that it did help create a working class political consciousness in that it stimulated the Chartist movement. Others may emphasise its importance in encouraging middle class political participation at both a central and local level leading to the setting up of extra-parliamentary pressure groups such as the Anti-Corn Law League. Whatever they choose they should examine criticisms of the Whig view that the Reform Act was a step along the path to democracy. They should be aware of its short-term/longer term impact and the difference between what was intended and what was unintentional. They may conclude that the manner of its passing was more significant than the terms of the Act itself.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 COURSE ESSAYS HS03

Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848

B: Chartism, 1838–1848

Was the failure of the working class to gain the vote in the 1832 Reform Act the most important factor in explaining support for the Chartist movement in the years 1838 to 1848? 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.

The Chartist campaign peaked in 1838/1839 with meetings and a petition to parliament, in 1842 with a second petition, the rejection of which led to strikes and riots, including the Plug riots in Lancashire and finally in 1848 with a third petition following a rally at Kennington Common in London. Some mention may also be seen of O'Connor's co-operative idea. Candidates should assess reasons for the development of Chartism that show awareness of the changing motives over the ten-year period. Some answers may address specific reasons for each wave, though some conclusions that consider the whole period would represent judgement.

Candidates are directed to one reason for the development of the Chartist campaign, the failure of the working class to gain the vote under the uniform £10 borough franchise qualification introduced in 1832 (exception some £10 occupiers in London). They should also consider other factors to assess which was the most important, mainly economic motives (Chartism as a knife and fork issue).

Working class dissatisfaction:

- reference to the six points of the people's charter and evidence of why the demands were necessary would show the limits of 1832
- payment for MPs and an end to the property qualification for voting would be needed to end the landed dominance of the House of Commons – 71% in 1841 after the Reform Act

- equal constituencies would remove the remaining anomalies – Doncaster (population 10,000) had no representation
- secret ballots would end pocket boroughs that had not disappeared in 1832; annual parliaments would make the government more accountable, given that the reformed governments could claim to represent the people, yet acted more as an elected dictatorship
- universal suffrage would give the vote to more than the 18% of adult males enfranchised in 1832 and end the anomalies based on the £10 qualification (many skilled workers qualified for the vote in London, but many of the middle-class the Act was meant to enfranchise did not qualify in Wales)
- furthermore, the Reform Act had whetted radical appetites, such that the working-class now assumed that the next step would be to grant them the vote, but given the attitude of politicians (e.g. ‘Finality Jack’ Russell) there was a need for further agitation. This might be linked to the relative effectiveness of agitation in 1831/1832

However, other causes of Chartism should also be considered:

- working-class dissatisfaction with social and economic conditions – the ‘knife and fork’ analysis of Chartism. Wages were falling; food prices and unemployment were rising
- from 1837 a general depression set in enhancing these concerns
- anger at the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act, which created workhouses and blamed poverty on laziness, whilst also ending poor relief for many
- effects of industrialisation – overcrowding, pollution, disease-ridden towns, poor working conditions, which the 1833 Factory Act had only gone some way towards addressing (did not apply in textile factories, not enforced)
- other demands of the working-class might be addressed through the Chartist movement, some people joined for specific reasons as a broad church – eight-hour day, end to child labour, support for Trade Unions, for example.

All of these factors meant that the working-class sought a more representative parliament which would not ignore their needs.

- O’Connor’s dream of a new Britain, based on communal land might also be discussed.

Judgement might be represented by

- arguments that Chartism was essentially motivated by economic suffering in periods of unemployment and depression and was therefore not popular when the economy improved, meaning that the political reasons were less important
- alternatively it might be argued that the reasons for Chartism changed over the period – initially dissatisfaction with the Reform Act was the catalyst, but then the movement embraced those whose concerns were more social and economic.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 COURSE ESSAYS HS03

Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951

A: The Making of the Welfare State 1942–1951

Examine the extent to which the aims of the Beveridge Report of 1942 had been achieved by 1951.

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 **central focus** of the question is on identifying what the aims of the Beveridge Report were and then evaluating the degree to which they had been put into effect during Attlee's post-war Labour governments ending in 1951.

Answers will need to outline the Beveridge Report identifying its main aims and proposals. These should include the overall aim of abolishing poverty by tackling the 'five giants'. Amongst his key proposals for achieving this was a comprehensive, universal, national system of social insurance (ending Want) but also the recognition that social insurance was only one part of a broader, comprehensive policy of social reform administered by one Ministry and including: 'allowances for children', the need for future governments to secure full employment (ending Idleness), a national health service (slaying Disease), re-housing (ending Squalor) and an extension of secondary education (ending Ignorance). More knowledgeable candidates may explain Beveridge's proposals in more detail, e.g. by extending existing national insurance to cover all workers, by extending it to cover areas not covered before and to raise the rates of benefit. Good candidates may point out that Beveridge put the stress on having a contributory scheme based on flat rate contributions rather than 'free allowances from the State' and that he proposed to abolish the 'means test'.

In their evaluation candidates will probably consider both how far the broad aims were achieved as well as the how far Beveridge's proposals for achieving them were implemented. Amongst the detailed measures enacted by Labour which drew heavily on Beveridge was the National Insurance Act 1946. Candidates should identify it as implementing a contributory system supported by employer and State, compulsory for all employees from 16 to 65 and

seeking to guard against all risks from the cradle to the grave. In return for contributions every worker was entitled to sickness and unemployment benefits, old age pensions, widows' and orphans' pensions, maternity allowances and death grants. Following Beveridge the general approach was flat rate contributions for flat rate benefits and the scheme was administered by a new Ministry of National Insurance. The 1948 National Assistance Act provided a safety net for those who were unable to make the contributions and so fell through the National Insurance net and, in effect, ended the Poor Law. These Acts met Beveridge's desire to get rid of the patchy, limited schemes often based on a household means test and still retaining the workhouse, which existed before the war. In addition Labour implemented the Family Allowances Act and became the first government to pay out a universal benefit to families with more than one child.

Candidates will probably also refer to **other measures** which Labour introduced which implemented key ideas and proposals in Beveridge. Obvious examples would be the National Health Service Act 1946 put into effect from July 1948. Again candidates should note the way the NHS implemented the principles of comprehensive medical treatment, universally available and free at the point of use. Mention might also be made by the well-informed of the Industrial Injuries Act and the Children Act 1948. In tackling Squalor candidates might refer to the New Towns Act, the Town and Country Planning Act and 1949 Housing Act. In regard to Ignorance, candidates may well also refer to Labour implementing the 1944 Education Act with the raising of the school leaving age to 15, the establishment of universal and free maintained secondary education as well as grants for those going on to the universities.

As well as putting into law many of Beveridge's proposals, **candidates may well try to assess how far these did end poverty** and its associated ills. Candidates could refer to the generally high level of employment Labour achieved especially in the former depressed areas; the huge take up of health care from 1948; the findings of the 1951 Rowntree Survey which showed remarkable improvement on 1936 in the amount of poverty; the 1½ million new houses built, the Green Belt and the first new towns re-housing many who had been 'blitzed out'.

Amongst evidence for Labour not implementing Beveridge's proposals candidates may point out that the Butler Education Act, the Family Allowances Act and the setting up of the Ministry of National Insurance took place under the War Coalition with a Conservative preponderance in Cabinet. They may also argue that although Labour drew heavily on Beveridge it also saw a greater role for the State and that there was criticism from the Left of such aspects as flat rate contributions and benefits. **The limitations of Labour's achievements** in housing, and education, as well as in the introduction of prescription and other charges into the NHS by 1951, will be pointed out, though **better informed candidates** may well refer to post-war economic difficulties and competing demands for scarce resources in Labour's defence. Candidates may well bring out **other limitations** such as the relatively low level of family allowances; pension and other benefits not being earnings related or inflation linked; although Labour's pensions were more generous than Beveridge had envisaged.

High level answers will show an understanding of the Beveridge aims and proposals; knowledge of Labour's measures and their degree of success; and have some depth of assessment as to how far Labour did put into effect Beveridge's more detailed proposals as well as his broader aims. Such answers will perhaps also show awareness of the difficult economic background against which these measures were implemented. Some candidates may put more emphasis in their answers on the measures which Labour passed which were

inspired to some degree by Beveridge, others may look more at the practical effects on reducing the 'Five Giants' by 1951. **Very good answers** will do both.

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

How important was Churchill's personal style of management to the success of the wartime coalition government?

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 record of the wartime coalition government, assessing the factors which made it a success. Candidates' comments may differ, however, according to their view of the government's aims. Some may simply see it as an interim government whose sole purpose was to win the war, while others may combine its aim of achieving victory over Nazism with a desire to plan for a better post-war world. This will obviously affect judgements on Churchill's contribution which should be at the heart of all answers. Whatever the premise adopted, candidates will need to explain Churchill's contribution from his appointment as Prime Minister in May 1940 to the 'success' of this Coalition government. They will need to set this against other factors in order to provide a balanced appraisal.

Relevant material on Churchill's personal style of management would include:

- the way in which he consolidated his leadership in the Conservative party in 1940, overcame the Halifax group which doubted the wisdom of continuing the war and buried his past reputation
- he worked to create a united government and picked a successful team to act as his 5 man war cabinet. He won over the support of prominent Labour politicians such as Atlee and Bevin (who helped to ensure the loyalty of the Trade Unions). He even retained Chamberlain to October 1940 and so created consensus politics which were necessary for a successful war effort

- his energetic leadership provided inspiration and contrasted with what had gone before. His ministers, civil servants and officials were inspired by his dynamism, shamed into keeping up with him or dismissed. He realised that the government had to be seen to have the support of the nation behind it, so he travelled around the country, mixing with ‘ordinary’ people, visiting bomb sites and using his force of personality to impart a sense of urgency and decisiveness. He displayed a mixture of ruthlessness and impetuosity. Determined to have action, he cajoled and sacked generals and although he made many mistakes, his style contributed to a greater sense of unity and purpose which helped the nation to victory
- he showed a mastery of propaganda, emphasising national unity. He exploited myths like Dunkirk, gave meaning to the famous V for victory sign and developed the possibilities of the BBC. He gave rousing speeches to maintain morale and came up with slogans which suggested a shared purpose. This aspect of his style was psychological and propagandist but it helped to emphasise his role as the only man that could lead the nation in defiance of Nazism and reinforced his unchallenged position as Prime Minister
- he assumed personal responsibility for the day-to-day workings of government. He developed a special relationship with loyal staff inspired by his own hard work late into the night. He sent his ministers correspondence headed “Action this day” and adopted an important managerial and decision making role
- he not only handled the war cabinet, he also directed military and strategic operations, taking personal responsibility for defence and foreign affairs. He was the all important co-ordinator of strategy (e.g. convoys, code-breaking) and was seen as the man behind the Battle of the Atlantic and D-day. Where he could not assume personal control, he appointed other dynamic personalities and friends like Lord Beaverbrook for aircraft production
- he was a skilful diplomat. He understood the need to rally support from the USA and the Commonwealth. He showed his skill in personal diplomacy and face to face meetings (especially at big conferences) and worked to develop a good relationship with Roosevelt. He played on the country’s need for him and his protection of British interests in international relations
- although he had little time for the Home Front and post war planning, leaving domestic affairs to Attlee and his Labour colleagues, he nevertheless succeeded in winning over public opinion with vague promises of a better post-war world and his apparent support for the welfare schemes which were planned in this period (e.g. Beveridge Report)

Other relevant factors which contributed to the success of wartime coalition government might include:

- the fact that it was a true coalition government embracing Conservative, Labour and Liberal MPs who set aside their differences in the interest of fighting the war
- British success in the Battle of Britain (June-September 1940) shortly after Churchill came to power which seemed to confirm that Churchill was right and Hitler could be beaten

- The contribution of others, particularly the Labour members of the cabinet who should take credit for domestic post-war planning; the generals who ‘won’ the war; the USA whose intervention was decisive in the final achievement of victory.

In conclusion candidates may note that in some ways the reputation Churchill built up as a wartime leader was only a myth. His style of management infuriated many – both within government and outside it. Not all workers supported him and some regarded him as the arch anti-socialist and doubted his commitment to welfare reform. His failure in the 1945 election speaks for itself and if the broader view of the aims of the coalition government is adopted he was in some ways a liability. Nevertheless, from the narrower perspective of leading his country to victory, his style, even if it helped to paint a false picture, did succeed for the most part in holding Britain together and inspiring the nation through 5 years of war.