AQA

ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

HS03　　Course Essays

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS UNIT 3: COURSE ESSAYS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**

In marking Coursework Essays all examiners must, to decide on levels and placing of a response within a level, refer to:
- **the generic essay mark scheme and its descriptors for AS**
- **the exemplification of AS level descriptors**
- **the indicative content designated by the Principal Examiner**
- **additional content (i.e. not in the indicative content) which is relevant and targeted**
- **guidance on discriminating within a level.**

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

L1:   The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating, 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 undiscriminating, 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 undiscriminating, with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

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

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

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

Exemplification/Guidance

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

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

So, is the response:

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

Important Note

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

Summary of mark scheme for HS03

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

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

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism

> **A:**   **The Military Orders in the Latin East in the Twelfth Century**
>
>   Explain why the care and protection of pilgrims were so important to the
>   emergence of the military orders in the early twelfth century.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will consider a range of reasons for the growth of the military orders, both the Knights Templar and Hospitaller. This should include the events surrounding their formation. Reference may be made to a variety of aspects, in particular the care and protection of pilgrims, but also the defensive needs of the newly created states; shortage of manpower, religious enthusiasm and the knightly classes.

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.

Care and protection as reasons for their creation will focus on the care and protection of pilgrims including the roots of the Hospitallers in 1070 and their caritative role. The Hospitallers carried out 'charitable and pastoral work among the faithful' (Riley-Smith), and worked at the Hospital of Saint John, where Riley-Smith claims they treated the sick like 'the grandest lords…almost unimaginable luxury for the time'. The Templars were originally 'committed to defend the pilgrim roads' (Riley-Smith). Focus on the key word 'emergence' may lead to analysis of the actions of men such as Gerard (founder of the hospice which in 1113 became the order of Knights Hospitaller), Raymond du Puy (who led the militarization of the Hospitallers) and Hugh of Payens (who formed a brotherhood in 1119 to secure the pilgrim roads to the Holy places) in shaping their relative orders.

Soon both orders took on a more militarised role. The Master of the Hospitallers believed that looking after the pilgrims was not enough, and that his order must 'fight to keep the

pilgrim routes open' (Runciman). Focus may be placed on the events of 1119. The manpower shortage in the Crusader states was made apparent that year with the Battle of the Field of Blood and the needs of pilgrims for protection became apparent with significant attacks on parties of pilgrims.

Evaluative alternatives will also include the lack of power in Outremer; the nature of crusading as a temporary penitential pilgrimage; the needs of the crusader states for manpower; their tenuous geopolitical position; the need for the permanent presence of a regular army of trained soldiers; their failure to attract sufficient new settlers and their tenuous geopolitical position.

The importance of religious enthusiasm may include the importance of the twelfth century as a period of spiritual/religious revival, with the orders as one element of the New Monasticism, especially through Templar links with the Cistercians. Bernard of Clairvaux's impact and the Council of Troyes which established the order with its rule as a monastic order may be discussed. The Orders developed as the living personification of the crusading ideal. Europe's nobility was attracted by the warrior-monks knightly ethos, and the potency of their message was an ideal for a religious military aristocracy, whose mentality linked piety and martial valour.

The chronology of their creation may focus on growing needs after 1099: the events of 1118–1119 including the impact of the Battle of the Field of Blood or the slaughter of 300 pilgrims; the stimulus of the tour undertaken by Hugh of Payens and the council of Troyes in 1129 and their evolution from lay fraternities pre-dating 1099 to their emergence as monastic orders with a military function in the 1130s. The Council marked the Templars' emergence as military order and may link with the role of Bernard of Clairvaux, and his 'In praise of the New Knighthood' and the concept of the 'just war'.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism

    B: **The Development of New Monasticism in Twelfth Century Europe**

        How important a factor was royal patronage in the popularity of the Augustinian canons during the twelfth century?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

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.

Answers will consider a range of reasons for the growth of Augustinian canons. Reference may be made to a variety of aspects, in particular the influence of royal patronage, but also the moderate cost of Augustinian foundations; the attraction of the rule of St. Augustine; the practical nature of such foundations, and religious enthusiasm and the knightly classes.

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. Also, the order 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.

Augustinian canons proved very popular; 274 houses were founded in twelfth century England alone, 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, including Holy Trinity in Aldgate, London and Llanthony in Gloucester. Their daughter, the Empress Matilda, was

also a noted patron of the canons. Queen Matilda's brother, David I, King of Scots, spread the order in his own kingdom with major Augustinian foundations at St. Andrews, Cambuskenneth and Jedburgh. As Janet Burton has said, 'the Augustinian expansion was the fist major religious movement in Scotland'. Augustinians thus became fashionable amongst court circles, and while, no doubt, patrons created houses to ease their path to salvation, they were also seen as a means of gaining royal favour.

In evaluating various factors candidates may highlight cost as a key issue. They may stress the popularity of the Augustinian canons was due to their practical nature and their small size, this attracted endowments from patrons of modest means, thus opening religious patronage to new social groups, the knightly and merchant classes in particular. 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 local churches. Southern estimates Augustinian cost as little as £3 per year, Benedictine monks needed more than three times this figure. But 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. Previously, monastic patronage was limited to royalty and the high nobility, but the Augustinians made it possible for a new social strata of men of more modest means to become patrons, in England this meant honorial barons and lay administrators.

In continental Europe reforming bishops were significant patrons of the canons, they spread the canons by turning their cathedral clergy into Augustinian communities, 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. In England Archbishop Lanfranc founded St. Gregory's Canterbury to serve the hospital and teach. For reformers the order resolved a key pastoral problem, by grouping priests in a regular community their behaviour could be controlled.

Another key reason for the success of the Augustinians was their rule of life. 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.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion

A: **The Origins of the French Wars of Religion**

Examine the extent to which Catherine de Medici's religious policies were responsible for the religious and political divisions in France by 1562.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Catherine de Medici was the mother of Francis II (King, 1559–1560) and Charles IX (King 1560–1574), and acted as Regent (1560–1563) because Charles was a minor. By 1562, relations between Catholics and Huguenots were deteriorating badly as Huguenot strengths grew (e.g. organisation of the church into synods, involvement of prominent members of the nobility). The consequence was war.

The answer should draw on the entire period, 1559–1562, but there may be particular emphasis on 1560–1562 because of Catherine's specific position as Regent. Any assessment will also be enhanced by some understanding of differing views of Catherine, one of which has until recently depicted her as a scheming, unprincipled woman, interfering extensively in both religious and political matters and aiming to grasp as much power for herself and her sons as she could. More recent opinion suggests that Catherine's religious policies were geared to reconciling factions, maintaining peace and ensuring the stability of the country and the safety of her children. Points which could be made on these themes are:

- Catherine acted swiftly when Huguenots plotted to seize Francis II and attacked the Guises in the Tumult of Amboise 1560, e.g. 57 Huguenots were executed for their part in the Conspiracy of Amboise

- she also recognised that the dominance of the Guise faction in the reign of Francis II (her son) generated fear and hostility amongst Huguenots. She managed to limit this to a degree by persuading the Assembly of Notables that when the Estates General

was next summoned it should consider relaxing the heresy laws. However, this request was ignored. The Triumvirate (mainly the Guise and Montmorency families) was formed and an edict of 1561 passed condemning Protestantism

- Catherine summoned the Colloquy of Poissy 1561 in the hope that this might develop a programme of reform in the church, some compromise and an ending of conflict; this showed how little she understood of the deep-rooted nature of the conflict, e.g. issues of doctrine and practice were largely irreconcilable and contributed to further friction. One specific area of friction was over the eucharist

- Catherine requested military help from the Huguenots. However, Anthony of Navarre changed sides and supported the Guise faction and the fear of an invasion from other Catholic forces outside France grew

- Catherine's policy of permitting Reformed worship (the Edict of January 1560, the Edict of St. Germain 1562) led to the Massacre of Vassy, the increased popularity of the Guise and a retaliatory campaign by Huguenots which caused the first war and the battle of Dreux in 1562.

Alternatively, answers could suggest:

- the Huguenots defiance made them an opposition party which no 16th century state could tolerate; their first national synod met in 1559 in Paris; there were possibly as many as 1800 Protestant congregations

- there were many influential nobles supporting the reformed religion – some estimate almost half. Many were influential women, e.g. Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre

- the Guises were particularly ruthless in their attitude towards Huguenots and their initial persecution, e.g. the execution of Anne du Bourg only served to make the Huguenots even more determined to have the right to pursue their religious beliefs and practices

- other rulers of continental Europe, e.g. Philip II of Spain, were concerned about events in France and the impact they could have on their own lands and were therefore prepared to support the Guises; Elizabeth of England and German protestants supported the Huguenots; thus raising the profile of the conflict

- once war began France began to divide geographically; the north favoured Catholicism and the south predominantly favoured the Huguenots; this clarified the differences even more.

Answers may draw conclusions in support of Catherine de Medici's culpability but in good answers it should be tempered by some understanding of other factors, e.g. of the attitudes and circumstances of the time, much of which was outside her control; there should also be some awareness of the difficulty for a woman whose claim to authority was as Queen Mother and not in her own right. Answers could also be credited for awareness of religious turmoil elsewhere, e.g. the Holy Roman Empire, England, etc. which suggests broader issues over and above individual personalities.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion

> **B: The Role of Individuals and Ideas in the French Wars of Religion, 1562–1598**
>
> Examine the extent to which political writings influenced the course and outcome of the French Wars of Religion 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.

The French Wars of Religion produced writings from both Catholics and Huguenots on the form government should take and the rights of monarchs and their subjects. Answers would be expected to consider a range of these and consider the impact they had, if any on the course and outcome of the wars.

Huguenot writings may be represented by:

- *Francogallia* by Francis Hotman (1573). He stated for example, that France was once a free country but undermined by the papacy and the monarchy (reference to papal power, growth of Protestantism etc.). He supported an elective monarchy and the concept of deposition by the people – an obvious justification of the civil wars, that the Valois had become too corrupt (Catherine de Medici, Henry III). He considered the Roman Church had too much power and as France had been freed from Rome's political tyranny, so it should be freed from Rome's religious tyranny (reference to potential rule of Henry IV) and raised the concept of elective monarchy which could be removed if needed. Some of these ideas were too *avant garde* and related to dissatisfaction with Henry III (who was, however, removed – assassinated in 1589).

- *Vindicae contra Tyrannos* by Philippe du Plessis Mornay. This work discussed the level of obedience owed by the people to the state, who could resist the power of the state, whether princes can be resisted and whether the people could seek help to remove a tyrant. Protestants who operated through synods, assemblies and councils

were seen as generating more authority for the people – deference to others should be because of ability rather than because of birth/class. This latter idea was promoted by French Protestants through their consistory courts, colloquies and synods

- *The Rights of Magistrates* by Theodore Beza. This work directly considered the question of who had authority to depose a wicked king and discussed the concept of a limited monarchy rather than an absolute monarchy and looked back to Louis XI to support this.

Catholic writings may be represented by:

- the works of Jean Boucher – he asserted that that there was a right to depose Henry III as a tyrant

- *The Just Authority of a Christian Republic,* 1590 this work argued for an elective monarchy and the deposition of a king if he proved to be tyrannical, e.g. taxing without the consent of the estates. The king was seen as having a contract with the people and could only be obeyed if he promised to rule justly and in a Christian manner; as Henry IV was a heretic he could not be king.

Politique authors:

- *Six books of the Republic,* Jean Bodin, 1576 Bodin had a political background as a member of the Estates. He focused on royal power; considered that sovereignty was enhanced by the Estates General; anarchy should be replaced by a powerful monarch whose power was indivisible. The Monarch was however expected to be moral and upright and to obey the fundamental laws of the land, e.g. the Salic law. The monarch's power was not dependent on religious sanctions and religious zealots could be prevented from disrupting the state.

Influence on the course and outcome of the wars:

- the middle classes were in a better position because they were released from subservience to the nobility

- more emphasis was placed on the virtues of loyalty and morality in political life which had been deemed to be missing

- Catherine de Medici attempted to follow some concepts, e.g. organised an assembly of notables which suggested changes in the way parlement operated, in dealing with crime and disorder, protection for ordinary people from extortion etc. Unfortunately nothing permanent came of this but the fact she was interested in making changes is significant in itself

- Henry III was assassinated as a result of dissatisfaction with both the king and his government

- focus on the manner in which monarchs related to the people, on politics rather than religion, on responsibilities rather than just power, and the agreement of both Catholic and Protestant writers on the concept of limitations to the power of monarchy was significant, e.g. in the acceptance of Henry IV as king. He did have to become a Catholic but laws allowing Protestants rights of worship were sanctioned

- Henry IV became king, relatively without challenge, because he had a legitimate claim which could be tested in law. However, most of his opponents were dead and he converted to Catholicism. He was assassinated by a Catholic fanatic. By 1610, the claim of his son to be king was unchallenged even though he was only 8 and a Regency had to be established. Clearly he was seen as the legitimate heir

- political writings gave participants in the war ideas which they could use to promote their view of how the country should be governed, and probably contributed to the length of the wars, but the outcome and the nature of Henry IV's rule was no less autocratic than that of his predecessors. The fact that the Huguenots were allowed freedom of worship in certain places was, in itself, an indication of the level of authority still exercised by the monarch.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743

    A: **The Regency, 1715–1723**

        Examine the extent to which the Regent Orléans was successful in maintaining the absolute authority of the monarchy.

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 attempt to establish the nature of monarchical authority at the beginning of the regency and then progress to consider the subsequent problems that Orléans faced. Some candidates may question the existence of absolute authority, and credit can be given for this, but the clear focus of the question remains Orléans's success in maintaining monarchical authority.

Factors that initially weakened monarchical authority:

- previous regencies had been far from successful, and the last had witnessed the Frondes

- in theory the regent had sovereign authority, but Louis XIV had hindered this by virtue of his Will. The question over the health of Louis XV and the unlikelihood of his reaching majority, combined with fears over the claim of Philip V of Spain to the French throne and a general distrust of Orléans at court, meant that Louis XIV had tried to place Maine and Toulouse in line of succession and limit the power of Orléans by means of a Regency Council

- the Grandees expected greater influence in government and the Parlement of Paris sought to restore its own rights of pre-registration remonstrance

- Jansenism and consequent attempts to register Unigenitus had not only questioned the nature of the King's sovereign authority as highlighted by the Gallicans in the Paris Parlement, but was also an issue left unresolved on the death of Louis XIV.

Orléans success in maintaining absolute authority:

- Orléans had demanded complete freedom on the distribution of favours and office, and although forced to accept majority decision in the Regency Council, he nominated its members. The very fact that Maine and Toulouse remained on this council, the dramatic increase in its size to 35 members in 1722 as Orléans awarded his supporters, and the fact that after 1718 even the taking of minutes ceased, may show the increasingly figurative nature of this body. It failed to weaken the King's authority

- the work of the Polysynodie tended to be consultative, merely advising the Regency Council, and the councils certainly were not allowed any executive or legislative power. Orléans was also careful to ensure that he negotiated directly with council presidents rather than allow genuine debate within council that might damage his authority

- increasingly Orléans turned back to the system of government under Louis XIV, using favoured advisers such as Dubois and Law who owed their position to him alone. The abolition of the Polysynodie in 1718 and the restoration of the Secretaries of State coincided with the further weakening of Maine and Toulouse, and also a firmer line with Parlement

- the success with which the Parlement of Rennes was brought into line illustrates the fact that Orléans was unwilling to negotiate away royal authority with a politically ambitious parlement. Sending the Edict of Recoinage of 1718 to the Cours des Monnaies; the decree of August 1718 obliging Parlement to remonstrate on all edicts within a week of issue; the arrest of 3 Parlementaires; the exile of Parlement to Pontoise in 1720 and their subsequent registration of the financial edicts in the same year proved how effectively Orleans retained authority.

Failure to maintain absolute authority:

- initial concessions given to the Grandees, and especially their inclusion on the Regency Council and the Polysynodie, indicate that in the first few years of the Regency, Orléans relied on the support of the privileged to retain his position as Regent. Although the actual amount of influence that the nobility acquired in government has probably been overestimated, Orléans did increase the role of the privileged in government up to 1718 and gave the impression that he could not govern without them

- the return of parlement's right of pre-registration remonstrance in 1715, although necessary to overturn the Will of Louis XIV, gave Parlement an elevated view of their constitutional role and perhaps contributed to their belief of themselves as guardians and beneficiaries of fundamental law

- Orléans attempts to weaken Parlement throughout the regency did reinforce the principle that laws of public importance had to be registered in parlement first

- the final months of the Regency saw Dubois' acquisition of the title of first minister, and hence the return to the type of politics seen before Louis XIV. It might be argued that the fortuitous death of Dubois did much to preserve the authority of monarchy in the absence of a pro-active king.

A conclusion might suggest that on balance Orléans did exceptionally well in maintaining the authority of the monarchy. This was especially true considering the historical weaknesses of regencies and also Louis XIV's deliberate attempts to undermine the power of Orléans. Whilst Orléans gave the impression of conceding power to the privileged, he actually did quite the opposite.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743

    B: **Cardinal Fleury, 1726–1743**

    With what success did Cardinal Fleury's government deal with the problems of the economy and also those of government finance between 1726 and 1743?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should address both the general economic well-being of France and also the state of government finance/revenue collection during this period. There should be some acknowledgement of the problems faced and of the solutions found. There might be some recognition of the correlation between the economy and finance.

Problems of the economy and finance:

- the continuing financial burden of previous wars and especially the debt left by Louis XIV; heavy loans; the inequitable taxation system; the failure of previous radical reform of the economy and finance – most notably that of John Law and the consequent loss in confidence in state credit; the continuing power of the guilds; the weakness of the entrepreneurial class; and the reversion back to tax farmers.

Solutions to the economic problems:

- although foreign policy is not included in the specification, candidates might consider that one of the greatest contributors to economic growth was the long period of peace under Fleury. The expansion in overseas trade was due in part to this new 'bourgeois policy of pacifism'

- the slave trade with the islands of the Caribbean flourished and improved relations with the Ottoman Empire accelerated the Levantine trade. Such growth was reflected in

the rapid development of very conveniently placed ports such as Marseille that exploited the Mediterranean/Levant trade, Dunkirk the Baltic and Bordeaux the Indies and Africa

- trade advances were assisted by the imposition of high tariffs on imports, the use of inspectors to guarantee the quality and reputation of French goods and the use of chartered trading companies to establish new markets

- Fleury re-established a Council of Commerce, and in 1738 Orry extended the Corvee, dramatically improving the road system which, combined with the canal network, ensured a very effective commercial infrastructure aiding both domestic and overseas trade

- Fleury's efforts to stabilise the French currency in 1726 by standardising and marking the Livre further encouraged confidence in French commerce.

Solutions to the financial problems:

- government finances benefited from this commercial upturn and period of peace. Regular debt payments by the government combined with growing tax revenue increased confidence in the financial situation and encouraged the flow of credit

- the renewed use of corporate bodies such as the General Farm to both collect tax and raise loans meant that administration costs were kept down, a guaranteed revenue was received before the tax was even collected, and lower loan interest rates could be achieved

- the reversion to mercantilist principles of high tariff also brought in more revenues, as did Orry's efforts to extend the scope of venality to municipal government and thus raise money from groups hitherto successful in avoiding the tax burden. Measure of success in government finance is illustrated by Orry's balancing of the budget 1739–1740.

Failure in dealing with the economic problems:

- much of the improvement in the economy came from factors outside the conscious policy of government, and anyway may be implicit in the cautious foreign policy

- demand for manufactured goods had been rising long before 1726 and hence Fleury may simply have accelerated existing trends. Much of this was due to a steadily rising population that not only increased demand and lowered labour costs, but also increased returns of agricultural rent and hence noble income. This in turn produced more demand for goods and services.

- government policy was also limited and in some cases counter-productive. High tariffs may have limited economic development, and there remained an over-burden of government inspection and regulation. The guilds also retarded innovation and competition, yet Orry and Fleury did nothing to reform them and hence industrial growth was often limited to a minority of the population away from guild regulation

- the countryside was far from a prosperous area, as despite increasing prices for produce, little was done to introduce new techniques here either.

Failure in dealing with the financial problems:

- the major failing of government finances – its inequitable nature – was not addressed, although it is questionable how realistic an objective this might have been. Consequently the government continued to rely on short term expediency such as 'emergency' taxes like the Dixième of 1741 and also loans

- the use of Tax farmers was inefficient and subject to corruption and was clearly not a solution to financial concerns

- the increased use of venality would lead to later problems, hindered effective government and meant even more people bought their way to tax exemption

- the burden of taxation continued to fall on the peasantry and such a load was increased by the inconsistent nature of indirect tax

- the failure to establish a national bank continued to mean that the crown had no means to raise money quickly.

Whilst this period appears one of economic well-being and financial stability, much was due to demographic and martial issues rather than Government financial policy. Any population crisis or outbreak of war would seriously jeopardise what were quite conservative changes to a bad and inefficient system.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative D: Europe, 1825–1850

   A: European Diplomacy, 1825 to 1835

   Was the Belgian Revolution of 1830–1831 the most important factor in
   damaging Great Power relations in the years 1825 to 1835?
   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.**

The Belgian Revolution of 1830 was a revolt against Dutch rule and a threat to the Vienna
Settlement and the principle of legitimacy. The Belgian Revolution threatened to plunge
Europe into a major war, however, the London Conference of November 1830, which
resulted in the 1831 Treaty of London, where Belgium was established as an independent
and neutral state, is often cited as a remarkable display of collective responsibility on the
part of the Great Powers. Answers should clearly focus on the extent to which the Belgian
Revolution was a threat to Great Power co-operation and then consider other events which
may have been a more serious threat to the Concert of Europe.

Initial threats to o-operation

The revolution in Belgium could have precipitated a major European war for a number of
reasons:

•   it was the first clear violation of the Vienna Settlement of 1815

•   it threatened to wedge a divide between the autocratic Eastern powers who were
     opposed to revolution and threats to legitimacy and the more liberal powers of Britain
     and France

- the Eastern powers feared intervention by the new 'liberal' French Government in support of fellow Catholic Belgians

- Britain feared Belgian ports falling into French hands

- Prussia felt obliged to come to the aid of the King of the Netherlands due to the terms of the Vienna Settlement

- the French declared that they would intervene in Belgium if Prussia sent in troops to help the King of the Netherlands.

Examples of co-operation

The revolution in Belgium can be seen to have encouraged Great Power co-operation:

- Prussia and France agreed a policy of non-intervention after the Belgians declared their independence in October 1830

- the London Conference of November 1830 agreed the re-establishment of the old United Provinces (Holland) and the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium)

- conference diplomacy successfully resolved issues over boundaries, finance and monarchy

- the Great Powers agreed that Belgium would remain a neutral state, therefore virtually recognising Belgium's independence

- Louis-Philippe exercised diplomatic restraint be declining the Belgian throne on behalf of his son, the Duke of Nemours

- Talleyrand (French ambassador to London) agreed that the politically sensitive issue of Luxemburg should be subject to separate negotiations from Belgium

- the Great Powers collectively agreed for French and British troops to be dispatched to Belgium in August 1831 to force the retreat of the Dutch army

- Anglo-French troops (again with the consent of other powers) evicted the Dutch from Antwerp in December 1832

- Russian and Austrian governments were willing to accept the British and French proposals for Belgium due to the restraint shown by both Britain and France towards the revolts in Poland and the Italian states.

Evidence against co-operation

Candidates may justly argue that the resolution of the Belgian Crisis was due mainly to the actions of Britain and France and that the crisis promoted co-operation between these two powers. The Eastern powers played only a minor role in the resolution of the Belgian Conflict because:

- the Polish Revolt distracted Tsar Nicholas I

- revolts in the Italian states distracted Metternich.

Despite the success of the London conference the Great Powers still had difficulty putting aside the interests of their own countries and there were serious disagreements about the following issues:

- the position of Luxembourg as it was part of the German Confederation

- the exact nature of Belgium's boundaries

- the type of government the new Belgian State should have.

Other events which threatened Great Power co-operation

Answers may consider one or more of these events to be a greater threat to the Concert of Europe. Be wary of descriptions of the events; responses should focus on the nature and seriousness of the threat to Great Power co-operation.

- The Greek Revolt

- The Eastern Question

- The 1830–1831 Revolutions in France, Italy and Poland.

Conclusions

A major revision to the Vienna Settlement of 1815 had been made through the creation of a neutral and independent Belgium. The Great Powers had shown restraint and pursued diplomatic co-operation in order to avoid a major European war. However, the extent to which co-operation between the Western and Eastern powers had been promoted can be called into question.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative D: Europe, 1825–1850

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

How important was social unrest as a cause of the 1848 revolutions in Europe?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02

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

Mark as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The 1848 Revolutions in Europe had a number of social, economic and political triggers. The purpose of this question is for candidates to judge the relative importance of social factors against a range of other political and economic factors. Candidates should draw upon evidence from the Revolutions in France, Austria, Germany and Italy.   More sophisticated answers should approach the question in a thematic manner, examining social factors, linking these with economic issues and examining the shorter term political situation in each country. Weaker answers may take a country by country approach, describing social, economic and political conditions, rather than linking and evaluating causational factors.

Evidence of social unrest

The perception of the ruling classes of Europe in 1848 was that social unrest from the 'lower classes' was the trigger for the revolutions of that year. Marxist historians stress the importance of working class actions in bringing about the Revolutions of 1848. However, it is clear that unrest was expressed by a number of social groups. For example, in the Italian States the urban classes were often the vanguard of the original revolutionary surge, yet the peasants were quick to come to the aid of townspeople. In the German States the middle-class liberals grabbed the headlines, but it was the violence of peasant uprisings and the fighting of workers and artisans on the barricades, which frightened the governments into meeting some of the demands of the liberals. The trigger of peasant, artisan and working class unrest can mainly be found in the economic conditions of the mid 1840s, whereas

middle class unrest was usually an expression of discontent about the uneven distribution of political power and the demand for liberalism. The clearer the links and connections made between social, economic and political factors the candidate makes the higher the level of understanding demonstrated.

Economic Factors

The mid 1840s saw a number of economic crises, evidence can range from:

- Agricultural – potato blight (1845), failure of the grain harvest (1846), food riots in Venetia, Verona and the Low Countries

- Industrial – (1845–1847) overproduction and saturated markets, unemployment, low wages

- Financial – rise in bankruptcies amongst the petite bourgeoisie, sharp decline in capital investment and construction projects, rise in government debt.

Political Factors

The middle classes demanded liberalism in France and the German States, whilst in the Habsburg Empire and the Italian States they demanded nationalism. These political demands coupled with the threat of widespread social disorder due to the economic crisis witnessed the almost voluntary capitulation of governments in Europe.

Weak political leadership was certainly an important factor in the initial success of the 1848 Revolutions. Certain monarchs and ministers attracted an exceptional degree of personal unpopularity – King Louis-Philippe and Guizot in France, Metternich and 'Ferdy the Loony' in the Habsburg Empire, King Ludwig in Bavaria and Frederick William IV in Prussia.

Conclusions

Social unrest was clearly an important factor in the causation of the 1848 Revolutions, however, it was generated by a severe widespread economic crisis. Yet ultimately it can be argued that it was the incompetence and lack of nerve of the political leadership of Europe which led to the downfall of Louis-Philippe and the resignation of Guizot and Metternich *et al*. Please note that any of the above factors can be stressed by the candidates as most important.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914

A: The Balkans, 1870–1890

Is nationalism the most important factor in explaining the conflict in the Balkans in the years 1870 to 1890?

Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

This question focuses on the issue of nationalism, but candidates will need to assess this in relation to other factors, appreciating the links and connections between different issues, and providing an integrated assessment on the causes of conflict in the Balkans. Two major events dominate this 20-year period – the Near-Eastern Crisis of 1875–1878 and the Bulgarian Crisis of 1885–1888.

Evidence supporting nationalism as an important factor:

•   the Christian Balkan states were determined to win self-rule or independence from the Muslim Ottoman Empire

•   the threat of an emerging nationalism was evident from 1875 as uprisings and rebellions escalated across the Balkans. In 1875, the oppressed Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina rose in rebellion, and in 1876 the revolt spread to Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro

•   a second crisis occurred in Bulgaria from 1885, arising from a more anti-Russian nationalist movement as Eastern Rumelia announced its union with Bulgaria

•   this crisis marked a new nationalist dimension, with the intra-Balkan rivalry between Serbia and Bulgaria

- the issue of nationalism also focuses beyond the Balkan states to some of the major powers, as Russia saw opportunities for Pan-Slavism, while Austria-Hungary strove to resist the spread of nationalism to her own multi-racial empire

- Balkan nationalism had implications for the major powers who could not ignore the crises as they arose. They could either assist the Balkan states, or 'prop-up' the Ottoman Empire, while putting pressure on the Turkish government to introduce reforms. However, the attitudes of the powers were liable to change according to the nature of the crisis.

Evidence supporting other factors in explaining conflict:

The decline of the Ottoman Empire

- a power vacuum created by the misrule and corruption of the disintegrating empire

- integration had never been attempted; the races and religions, Muslim and Christian, simply co-existed, usually in a state of mutual animosity, until grievances, often economic, provoked uprisings

- the repression of the Turkish government, often accompanied by ferocious slaughter such as the 'Bulgarian Atrocities' of 1876, aggravated the international reaction

- the decline of the empire carried with it the danger of conflict among the Great Powers

- with increasing resentment at European interference, Abdul Hamid II (Sultan from 1876) re-asserted traditional Muslim values in a rearguard action against both nationalist movements from within and European interference from without.

The rival ambitions of the major powers

- Russia wanted to exploit the unrest in the Balkans in order to extend her own influence there

- Austria-Hungary also saw scope for expansion, and wanted Turkey to be weak, but also needed to prop-up the Ottoman Empire

- Britain and France wanted to keep Turkey strong and feared that, if national states were formed, they would be Russian dominated

- Germany wanted to avoid taking sides

- In the crisis of 1875–1878, the actions of the major powers – including the unsuccessful attempts at diplomacy, the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War, and the Treaties of San Stefano and Berlin – all contributed to the continued conflict in the Balkans

- Similarly, attempts to restrain Russia in the Bulgarian Crisis from 1885 destroyed the delicate diplomatic harmony established in Berlin in 1878, and marked a further deterioration in international relations.

At the higher attainment levels, candidates will clearly provide more than a narrative of events and will attempt to analyse and assess the issues, trying to prioritise the causes of

conflict and make links, seeing the connections between Balkan nationalism and the nationalism of the major powers, in the context of the declining Ottoman Empire.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914

  B: **The Balkans, 1890–1914**

    With what success were the major powers able to control events in the Balkans in the years 1890 to 1914?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The fact that the outbreak of war was avoided until 1914 does suggest some degree of control by the major powers, but the crisis of 1914 cannot be seen in isolation. Earlier events might not have led to immediate conflict, but these left a clear legacy of increasing hostility and suspicion, as events began to spiral out of control.

Evidence to support success in controlling events:

- for almost 20 years after 1890, the Balkans were relatively quiet with Russia's diversion to the Far East, and with the 1897 Austro-Russian agreement to maintain the status quo putting the prospect of conflict 'on ice' for a decade

- with the prospect of a crisis in Bosnia in 1908, Austria-Hungary and Russia concluded a bilateral diplomatic agreement which seemed to have defused any chances of conflict. Ultimately, the crisis was contained and controlled, and war was avoided, because Russia received no increased support from Britain and France

- in 1913, the Treaty of London, ending the First Balkan War, was the high water mark of attempts by the major powers to control events in the Balkans, and showed the potential for peace and negotiation. It was a tribute to Anglo-German co-operation in a mediating role, effectively defusing the situation by forcing Austria-Hungary and Russia to compromise

- such diplomatic co-operation could have worked again in 1914, and for 3 weeks after the assassination, there was little indication that events were running out of control or that Europe was moving towards a major crisis. Swift action in a limited military strike against Serbia by Austria-Hungary could also have defused the situation.

Evidence which could be set against this:

- even before the first crisis in 1908, there were ominous signs that the situation in the Balkans was beginning to destabilise beyond the control of the major powers. Nationalism was revived after a change of dynasty in Serbia in 1903. This force sought to unite all Serbs into a Greater Serbia, and was a deadly threat to the Habsburg Empire. Russian support for the Serbs heralded a head-on clash. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the Serbian government's control over the nationalistic secret societies and the army was inadequate

- Austria-Hungary's unexpected unilateral annexation during the Bosnian Crisis in 1908 shocked the other major powers and undermined the chances of international control. The German ultimatum of 1909 was a scarcely veiled threat of military action which ended any chances of diplomatic co-operation. There was no war simply because Russia and Serbia backed down

- the diplomatic progress made at the end of the First Balkan War was quickly undermined by the Second War in 1913, which changed the military balance in the Balkans and precipitated the final crisis. Austria's dominance in the Balkans had been replaced by Russian influence over Serbia; and an enlarged Serbia now posed a threat to Bulgaria and Austria-Hungary, with the latter looking for an excuse to eliminate Serbia

- the assassination at Sarajevo in 1914 was the final straw, leading to an unpredictable chain of event which followed at such speed that diplomacy had little chance to control events or avert war – with 'blank cheque', ultimatum, alliance commitments and accrued suspicions from earlier crises. The complicity of the Serbian government and support from Russia resulted from the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, provoking a significant over-reaction in 1914.

Candidates should show some understanding of the differing contexts of different events, and also appreciate the varied foreign policy aims of the major powers. While some focused on maintaining peace and defusing potential crises, other powers were less worried about destabilising the situation in the Balkans and were more provocative in trying to fulfil policy objectives. However, it might be argued that the momentum for some events was provided by the Balkan states themselves, especially Serbia, making it difficult for the major powers to prevent events escalating into conflict.

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 relative importance of terror and reform in enabling the Bolsheviks to secure their power in Russia between the October/November 1917 Revolution and the end of the Civil War in 1921.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should focus on the key aspects of terror and reform and make a sustained and relevant judgement on their relative importance in enabling the Bolsheviks to stay in power between 1917 and 1921.

'Terror' is an emotive term but in this context can be used for any aspect of force or intimidation used by the Bolsheviks in this period. Force was implicit form the start: the Bolshevik take-over in 1917 had been an organised coup, not a popular uprising. Lenin seized power in Moscow and Petrograd, not the whole country, and very soon faced opposition from forces both on the Left and the Right who had no reason to tolerate this seizure of power by a (relatively) unknown group which just happened to be more organised and determined than most groups in Russia. Russia was in a state of chaos resulting from war and an ineffectual Provisional Government.

Force was used by the Bolsheviks from the start. Elections for the Constituent Assembly took place as previously planned, but when it met in January 1918 with an anti-Bolshevik majority, Lenin simply forcibly dissolved it. Democracy was not on his agenda. The CHEKA, a special police force, was set up explicitly to root out and destroy real or potential enemies of the Bolsheviks. Thousands were executed, not just political enemies but 'social deviants'. In July 1918 the royal family was shot, to avert the possibility of them falling into anti-Bolshevik hands. Intimidation was regarded as an acceptable political weapon. Even the new Red Army had political commissars to ensure obedience to the Party. Decrees in 1918 separating church and state resulted in frequent attacks on church property and personnel.

When War Communism was introduced in the Civil War to ensure production and supplies of food, those such as peasants who resisted requisitioning were ruthlessly crushed. When fighting the Civil War, Trotsky imposed draconian discipline on the Red Army to ensure its obedience. There were frequent acts of brutality (on both sides) during the Civil War. There was an element of intimidation in the way that local Party soviets had their powers reduced in favour of centralised Communist control from Moscow. Other forms of persuasion and control were adopted, such as vigorous propaganda, but use of force and terror was an integral part of the Bolshevik regime, justified by Lenin as necessary to enable the Communists to survive in a hostile world and build socialism at a time when they were being attacked not just by Russian opponents but foreign interventionists.

Reforms were also carried out by the Bolsheviks as part of their plans for a new society. The church was separated from the state and religious teaching banned in schools. Banks and businesses were nationalised. Inheritance was abolished. A new electoral system was introduced, excluding 'class enemies'. Land ownership was abolished. People's courts replaced the old legal system. The class system was abolished. Women were granted full equality. Divorce was made easier and abortion legalised.

What cannot be determined is the precise effect of these policies. Some people may have benefited, some were clearly opposed, particularly those with money and influence from the previous regime who lost wealth, position and often their freedom and lives. Any reforms were introduced at a time when the Bolsheviks were fighting for their lives, and the state was in chaos, whilst the Bolsheviks only controlled a small part of pre-war Russia. Whether these measures secured much popular support for the Bolsheviks is debatable: it may have depended on the extent to which ordinary people believed Party propaganda.

There were other important factors in enabling the Bolsheviks to secure their power. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which ended Russian participation in the First World War early in 1918, gave the Bolsheviks a brief but crucial breathing space. During the bloody Civil War of 1918–1921, the Bolsheviks won not just because of their ruthlessness and geographical and strategic advantages but because their enemies were weak and disorganised: the White forces lacked unity and a coherent purpose beyond exterminating the Bolsheviks; the Allied intervention was half-hearted and largely ineffectual.

Whilst credit should be given for rational discussion of these factors, the key focus should be on terror and reform, however these are defined. Whilst most answers may well conclude that force in all its forms is what ultimately secured Bolshevik control, there is no simple answer, and a supported argument should be credited.

Summary

Use of terror: Bolshevik philosophy of Terror; treatment of Constituent Assembly; Cheka; requisitioning under War Communism; atrocities in Civil War; execution of royal family; Trotsky's ruthless control of Red Army.

Reform: Church reform; land reform; social reform; class warfare; women's rights; nationalisation.

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 Trotsky's own weaknesses and errors were
   responsible for his failure to secure the leadership of the USSR following
   Lenin's death in 1924.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Trotsky was clearly one of the leading contenders for power as Lenin's death approached.
Despite his Menshevik origins, he had good revolutionary credentials having been in exile
and tsarist prisons, and along with Lenin he played a crucial part in the 1917 success,
planning the Bolshevik coup and organising the Red Guards. He had also played a crucial
role in the Petrograd Soviet. He negotiated the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk after the Bolshevik
takeover. During the Civil War he helped to ensure the Red victory through his ruthlessness
and effective leadership of the Red Army. He was intelligent and a great orator.

However, Trotsky also had weaknesses, some of his own making, some not. His intellectual
strengths were sometimes interpreted as arrogance. Like many other leading Bolsheviks, he
was Jewish, and in a society in which anti-Semitism was strong, he himself felt that it might
damage the Party if he became leader. He had crossed swords with the dangerous Stalin
during the Civil War, over his employment of ex-tsarist officers in the Red Army. Crucially,
Trotsky had no real power base in the Party and did little to cultivate one, and this was to be
a major weakness after 1924. Even his Red Army officers were lukewarm towards him after
the Civil War, feeling that he was not promoting their interests sufficiently. Yet ironically
some colleagues feared that Trotsky might use his position in the Army to carry out a military
coup. Lenin himself had doubts about his suitability as leader, expressed in his Testament.
Trotsky, for all his abilities, could be highly strung and was prone to falling ill at crucial times.

Trotsky also made serious tactical errors. He acquired a reputation for opportunism and lack
of consistency. As a hardliner, he attacked aspects of Lenin's policy such as NEP, because

of its compromise with capitalism. He became a spokesman for 'Permanent' or World Revolution, the idea that in a hostile capitalist world, the USSR should devote its energies to promoting revolution abroad. Stalin's policy of Socialism in One Country, building up Russia's strength, seemed more appropriate in the 1920s when Russia was recovering from war. After Lenin's death Trotsky agreed with leading colleagues not to publish Lenin's Testament, in the interests of Party unity, because it criticised leading Communists. He missed an opportunity thereby to defeat Stalin, who was the most criticised – an example of Trotsky's vain underestimation of Stalin, whom he could not accept as his intellectual equal. Trotsky also appeared to be an opportunist. Having been opposed by Kamenev, Zinoviev and Stalin before 1924, Trotsky now joined with the first two to oppose Stalin. Trotsky was no match for Stalin, and simply would not 'demean' himself to actively campaign for power. He missed Lenin's funeral and had no answer to Stalin's tactics of building up support within the Party. By 1927 Trotsky had lost his place on Central Committee, and within two years had been exiled from the USSR for good.

Clearly Trotsky's weaknesses were significant and he certainly failed to build on his earlier successes before 1921. However, this does not mean that his weaknesses alone were responsible for his demise. Other leading Bolsheviks – notably Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukharin – were singularly ineffective in gaining the succession or even staying at the centre of policy-making. This was largely due to Stalin's skill as General Secretary in building up a strong base of Party support and presenting himself as a man of the centre. Everyone underestimated Stalin until it was too late. Trotsky continued to write at length about these events, but his explanation that Stalin rode to power on the back of war weariness was unconvincing. Trotsky continued to underestimate the man who drove him into the wilderness and imposed his own version of socialism on the USSR.

Clearly Trotsky's ultimate failure and Stalin's success were a combination of Trotsky's weaknesses, Stalin's strengths and several other factors, some planned, some accidental. Therefore there is no simple answer to this question, but any well-argued and supported case should be credited.

Summary

Trotsky's weaknesses: lack of Party base; Menshevik past; arrogance; fear of his potential military power.

Trotsky's mistakes: perceived opportunism; failure to build up support; changing alliances; underestimation of Stalin; unpopular policies.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938

     A: **The Weimar Republic, c1925–1933**

         How important was the part played by the right-wing conservative élites in undermining the stability of the Weimar Republic between 1925 and 1933?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on the influence of the conservative élites – in particular the landowners, big business, the civil service, judiciary and the armed forces in undermining Weimar democracy. Although the traditional view is that the Republic enjoyed relative political stability between 1925 and 1929, and that democracy was not doomed until the German economy collapsed after 1929, candidates should consider (although they are not obliged to accept) the alternative view that the stability was only superficial and that increasing criticism from the right wing undermined and eventually destroyed it.

Relevant material on the the importance of the right wing elites may include: the engrained right wing hostility which continued throughout this period and which questioned the 'legitimacy' of the Republic. This reflected the pre-war lack of tradition of democratic government:

- the continued importance of the army and military values stemming from the Ebert-Groener pact and the need to restore order in 1918–1919 which helped perpetuate the long term authoritarian tradition and provided sympathy and recruits for the right wing extremists

- right wing hostility to the continuation of the terms of Versailles and reparations, despite Stresemann's attempts to rehabilitate Germany in Europe

- the revival of the DNVP under Hugenberg from 1928 and a growing rightwards shift which played into the hands of the Nazis

- right wing dislike of democratic procedures encouraged by Hindenburg's leadership from 1925, leading to the breakdown of coalitions and support for the increased use of Article 48 after 1930

- successful right wing demands for agricultural protectionism which worsened the effects of the depression for the majority and helped increase the instability of the depression

- judicial and institutional favouritism which allowed right wing extremism to grow and go largely unpunished. Hitler's SA relied on favourable treatment from authorities

- right wing support increased Nazi prestige after Hitler's showing in the 1932 Presidential election

- Prussian landowners persuaded Hindenburg to dismiss Brüning, leaving the way open for those who were prepared to do a deal with the Nazis

- right wing aristocratic forces (chancellors, president and supporters) indulged in political manoeuvrings (1930–1933) which brought Hitler to power.

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

- the imperfect constitution which left the President with considerable powers and involved a system of proportional representation

- the legacy of Versailles, the loss of territory and reparations which created an intolerable economic burden and left Germany vulnerable to economic forces beyond their own control from 1929

- the appeal of extremism – Nazism (and Hitler in particular) and Communism which extended (most particularly in the case of the latter) far beyond the right-wing elites. Effective electoral campaigns, a sense of chaos/fear in the Depression and following the death of Stresemann all helped win support for the extremists

- economic crisis which left 6 million (a third of workforce) unemployed by 1932, destroyed businesses and trade and had a huge psychological impact

- inept leadership – coalitions which could not agree on action and lack of understanding of how to deal with the budget deficit created by the demand for unemployment benefits and the desperate undemocratic measure taken to try to get the economic situation under control.

Answers are likely to conclude that it was a combination of factors, most particularly the economic crisis and the political manoeuvrings of Hindenburg, Schleicher, Papen and Hitler which brought the Weimar Republic to the edge of collapse 1929–1933, but that the attitude of the conservative élites from 1925 (and before) was crucial in the destabilising of the Republic.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938

      B: **The Nazi consolidation of power, 1930–1938**

            Examine the extent to which the Nazi Party had established control over Germany by the end of 1933.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on the Nazi consolidation of power up to the end of 1933, but they will almost certainly need to look beyond this date in order to establish just how far the Nazis had supreme control by the end of their first year in power. Thoughtful candidates should also pay heed to the fact that the question asks about the Nazi Party – not Hitler, and this could provide some opportunity for a discussion of the nature of Nazi government. (Although this is certainly not essential.)

Material on the degree to which the Nazi Party had established control might include:

- Hitler's position as Chancellor and the Enabling Act

- the Nazi seizure of power in the Länder (first steps to ending federalism – completed Jan 1934)

- the abolition of trade unions (May), and other political parties (by June/July)

- the purging/controlling of the civil service and police

- control of the media permitting the spread of Nazi Party ideas through schools, universities and cultural life

- Nazi control over youth movements and the workplace making opposition difficult to organise and complementing the political process by the winning of mass support for the Nazi way of life

- the beginnings of the terror state (first concentration camp at Dachau in March 1933)

- the persecution of the Jews (boycott of Jewish shops and Jews banned from civil service and other professions, April 1933), in accordance with party policy

- Nazis placed in leading positions in government and administration and the law of July 14th 1933 which declared Germany a one party state. Local gauleiters, reinforced Nazi Party control and prevented opposition.

To balance the answer candidates will need to refer to areas of government where Nazi Party control was absent or incomplete:

- the Nazi Party was not even united in itself at the end of 1933. Central control over the SA was not established until the Night of the Long Knives in June 1934

- different interest groups persisted within the Party (e.g. Hitler Youth and local Gauleiters sometimes conflicted with central leaders or acted independently; to 1934 there was conflict between SS and SA). Lack of clarification in party structure and Hitler's preference for 'personal' government meant the Party was never monolithic

- the Protestant Church had divided allegiance and despite the Catholic Concordat (July 1933) there was still uncertain control of this institution which felt greater allegiance to the Pope than the Nazi Party

- there had been no attempt to nazify big business and the loyalty of this interest was not assured particularly while the SA remained strong

- the Presidency and the Army remained independent institutions. The army resented the SA and while Hindenburg lived, Hitler's power was circumscribed. It could be argued that the Nazi Party had limited control until Hitler's assumption of the Presidency and the army oath of allegiance (1934) and that the army still remained a 'separate pillar' until dismissal of Blomberg and Fritsch, 1938 and even after this, control was not total.

Although some candidates may successfully argue that Nazi Party control had been completed by the end of 1933, by the rapid legal revolution and the destruction of opposition and the potential for opposition, the majority are likely to suggest that total power had not been fully achieved. Some may argue that it took until June 1934, while others may argue that it never came about.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

> **A: Britain and Kenyan Independence, 1953 to 1964**
>
> Examine the extent to which Britain's use of force in Kenya in the years 1953 to 1959 contributed to the achievement of independence in 1963.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the extent to which British military violence led to the decision to grant Kenya its independence. Candidates will also have to consider other factors which contributed towards independence in order to assess the relative importance of violence in the process.

- **British military violence:** the State of Emergency was created in October 1952 and continued until 1959. There are numerous examples of Britain's use of violence and aggressive tactics in order to neutralise the effectiveness of the Mau Mau and ultimately to destroy it as a terrorist organisation. Particular reference may be made to the role of the Home Guards and the King's African Rifles. The use of internment and communal punishments may also be referred to. During this period the British dropped 50,000 tons of bombs and fired over two million machine gun rounds. Candidates may suggest that the violence was very effective in undermining the impact of Mau Mau terror and thereby weakened the Mau Mau to the point where it was clear that British tactics were not contributing to the achievement of independence but the exact opposite. Equally candidates may examine the political impact of the violence used during the Hola Camp Massacre in March 1959. This lead directly to a change in personnel, the new Governor became Sir Patrick Renison, a man committed to Kenyan independence.

Other Factors:

- **Mau Mau terror:** there are many examples of Mau Mau terror. Candidates may seek to consider the destabilising effect of this terror and the chaos it brought to Kenya. Comments on this could be linked to the above. The international notice that the Mau Mau brought to the struggle for independence may also be examined as could the costs Britain faced in controlling the terror.

- **The role of Macmillan:** candidates may suggest that Macmillan was the key player in the achievement of independence although the Hola Camp Massacre has a significant impact on his approach. Answers may also explore the wider objectives of Macmillan in terms of establishing economic prosperity and strategic power for Britain beyond the confines of imperial possessions in Africa. There is an opportunity to balance the impact of Hola against the possibly more fundamental priorities identified by Macmillan.

- **Pan-African nationalism:** candidates may consider the impact of the wider process of continental African nationalism. Reference to Macmillan's 'Winds of change' speech may be made here. Candidates may consider examples of African nationalism being very effective, e.g. the impact of the Suez Crisis on Britain's imperial attitudes. The granting of independence to Ghana in 1957 may also be examined in this general context.

- **Multi racialism and constitutional changes:** there were some attempts to develop limited power sharing through constitutional reforms, e.g. the Lyttleton Constitution. Links may be made to Mau Mau's influence in this change.

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 use of force by both the French and the Algerians in the years 1954 to 1962 contributed to the achievement of independence for Algeria.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this essay is on the impact of both military and FLN violence and the relative importance of this collective violence to the achievement of independence for Algeria. Candidates will need to consider a range of other factors in order to determine the importance of violence.

- **FLN violence:** this can be traced from about 1955 to 1958. The terror had the effect of forcing France to commit thousands of troops to control it, destabilising the state of Algeria, generating international attention, promoting anti-government public opinion in France and necessitating that De Gaulle ultimately had to address the issues demanded by the FLN. However, candidates may balance against the fact that by 1958 the effectiveness of the FLN had been greatly undermined by very effective French military tactics. This may suggest that ultimately the FLN's contribution to independence was limited.

- **The army:** the army was determined not to suffer another humiliation of the kind in Indo-China and later in Suez. Military terror was adopted as the primary tactic and this resulted in huge loss of life to ordinary Algerians. Military terrorism only served to bolster the FLN and its membership. Candidates may suggest that the army deepened the crisis rather than contributed towards its control. Some may suggest that this heightened De Gaulle's determination to bring the issue to an end diplomatically. The army's use of violence may also be extended to the development of the OAS. OAS violence and the report it received in Algeria from disaffected colons

is a fertile area that candidates may explore to determine the negative impact of the violence and its influence of French politicians.

Other Factors:

- **De Gaulle:** He was crucial in the process leading to independence. The creation of the Fifth Republic gave him the chance to establish political stability in France – stability that the OAS was challenging after 1958. The Fifth Republic also ended the political instability associated with the Fourth Republic. De Gaulle's own priorities for France may be explored and candidates may suggest that although the violence had an impact on De Gaulle the key issue was France's role in the new European Community.

- **French public opinion:** the violence certainly generated much anti-government public opinion and it was a priority of De Gaulle's to neutralise this in order to preserve his own position and stabilise French politics. Both the violence of the army and the FLN contributed to this factor.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

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

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

How important was the Provisional Government's decision to stay in the First World War in explaining the Bolshevik seizure of power in October/November 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.

By the end of 1916 Russia was limping towards certain military defeat. Factories were unable to provide the equipment needed at the front; the transport infrastructure was at a standstill due to shortage of coal; soldiers were hungry and dispirited and simply gave up the hopeless struggle, morale and discipline had broken down. Nicholas II was overwhelmed by a breakdown in social and economic order in February 1917. It was clear the Tsar's chaotic and ineffective rule should come to an end and he abdicated on March 2, 1917.

The Provisional Government supported by the soviets, SRs and Mensheviks took the deeply unpopular decision to continue the war and avoid making a separate peace with Germany, possibly paving the way for German victory over Great Britain and France (Russia's allies). Most workers, soldiers and peasants however wanted an end to the hostilities. Despite this, the Provisional Government planned a new offensive for June 1917 in Galicia. It was a complete failure. A number of Bolshevik anti-war demonstrations took place in early July (the July Days) beginning at Kronstadt then spreading to various cities. The Provisional Government suppressed the Bolshevik leadership, forcing many, including Lenin, back in to exile. Some historians, like Marc Ferro, view the First World War, in particular the Provisional Government's decision to stay in the war, as the vital factor which led to revolution in October.

Other historians stress the brilliant leadership skills of Lenin and the superb organisational abilities of Trotsky in explaining the Bolshevik seizure of power. The Bolshevik leaders were able to take advantage of the mistakes made by the Provisional Government and the other

political parties. These historians, such as E H Carr, point to the limited popular support for the Bolsheviks, and explain the Bolshevik Revolution as a *coup d'état*.

- Lenin proved himself to be clear thinking and decisive at a time of political confusion. His *April Theses* outlined his demands for peace ending the 'predatory imperialist war' (Lenin) and the transfer of power to the soviets. His appeal was based partly on the decision to keep Russia in the war, but also on other mistakes made by the Provisional Government

- Trotsky joined the Bolshevik Party in the summer of 1917. He played a major part in organising opposition to the Provisional Government as President of the Petrograd soviet, and planned the seizure of power in detail.

Lenin's influence on events was immense. He was the driving force behind the Bolsheviks believing that the small workers' party, if tightly disciplined and well-led, could destroy the provisional government and lead Russia towards socialism.

The record of the Provisional Government itself, during the short period in power, was mixed and also explains the Bolshevik seizure of power. Members of the Duma and Petrograd Soviet set up the Provisional Government led by Prince Lvov to exercise power until a new constituent assembly (to create a new constitution) was put in place. The Kadets, many of whom preferred to retain some sort of constitutional monarchy, dominated the Provisional Government. The only representative of a revolutionary group was Kerensky, an SR. Kerensky was middle class, liberal and democratic. The Mensheviks backed the Provisional Government because they too wanted a more liberal and democratic system of government in Russia. It passed various reforms including free press, free speech, an eight-hour day, release of political prisoners and abolition of the death penalty.

Despite these measures the Provisional Government proved itself to be politically inept and indecisive.

- it delayed introducing a programme of land reform adding to resentment in the countryside and opening up Lenin's appeal over 'Land'. The Russian people were not willing to wait for the end of the war before true social reform began

- it allowed a dual system of government to develop tolerating the local soviets, that had sprung up in the cities. They were not yet rivals. The Bolshevik Revolution on October 25 would be started by a declaration in the Petrograd Congress of Soviets that the Provisional Government had been overthrown

- it delayed setting up elections to a constituent assembly. This proved a critical error as the SRs would surely have won a huge majority and so exposed the limited support for Bolshevism in Russia

- it was hampered by the Kornilov affair in September 1917. General Kornilov tried to strengthen the power of the liberals in the Provisional Government but only undermined its credibility.

By July Lenin had persuaded the Bolshevik party that the time was right to seize power through the soviets. The Bolsheviks secretly prepared a dedicated elite of professional revolutionaries for the task. While the Bolsheviks were organised, their rivals were not. By late September the Bolsheviks had gained control in both the Petrograd and Moscow soviets. In October Lenin launched his programme of 'all power to the soviets'. On October 25, Lenin and Trotsky used the Red Guards and loyal soldiers and sailors to seize control of

key points in the city of Petrograd and to drive the provisional government from the official government building. The next day Bolsheviks took up new jobs in government, Lenin was appointed chairman and Trotsky Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

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 was Germany's defeat in the First World War in explaining
>   political extremism in Germany in the years 1918 to 1920?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Germany's defeat cannot be easily separated from the political changes and extremism in
Germany October-November 1918. By late 1918 the military defeat of Germany was a
certainty, and even Ludendorff recognised it. Facing Allied invasion and internal upheaval,
he agreed to set up a constitutional monarchy. He did this to pre-empt revolution among the
people, to secure more lenient peace terms and to remove responsibility for defeat from the
military and conservative establishment. In this tangled web lies the origins of the 'stab in
the back myth' i.e. the idea that German democratic politicians betrayed their country by
asking unnecessarily for a ceasefire, so earning the nickname 'November Criminals'.

Prince Max of Baden became Chancellor. Over the next few weeks a series of constitutional
reforms were introduced making Germany into a parliamentary democracy with the
Chancellor and his government answerable to the Reichstag rather than the Kaiser. At the
same time armistice negotiations were opened with the Allies. Germany was being pushed
into these changes by the realisation that the war was lost. Public opinion had been formed
in the war years by hardship and optimistic propaganda; and the situation rapidly
deteriorated into a potentially revolutionary situation. Political extremism flourished.

For many Germans, the news that the government was negotiating an armistice was a great
blow. The November Revolution began as Prince Max's government lost control of the
sailors at Kiel.   The Kiel mutiny on October 28 fanned flames of discontent throughout
Germany and, by November 8, soviet-style workers' councils were set up across German
cities. A socialist republic was declared in Bavaria. Modern historians tend to argue that the
politically extreme language was that of the left-wing socialist revolutionary movement, but

the political intent was to set up liberal democracy. The only two exceptions to this moderate stance were in Dresden and Leipzig. This political extremism appears at first sight to be revolutionary and to be prompted by the defeat, but it was little more a wave of popular discontent.

The Spartacists organised political violence on the extreme left. They were driven by desire for social and economic change, but were very disunited over political change. The defeat was not a key factor here, the Spartacist political extremism broke out in Berlin because leading Spartacists wanted to achieve socialism, though the background of German society in a state of near collapse, partly due to the defeat cannot be ignored. Historians used to consider the Spartacists and other left wing revolts as evidence that Ebert saved Germany from Bolshevism. Recent historians have re-examined the challenge from the left, and conclude that few of the left wing challenges were extreme, and that the threat from the left has been exaggerated. The government compromised with the conservative forces, such as relying on the Freikorps to defeat the Spartacists, and unintentionally played into the hands of more serious political violence. Ebert-Groener and Stinnes-Legien agreements are further evidence that the new democratic government acted to ensure stability by strengthening its hand against the extreme left.

Right wing political extremism took on various forms. It connected to the 'stab in the back', and therefore to the defeat; it blamed a range of unpatriotic forces that included socialists, Jews, pacifists, and democrats; it was incensed by the treatment of the German delegation at Versailles and by the terms of the Peace Treaty especially the war guilt clause. It sought to destroy the democratic constitution of the Weimar Republic and to establish nationalist-style dictatorship. Right wing extremism came from various political parties as well as paramilitary organisations. The Freikorps were almost certainly behind 'Organisation Consul' which assassinated two key signatories of Versailles – Erzberger and Rathenau. The Kapp-Luttwitz Putsch in 1920 was significant as it showed the right wing sympathies of the army who refused to fire on the revolt, and the judiciary who granted Luttwitz early retirement after the putsch.

The new constitution ironically emerged as an unintended reason for political violence in these years. It outlined basic rights to be enjoyed by German citizens however the civil service, judiciary and army elites were left virtually unreformed so preserving the authoritarian state apparatus.

Candidates may well conclude that the defeat was more a cause of right than left wing extremism; but above all Germany was practically ungovernable given the political vacuum after the abdication, the lack of support for new democratic government, and the immense social and economic hangover from defeat.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

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

     C: **'Mutilated Victory': Italy and the First World War, 1915–1920**

         How important was the threat of socialist revolution in Italy in explaining the emergence of Fascism by the end of 1920?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The question asks candidates to consider how far Fascism was a response to the perceived growing threat from the political left in Italy, and how far other factors explain the emergence of Fascism by the end of 1920. These factors might include the impact of the First World War, the terms of the 'mutilated peace', the lessons of d'Annunzio, and Mussolini's personal ambition and political skills.

Italy had been divided before the war leaving the Liberal regime under attack from the right and left. The Soviet revolution in Russia inspired many socialists to improve their position through a series of strikes while returning peasant soldiers seized land. Discontent among the industrial and rural workers led to increased membership of the Socialist party in the years of economic crisis after the war as inflation and unemployment undermined living standards. The Socialists talked of using force and Trade Unions organised a wave of strikes – the Biennio Rosso (two red years). In 1920 the PSI (Italian Socialist Party) won elections to many town councils. This drove many of the elite to support Fascism.

Other factors: The war strained Italy and therefore weakened the government leading to political instability allowing for the emergence of Fascism. The events leading up to, and the consequences of, Caporetto October 1917 when the Italians suffered a major defeat partly explain later political developments. The defeat had massive domestic implications.

- the disaster was blamed on subversion of the war effort by defeatist and pacifist forces, and so the government put even more restrictions on the anti-war labour

movement and Socialist party. This government repression hardened the Socialist outlook adding to the threat from the left

- the government had to rally Italy after Caporetto and so tried to make the war popular by presenting post-war world as a reward for Italian wartime sacrifices. This raised the expectation of wide-ranging reform, and so fanned demands for radical right politics when the reconstruction proved insufficient.

The political social and economic impact of war added to the appeal of Fascism:

- food shortages led to food riots e.g. Turin 1917 where workers opposed the war
- the experience of trench warfare hardened soldiers' attitudes against war profiteers and industrial workers who stayed on the Home Front and gained from rising wages
- the war demands led to swift industrialisation and the emergence of new industries and larger working class
- the army command undermined the political system e.g. General Cadorna blamed the defeats on the weak government.

Events after the war built on all these tensions and often the Liberal government response was ineffectual opening up the way to fascism.

- the peace settlement terms contrasted to the 'radiant days of May' when Italy joined the war in 1915. Orlando got most of the promised land but failed to secure colonies in Africa, Fiume or N. Dalmatia hence the 'mutilated peace'. The weak Liberal government seemed to have let the country down and the Fascists offered a convincing alternative government for Italy
- the Fiume incident highlighted the bold action taken by d'Annunzio. As Commander of Fiume he gave identity to Fascism, e.g. through the speeches, salute and his talk of a corporate state. The Fascists adopted some of his political techniques during their emergence as a political force in Italy.

Beside all these factors candidates will need to balance the political appeal of the Fascists:

- the character and role of Mussolini. D Mack Smith argues Fascism was the means one man devised of winning power
- their appeal to a range of people e.g. anti-Socialists, members of various elites
- the use of the blackshirts from 1919.

Even in 1919 the Fascists were still relatively weak as seen in the November 1919 elections when no Fascist candidate was elected. Good responses may well investigate this. By the end of 1920 Fascist support had grown. This coincided with Mussolini's decision to drop his radical policies and instead to promote Italian prestige, economic development and strong leadership.

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 the part played by public health reform in explaining population change in Britain between 1870 and 1945?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Some typical information which may be considered for the importance of public health reform:

•   the fall in death rates which accompanied the fall in birth rates was due to greater compulsion in health legislation enforcing higher standards

•   the Public Health Act of 1875 and subsequent legislation on food safety

•   the improvements in public health provided more support for pregnant women, e.g. maternity clinics in Birmingham, after the Great War

•   higher spending on health provision by government after 1919

•   the recognition given to single mothers after the First World War and therefore better care for them and their children.

Other Factors:

•   the rise in living standards for the working class 1873–1900 owing to the falling food prices

•   improved provision of housing from the Artisans Dwellings Act (1875) through the Addison, Chamberlain, Wheatley and Greenwood Acts

- the growing use of artificial contraception amongst the middle class after 1918, e.g. Marie Stopes 'Married Love' replacing 'natural methods' pre-1914, mainly abstention and prostitutes

- the increase in working class women after 1920 finding means of natural contraception as well as growing awareness of artificial contraception

- the fear of repeated pregnancies due to very high peri-natal death rates between 1919 and 1939 due to poor diet

- the higher proportion of women getting married after the First World War

- the postponement of families due to wartime and therefore the loss of potential births to fertile women

- the impact of 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**

Was Free Trade the most important factor in the strength of the Lancashire Cotton Industry in the period 1870–1914?
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.

Reasons why Free Trade would be seen as critical:

- the need to secure raw materials form abroad at the lowest possible cost as competitors entered the market

- the ability to access markets for all raw materials including food at the lowest cost so that wages could remain low – this is especially true after 1873

- agreements such as the Treaty of Berlin of 1875 which guaranteed free trade in West Africa, an important export market for Lancashire goods

- British action to control Egypt – an important source of cotton

- any tariff on US cotton would have increased costs considerably

- the steady decline of cotton as other countries introduced tariffs.

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

- the comparative advantage already established by 1870

- restrictions on Trade Unions prior to 1875 and after the Taff Vale judgement

- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton

- the existence of the Empire to provide both raw materials and markets especially with the destruction of the Indian cotton industry

- the role of the Royal Navy in protecting British commerce, for example, in opening up China.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941

A: America, 1919 to 1929

How important were technological developments in bringing about a consumer boom in the USA 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 will need to look at a variety of technological developments such as the invention of electricity and its availability and explore how this could lead to consumers into buying more consumer products.

The relationship between invention and newer and better consumer items could also be discussed leading to a growth in consumers buying products such as Hoovers, refrigerators, radios. The low cost of products, e.g. Fords (which were due to the development of mass production techniques) also encouraged people to buy cars. Developments in media such as silent film led to more consumers of theatre tickets.

Other factors for a consumer boom need to be balanced against the importance of technological developments:

•   consumer attitudes – people wanted to be fashionable and buy new goods

•   advertising which encouraged people to buy new products such as the famous Hoover adverts

•   salesmen encouraged a growth in sales because there was a lot of doorstep selling

•   the availability of products: there were lots more, different models to try etc. and no problems getting hold of items thanks to mass production. Although Fords did tend to be black model Ts for the less well off, there were also luxury cars for the well off

- with the move to the suburbs housewives wanted and needed more consumer goods, such as refrigerators, radios etc.

- rise in income and availability of HP (hire purchase) meant consumers could buy more goods using credit.

Conclusion

There were a large range of reasons for a consumer boom, not just technological advances. Technological advances meant low cost and the development and availability of electricity did fuel a boom in household products, yet people did need money to buy them so the fact that there were jobs and employment was booming also had a very important part to play.

Alternatively, some candidates may argue that the Republican governments, by helping to foster easy credit and big business, were really responsible for the boom. Alternatively new media forms, which fostered a must-have society, may have been a very important factor as well.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS** **HS03**

Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941

> **B:** **The New Deal, 1933–1941**
>
> With what success did the New Deal address the problems of industry 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.

Context

Candidates need to explain the problems that industry faced in this period and how measures in the New Deal tried to solve them.

Problems

- shut downs due to lack of investment

- over expansion and loans that firms could not pay back

- lack of consumer buying power owing to unemployment policies

- inability to solve their own problems under Hoover

- lack of credit from banks where banks had failed or shut down

- cost of importing raw materials

- lack of overseas markets because other countries were in a depression and defaulting on loans and repayments

- lack of confidence in stock market and so capital dried up

- poor industrial relations because of having to make so many people unemployed and paying them very low wages.

Solutions

- FDR in the first 100 days tried to restore confidence in the finance industry by closing it down and re-opening those banks with sound credit

- tried to help unemployment through raft of measures such as CCC, WPA, AAA so that they had money to buy industrial products and hence help industry

- Dawes Plan to help foreign nations

- work on infrastructure owing to change in economic policy, i.e. spending on projects which stimulated industries involved with road building etc.

- New Deal was a variety of experiments to help industry amongst other areas, e.g. TVA helped industry in an indirect way by bringing electricity to a deprived area. Better industrial relations to bring worker and employer together, e.g. Wagner Act.

Conclusion

Despite a lot of experimentation and a switch to Keynesian economic principles there was another depression in 1937–1938. Industry was brought out of this depression and the hangover from the last by the build up to World War II which brought about renewed exports. Therefore the New Deal was only partially successful in bringing about recovery.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1135

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

        Examine the extent to which it was the need for an army that led William to introduce the system of military feudalism into England.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should focus on the importance of William's military needs but there are other aspects to consider. These include the need to exercise royal patronage and the use of the system as a method of control and government.
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.

- **Military Factors**
  The nature of the conquest meant William needed an army, but could not afford to finance and supply a purely royal force that was large enough (estimates range from 4000-6000 men) for his needs. Military quotas based on the land holding patterns of his tenants in chief (both ecclesiastical and lay) were at the heart of the system. The quotas appear to be arbitrary at this stage.
  The apparent timing of its introduction suggests that the need became paramount as threats of rebellion and foreign invasion grew. Orderic Vitalis noted the change within the first phase of conquest from Hastings to c1071. At first William was prepared to use influential Englishmen but after the fall of Edwin and Morcar, more land was distributed to provide military protection, particularly in the north.
  The system incorporated castles held by appointed castellans and these were used as a method of extending the conquest, both through pacification and colonisation (Holderness, the Pennine crossings, North Wales), as defence against native rebellion (York, Durham) and to guard against invasion (Sussex rapes).

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

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

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

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1135

  B: Developments in Monasticism, 1066–1135

         How important was the introduction of new Orders in the monastic revival in
         England in the years 1066 and 1135?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates would need some familiarity with the nature of English monasticism before the
conquest but it is not envisaged that real depth of knowledge would be required pre-1066.
Answers should consider the nature of change as well as the agents of that change and
place England within the context of the wider European reform movement. At the highest
levels, answers should show understanding of the interaction of various factors and will be
expected to arrive at a reasoned, well-balanced conclusion. The range of relevant factors
will include the effects of Normanisation, and of increased patronage on the status and
economy of the monasteries, as well as the effects of the new Orders. A range of well-
chosen factual examples should support answers.

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

*   Anglo Saxon monasteries had been independent and followed their own customs
    though they still subscribed to the Rule of St. Benedict and were subject to outside
    reforming movements. From 1066–1135 monasteries were organised into Orders
    which took direction from the Mother house and followed a common Rule in every
    detail. They were not isolated from religious trends in western Christendom, following
    ideas in ecclesiastical reform, were responsible for developments in historical writing,
    hagiography and architecture, and brought about a degree of social and economic
    change, particularly in the north

- the forerunner was Cluny (Lewes 1077) and by 1135 there were 24 dependencies. The first generation of incomers gave grants of land to Norman houses rather than English ones and independent Benedictine houses were established after the conquest (Battle, Chester, Shrewsbury, Colchester). The second generation saw themselves more in the light of Anglo-Normans and the impact of Cluny was felt more forcefully. The major period of expansion was 1079–1100 (Much Wenlock, Bermondsey, Daventry, Pontefract, Northampton). These had no real 'English' dimension and were a form familiar to Normans – loosely organised and playing no part in public life, though supporting for the most part, close cooperation between Church and monarchy. The conqueror's daughter, Adela of Blois, became a Cluniac nun in widowhood, persuaded Henry I to found Reading and had her son Henry, future bishop of Winchester, enter the Order. Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny visited Peterborough with a view to bringing it under his rule. This was not enthusiastically accepted by the monks there who saw his reforming severity as religious persecution.

- by 1153 there were 50 Cistercian houses in England. These were the aristocracy; the leaders came from noble families and their patrons were magnates. Although monastic virtues may have been attractive only to the nobility (the peasants already lived in poverty and owed obedience to their lords) the Cistercians did recruit 'conversi' – lay brothers – whose labour on the 'desert sites' they favoured increased agricultural prosperity in the north and later in Wales

- there were 60 houses of Augustinian canons by the reign of Henry I. Around 1095 the influence of Gregorian reform had led to the creation of St. Botolph's at Colchester and this order of canons was to benefit from the patronage of Henry I and particularly his queen, Matilda. They fulfilled parochial functions and pastoral work in a wider context than the monasteries (St. Bartholomew's – care of the sick). Instead of withdrawing to huge estates like Rievaulx, they brought religious life to the laity

- there were changes in the design and layout of monastic churches. Originally according to the Regularis Concordia, the three distinct areas of the church had equal architectural and religious status. This can be seen at Winchester, which retained its dedication to the native Swithun and continued the Anglo-Saxon liturgical calendar and the English custom of the west end being the place of the king's crown wearing. After 1070 monastic churches followed the Decreta of Lanfranc, where the design concentrated worship in the east end, the choir and the transept (Christ Church Canterbury, Rochester, Evesham, St. Albans, Durham). The Cluniacs contributed lavish design and an Anglo-Norman style had developed by the 12th century with rounded arches showing incised patterns

- in the first generation after the conquest, there was spoliation of English houses, removal of native ecclesiastical leaders, a tightening of discipline with Lanfranc's reforms and the introduction of some new liturgical practices. This led to some racial tension and culture clash but was gradually replaced by the benefits of being brought into the mainstream of European monasticism. English elements were still retained

- this was not all one way and there was cultural interchange on an increased scale. The effect of an Italian archbishop from Normandy, Norman abbots on the wake of the conquest and the impact of Bernard of Clairvaux can be balanced against the role of Englishman Stephen Harding in the constitution of Clairvaux – the Carta Caritatis and Bernard's secretary William returning to plant Cistercian monasticism in the north. The religious vocation was no longer limited to a choice between the solitary existence of a hermit and the somewhat aristocratic ambiance of a Benedictine monastery. Now

also, there was a much wider range of ideals and practices fusing the eremitical spirit of primitive monasticism with the concept of a community.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529

        A: **Pretenders and Protest in the Reign of Henry VII**

              Examine the extent to which the security of Henry VII was threatened by the scheming of Margaret of Burgundy in the years 1485 to 1497.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is the security of Henry VII's position in the years 1485–1499 and on the relative importance of foreign support, especially from Margaret of Burgundy, in threatening that security. Answers will be expected to explain a range of factors that made Henry vulnerable in general, and made the role of Margaret of Burgundy in supporting the pretenders especially dangerous.

One approach to this question is likely to be that Henry's position as King was indeed in danger – the issue then would be the relative importance of Margaret in menacing Henry's vulnerable throne. But the assumption of vulnerability can, of course, be challenged. Some answers may argue that Henry was mostly in control during these years, that the pretenders got relatively little support from the Yorkists, and that although Henry was often worried about foreign interference there was little serious danger of him being overthrown. (There is also room for differentiation and analysis of change over time – perhaps arguing that the early years especially up to Stoke in 1487 were dangerous for the new monarchy but that by the 1490s, Henry was much more secure).

Answers should be based on a direct response to a clear choice – was Margaret of Burgundy a significant threat or not? Narrative biographical description of Margaret's role will be of limited value; the key requirement is assessment and explanation of relative significance.

There is a genuine choice of interpretation available, based on reasons such as:

The danger of foreign support and Margaret's central role

- Margaret was the sister of both Edward IV and Richard III; this gave her both a strong motive and great dynastic credibility – she was also persistent and with a lot of political skill

- she had a power base outside England which was a natural focus and safe haven for Henry's enemies – and a lot of opportunities to raise money and diplomatic support against Henry

- Lincoln, Lovell and Margaret of Burgundy were a powerful combination supported by the mercenary troops in the 1487 invasion

- Simnel's challenge led to a major battle, at Stoke in 1487 – this would not have happened without Margaret's political and financial backing

- Warbeck's challenge would never have got off the ground in the first place if Margaret had not recognised him as 'legitimate'

- the Warbeck campaign of 1495 depended, again, on mercenaries financed by Margaret

- the Spanish sovereigns held back from the Arthur-Catherine marriage until the Warbeck threat was decisively blunted

- there was always the danger that Margaret would influence the Empire to follow an anti-English policy because of her marriage connections – this applied to the challenge from Edmund de la Pole as well as to Warbeck.

Margaret's ineffectiveness and Henry's secure position:

- Simnel's impersonation was not credible – it is an example of Margaret constantly backing losers

- Margaret could gain foreign support and could always be a nuisance – but she never roused significant Yorkist opposition within England – Henry was mostly successful in winning over the Yorkist nobility

- Henry went a long way to solving his dynastic weakness by marrying Elizabeth of York

- the longer the reign went on the weaker Margaret's threat became – 1487 was probably the last realistic chance to undermine Henry's position

- rulers like Charles VIII of France and Emperor Maximilian were never going to go beyond opportunistic mischief-making – it was never on the cards they would back full-scale invasion to overthrow Henry. Even in Flanders people were more worried about trade issues than war against Henry

- Henry was not really frightened by the pretenders as individuals. He only had Warbeck executed as a last resort in 1499; and he treated Simnel even more leniently in 1487.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529

    B: **The Career of Thomas Wolsey**

        Examine the extent to which Wolsey's downfall was brought about by his failure to obtain the annulment of Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon.

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 dramatic decline and fall in the personal power and prestige of Wolsey from 1525 to his overthrow in 1529 (and his imminent execution, only avoided by death from natural causes in 1530). In the process of explaining Wolsey's fall, this question specifically requires an assessment of the relative importance of 1527, when Wolsey's position began to be undermined by his perceived failures in the negotiations for the royal divorce. Was this the key factor, or was Wolsey already on the slide because of other factors undermining his dominance in Henry VIII's court?

Descriptive accounts of Wolsey's career before 1525 can be of little relevance, though some high quality answers may possibly make effective points about how his decline and fall reveals deep-rooted weaknesses in Wolsey's position that already existed before there were any visible signs. There is room for answers to offer relevant judgements about the nature of the key relationship between Wolsey and the King – the 'master or servant' issue – but this material should be applied directly to the explanation of Wolsey's downfall and not set out for its own sake.

Evidence relating to Wolsey's fall, and specifically to the divorce question, might include:

- the adverse developments of 1525 – the undermining oaf England's foreign policies by the outcome of the battle of Pavia; the failure of the Amicable Grant to solve financial problems (and the extent of popular opposition caused by it)

- growing resentment of Wolsey's excessive power and personal wealth

- strong personal dislike of Wolsey from Catherine of Aragon and those around her

- the urgency and fundamental difficulty of the task Wolsey was set in 1527 when Henry set him to work on the divorce – and Henry's refusal to go along with Wolsey's original plan

- the special circumstances in which the Pope was the 'prisoner' of the Emperor from 1527 (with the Emperor Charles closely related to Catherine)

- Wolsey's failure to keep on good terms with the papal authorities in Rome, or with the papal legate in England – leading to the failure of the negotiations in 1528–1529

- the end of any hopes Wolsey had of influencing the Pope after the peace agreement at Cambrai in 1529

- the rise of factional politics as a result of the growing influence on Henry of Anne Boleyn – so that Wolsey's grip on the Privy Council was notably weakened

- intrigue by the Earls of Suffolk and Norfolk, combining forces with supporters of both Anne Boleyn and Queen Catherine

- the fact that all Wolsey's power flowed from the King – he had no independent power of his own.

Many answers will select from the above factors evidence to show the divorce was the turning point beginning Wolsey's fall. Others will take a wider view of Wolsey's decline, pointing to failures that pre-dated 1527 (and/or the argument that the divorce was not the key issue – it was the rising power of the woman who was the reason why Henry wanted a divorce in the first place). As usual, successful answers will be based on a clear and balanced assessment, of a range of factors, supported by appropriate 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**

            Examine the relative importance of persecution and compromise in James's handling of the puritans 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.

The Nature of Puritanism

Candidates will probably attempt some definition of Puritanism – extreme Protestants who sought the further reformation of the church; the 'godly' or 'elect' who through predestation could perceive themselves as better than others. Collinson has provided the most accepted definition of Puritans as 'the hotter sort of Protestants'.

James's approach

James was a Calvinist and thus had some sympathy with some of the Puritan agenda. Stronger answers will recognise that James responded to Puritanism as part of his general way of dealing with religion – moderation for moderates and persecution of radicals who posed a more serious problem. James aimed to maintain a broad church in which moderate Puritans, the vast majority, felt they could conform and would thus not pose an overt threat.

James wished to deal with the moderate Millenary Petition but also to outline his general religious position, he did this through the Hampton Court Conference. This would then be reinforced by Bancroft's Canons. Thus both should be seen as part of the same process – establishing a broad church but with the machinery to remove those who could really pose a threat.

In illustrating their argument candidates could make use of the following key 'events' of the period: the Millenary Petition; the Hampton Court Conference; Bancroft's Canons; the appointment of Abbot as Archbishop.

The Hampton Court Conference

The Hampton Court Conference was important in his response to Puritanism. James used it, by inviting only moderate Puritans, to shape what he expected. This was particularly clear in the 'no bishop, no king' episode where James made clear that he would never tolerate Presbyterianism. The most lasting outcome of the Conference was the King James Bible (1611). The vast majority of Puritans were happy with an English Authorised version. This was, like the Conference itself, another example of James's essential response being focused on maintaining his authority. By removing the need to use the Geneva Bible and its problematic, potentially republican, marginalia James was shaping the language of political discourse open to Puritans.   James saw the Conference as a settlement and was determined to impose his authority. Thus Bancroft's Canons were designed to do this and were thus the part of the same process as part of James's response to ensure that moderates could recognise his authority and radicals dealt with through persecution, in particular use of Canon 36.

Bancroft's Canons

James was determined to separate the radicals from the moderates. Bancroft as a proto-Arminian was chosen deliberately as the means to do this. The key issue was Canon 36 which enforced the 39 Articles. By this 1% of ministers were removed from the church. This illustrates that most Puritans were moderate but also that James's church was so broad that most felt they could conform. That many of his 'Silenced Brethren' removed themselves to America or the Netherlands lessened the problem of Puritanism for James. As the measure to deal with all Puritans and a form of enforcement candidates can justifiably argue that Bancroft's Canons were the most important part of James's response to the threat of Puritanism in this period. The maintenance of a broad church and the removal of radicals was at the heart of James's approach to religion and Puritanism. Bancroft's Canons through their persecution and moderation ensured that James maintained a 'Jacobethan balance' in the church that encouraged the conformity of the majority.

Abbot

The appointment of Abbot in 1610 is symptomatic of James's maintenance of a 'Jacobethan balance'. A broad church would allow as many to conform as possible and thus not push many into opposition. Abbot was an orthodox Calvinist who had real sympathy with Puritans. That he could be archbishop, alongside other bishops like the Arminian Lancelot Andrewes, was part of James's response to Puritans and all groups; a church to which all moderate Protestants could feel they belonged. This compromise was at the heart of James's success.

1618–1625

Puritanism in this period was shaped by responses to James's pacific foreign policy. The Calvinist consensus meant that the definition of Puritanism broadened as a function of ingrained anti-Catholicism. In response James used persecution through the 1622 Direction to Preachers and his prerogative in Parliament. As James's foreign policy shifted post-1623 the immediate pressure on James lessened and he compromised with his 1625 reversal of the 1618 Book of Sports.

James was essentially pragmatic throughout the period. Persecution was used against a minority but the majority were kept within the church because James maintained a broad 'Jacobethan balance'.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640

   B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603–1641

         Examine the extent to which the problems Charles I experienced in Scotland
         in the years 1625 to 1640 were the results of his religious 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.**

Candidates are likely to outline:

- Charles I's aims

- Charles I's kingship

- his policies, particular attention paid to religious policies

- impact of his policies, in particular discontent

- other reasons for discontent.

Charles's aims:

- unformity and conformity across the kingdoms – part of a 'British' policy less to
  Anglicise or unite the three kingdoms as to impose his will

- absentee kingship – Charles was to rule through others – Menteith, Lennox and
  Hamilton.

Charles's kingship

- regarded as English king

- Scottish Privy Council with nine non-resident English members

- Scots restricted from patronage

- Act of Revocation

- role of Hamilton.

Religion

- 1626 – issued proclamation commanding observation of the Articles of Perth, including personal instructions for kneeling at communion

- 1633 visit – Prayer Book

- 1634 Baron Balmerino

- 1636 Canons

- 1637 rebellion

- 1640 Canons.

Some may well argue that policies were not as important as Charles's style of kingship. Smith has argued that the 'conflict with the Scots was thus the outcome of the reforming policies and authoritarian style of government that were the very essence of the regime'.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714–1802

    A: **The Nature, Extent and Threat of Jacobitism, 1714–1746**

         How important was the lack of support within Britain in explaining the failure of the 1715 and 1745 Jacobite Rebellions?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates are expected to examine the nature and extent of domestic support for the Jacobites during both rebellions, contrasting this with other factors contributing to the defeat of the Jacobite cause. In 1715, there was substantial Jacobite support in Scotland (the Earl of Mar enjoyed the services of 5,000 men and 18 Scottish lords, in contrast to only 1,500 government troops) and parts of Northern England, but no real evidence of support in the rest of England; George I had chosen a solidly Whig ministry and the Tories, most likely to be sympathetic to the Jacobites, were demoralized when Bolingbroke and Oxford fled the country. By 1745, the Hanoverian dynasty and the Whig government were even more securely established than had been the case in 1715, and support was effectively limited to parts of Scotland.

In contrast to the lack of domestic support, candidates should refer to other factors. There were leadership weaknesses, both military and organisational, on both occasions. In 1715, the Earl of Mar was unable to take advantage of numerical superiority, notably with his indecisiveness after the inconclusive battle of Sherrif muir; other Jacobite commanders, such as Forster and Derwentwater, can be similarly criticised. In 1745, the Young Pretender can be criticised on various fronts: he failed to make adequate efforts to secure French support, or support from English Jacobites, and demonstrated indecisive leadership (notably with the decision to withdraw after reaching Derby). During his advance he failed to win the support of the English propertied classes, and during his retreat failed to maintain necessary discipline amongst his own men.

Other factors include the fact that, in both 1715 and 1745, there was a lack of promised French support; there was little French enthusiasm for involvement in 1715, and in 1744 the French were perhaps rather grateful for the bad weather which interfered with their plans for

a landing in Britain. Also, the Old Pretender was hardly an inspiring figurehead for the Jacobites: in 1715, he delayed too long before making his appearance, and by 1745 he had become a remote figure in Rome. Finally, George II firmly resisted any suggestions in 1745 that he should flee to Hanover.

Reasons for the failure of the 1715 Rebellion:

- lack of support outside Scotland and Northern England

- Whig government – firmly anti-Jacobite and united

- weak, indecisive leadership from the Earl of Mar and others

- lack of French support

- late appearance by Old Pretender.

Reasons for the failure of the 1745 Rebellion:

- virtually no support outside parts of Scotland

- firm Whig support for George II

- the Young Pretender – inspired support, but proved indecisive at Derby

- lack of French support

- no appearance by Old Pretender

- George II determined to remain in Britain, demonstrating leadership.

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 part played by Warren Hastings in the development of British influence in India in the years 1772 to 1784?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates should be aware of the background to Indian affairs at this time: Clive had extended British influence in India, but a combination of excessive speculation and corruption created a loss of confidence which the British government attempted to tackle in the Regulating Act of 1773.
Hastings became Governor of Bengal in 1772, a post effectively in the gift of the East India Company.
In his early days in Bengal, Hastings was mainly interested in restoring stability through administrative and financial reform, rather than expanding British influence. The Nawab of Bengal's power was subordinated to the East India Company in the interests of efficiency, native tax-collectors were made responsible to company officials, and legal reform created a more stable environment. Also he gave company support to the Nawab of Oudh, a long-term friend of the company, in his struggle with the Moslem Rohillas.
The Regulating Act of 1773 gave Hastings increased status as Governor-General of Bengal, but forced him to work closely with a government-dominated council, and it was difficulties here which paved the way for Hastings' later problems. In the Mahratta Wars of 1777–1782, Hastings asserted British rights against possible French expansion. However, he had less success dealing with an invasion of the Carnatic (1780–1783), and was involved in a financial scandal with the Begums of Oudh (1782).
The actions of Hastings were seen by some British politicians as despotic and tyrannical, resulting in his impeachment in 1786 in connection with the issues with the Begums; acquittal followed a lengthy trial (1788–1795).
Candidates should make a genuine attempt to comment on the extent to which Hastings achieved genuine progress in India, and his later problems were largely the result of the political strategy of Edmund Burke rather than policy weaknesses on the part of Hastings.

Like Clive, Hastings was an effective servant of both the Company and the British government in relatively difficult times and circumstances. French influence was resisted, there was some financial reform, useful links were established with some native princes, and overall there was an expansion of British influence.

Positive aspects of Hastings' role:

- stability was restored

- administrative reforms (the Nawab of Bengal was brought under authority of East India Company)

- financial reforms (tax collectors under East India Company control)

- legal reforms

- support given to the Nawab of Oudh

- status increased owing to the Regulating Act

- he resisted French aggression in Mahratta Wars.

Negative aspects of Hastings' role:

- failure to work effectively with the India Council

- failure to resolve problems in the Carnatic

- financial scandal with the Begum of Oudh

- impression of despotic rule.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841

    A: **Government Response to Poverty**

        Examine the extent to which the New Poor Law of 1834 was a genuine attempt to help 'the deserving poor'.

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 following points may be included against the proposition:

- the harsh rules regarding the separation of families certainly added to the deterrent effect. 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.

- the New Poor Law mainly reflected the desire of the Whig government to satisfy the desire of the new middle class electorate to see an end to the spiralling costs of poor relief not to benefit the poor

- the poor were effectively imprisoned because the families were separated and it was very difficult to leave

- the radicals saw it as class based legislation imposed by a regime with the same attitude as the French Ancien Regime.

The counter arguments may include:

- the relief of the deserving poor was genuinely desired

- the Poor Law embodied some of the Benthamite principles, at least as they were interpreted by Chadwick who was the Secretary of the Poor Law Commission

- the concept of relief being provided only to the deserving poor was embodied in Chadwick's goal which was a centralised system under the oversight of a central commission

- the New Poor Law was heavily influenced by Malthusian concerns regarding population growth and therefore sought to prevent poor people procreating beyond the point of subsistence.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841

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

             Examine the degree to which the Church of England was stronger in 1841 than it had been c1820.

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.

Yes it was:

- the link between the position of the Church of England and the social ascendancy of the landed aristocracy had been maintained

- the Reforms of the Ecclesiastical Commission which addressed abuses within the Church of England

- Evangelical Anglicans like Ashley and High Anglicans like Gladstone remained in influential in politics

- the desire of the monarchy to remain exclusively Anglican

- the Anglican Revival (though this may be seen as a two edged sword in relation to the future direction of Tractarians)

- given preferential treatment under the Education Bill in 1833.

No it was not:

- the political emancipation of the Non-Conformists

- the emancipation of the Roman Catholics – many contemporaries were very worried by this

- the risks faced by the Church of Ireland

- the growth of the towns – many had no parishes from which the Church of England could hope to build a presence. Some like Birmingham were centred upon Dissenting communities. In the towns, groups such as the Primitive Methodists appealed more directly to the working class. The move away from the countryside undermined the alliance of 'squire and parson'.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921

 A: **The Nature and Impact of New Liberalism, 1906–1915**

   How effective was the state in implementing 'New Liberalism' in the years 1906 to 1911?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should focus on the effectiveness of state action during the whole period assessing the importance of state/governmental/legislative measures introduced by the Liberal governments under the increasing influence of 'New Liberalism' which will need some definition. The new ideology saw the state as taking more responsibility for the quality of life and living than had previously been the case and in contrast with Gladstonian Liberalism. Previous efforts for the relief of poverty and its symptoms had in the main relied on voluntary effort. The long-standing exception was the Poor Law, administered locally (by 'the state'), but this alleviated the worst aspects of poverty without seriously attempting to improve living conditions. The 1906 government got off to a 'slow start' in terms of 'New Liberalism'. There was no overall scheme of reform. However, critical state intervention increased (quite dramatically compared with the records of previous administrations) from 1906 to 1911. At the heart of New Liberalism's attempt to alleviate poverty and protect the most vulnerable, especially the young and the elderly, and to improve national efficiency through state action, were several factors:

- the policies of Lloyd George and Churchill and to some extent Asquith

- a determination of many Liberals to take effective action to deal with the problems of poor health and poverty revealed in the work of Booth and Rowntree, the condition of recruits for the Boer War and in the 1904 *Report on Physical Deterioration*

- building on the early success of the 1906 Workmen's Compensation Act

- passing legislation directed at the young, elderly and unemployed. The main early initiatives were school meals (provided free by local authorities which chose to implement the permissive legislation), free school medical inspection, and the Children's Charter which made parents responsible for the health of their children, introduced juvenile courts and borstals, and banned under 16s from smoking

- the major (and controversial) introduction of (non-contributory) Old Age Pensions by Lloyd George in 1908

- Churchill's improvement of some of the worst conditions of work through the (state-directed) Trade Boards and making employment more accessible for many through the state's establishment of Labour Exchanges

- limitations on working hours of miners, and through the Shops Act which introduced a compulsory early closing day for the benefit of employees (although some employers got around this with longer opening hours at other times)

- landmark legislation by state action in the National Insurance Act dealing with unemployment (though only some trades were covered) and health.

Many of the reforms by the Liberals were radical relative to previous legislation, or lack of it, in terms of state responsibility for the most vulnerable and poor of its citizens. For many reforms there was effective action where nothing or little had existed before (e.g. school meals, Trade Boards for the sweated industries, pensions, insurance against unemployment and ill health). Sound answers will put the concept of 'New Liberalism' and effectiveness of state/government measure at the centre of responses. They will contain some analysis about the effectiveness of the state in implementing 'New Liberalism' policies through intervention/legislation to 1911 in bringing about improved living conditions, alleviating poverty and greater national efficiency in line with the new philosophy. There were limitations:

- in some ways the 'lesser' reforms had more impact by 1911 than the major legislation

- pensions were restricted in both amounts and numbers who were eligible

- National Insurance was implemented fully only in 1914

- several of the reforms were about working conditions, though welcome in the main for those affected, rather than improvement in a basic standard of living

- the Poor Law (including the workhouses) continued

- little was done to tackle slum housing.

Particularly effective answers will contain balanced views about how much of the (rather unspecific) objective of 'New Liberalism' had been achieved during the period. They may well argue that 'New Liberalism' was, at least in part, driven by Liberal concern about the rise of and pressure from the new Labour Party, its socialist ideology and agenda including the use of state powers and action to improve conditions, and especially its appeal to working class voters. The 1903 Lib-Lab pact and the parliamentary position of Labour from 1910 increased its influence in terms of using state action to deal with social issues. There is no doubt that the role of the state in implementing 'New Liberalism' policies, especially those espoused directly by Lloyd George and Churchill, was of major importance during the period

with some effective achievement of improved living and working conditions and improvements for children.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921

     B: **Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland, c1895–1921**

          How important were the actions of the British authorities during the First World War in changing the aims of Irish Nationalism by 1919?

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 assess the importance of the British authorities' actions during the First World War in changing the aims of Irish nationalism in a context of other longer and other short-term factors to produce a balanced assessment. The Irish Nationalists clearly remained the more important and popular nationalist Party before the First World War. John Redmond as Irish Nationalist leader still espoused the cause and aim of Butt and Parnell in the previous century of gaining Home Rule (within the United Kingdom). A dramatic shift in Irish nationalism, however, took place during the First World War.

Factors other than the actions of the British authorities included trends and causes over a longer term. These included:

* the cultural movement through the work of the Gaelic League amongst others

* the development of a concept of a (completely) separate political identity out of Irish cultural identity

* gradual emergence of a more aggressive separatist nationalism challenging Home Rule as the objective

* the foundation of Sinn Fein ('Ourselves') by Arthur Griffiths in 1902. (He had started the *United Irishman* in 1898, which preached 'Sinn Fein')

* the emergence of the I.R.B. from 1907

- Redmond's neglect of the significance of these changes.

The progress of more extreme nationalism coincided with the return of the Liberals to government in 1905 and growing concern amongst Protestants especially in Ulster. Crucially after the 1910 Elections the Liberals needed Redmond's votes in the Commons especially in reducing the Lords' powers. The Third Home Rule Bill was subsequently introduced. The arming of Ulster Unionists led to the nationalist equivalent, the Irish Volunteers. Ireland (and possibly Britain) was probably saved from civil war by the outbreak of the First World War. The implementation of Home Rule (though the Bill had reached the statute book in 1914) was delayed until the end of hostilities – but seemed the final decision (though not accepted by the Unionists). However, answers should focus centrally on wartime developments. Most Irish Nationalists, in line with Redmond's policy of now actually implementing Home Rule at first rallied to the war effort, but dramatic changes in nationalism took place during the war:

- 'extreme' nationalist elements including Sinn Fein used Redmond's co-operation with the British governments to oppose him and increase their own support

- though 169 000 of the Irish Volunteers backed Redmond, 11 000 did not

- opponents of Redmond rejected Home Rule (and constitutional means) and called for complete independence and a republic for the whole of Ireland

- the I.R.B. held the republican rising of Easter 1916.

The Easter Rising was the major turning point for the aims of Irish nationalism and much of the responsibility lay with the actions of the British authorities. Factors included:

- after surrender martial law was imposed and the ringleaders executed, an action which turned Connolly, Pearce and the others into heroes and 'martyrs'

- consequent increasing support among the Irish generally for an independent republic and complete break with Britain. The Easter Rising had limited support, but the violence with which it was suppressed by the British army and administration in Ireland, and then the decision of Asquith and his government to execute 15 ringleaders in Kilmainham Gaol, notorious for treatment of Irish dissidents in the past, changed the views of many Irish nationalists and Catholics dramatically. Home Rule came to be seen as an unacceptable solution

- the Irish Nationalists led by the complacent and ineffective Redmond, who remained wedded to Home Rule (and the British government) were left severely damaged; in 1917 Sinn Fein won two by-elections

- opposition to Irish conscription, introduced in 1918, well after that in the rest of the United Kingdom, a major mistake by the insensitive British government. This further increased support for Sinn Fein

- the increased influence of Ulster Unionists on the Coalition government in the later stages of the war further intensified nationalist feeling and suspicion that a British government could renege even on Home Rule. Still by 1918 there was no clear commitment by the British government to implement the Home Rule legislation which had actually been passed in 1914

- Sinn Fein's popular support in large measure came from the wartime policies of British governments whose priority was winning the war against Germany and not dealing sensitively with the political situation in Ireland

- the continued, but certainly not new, treatment of the bulk of the Irish population as troublesome and 'colonial' by the British forces, many of whose officers were Ulster Protestants, and by the police, hardly encouraged belief in the integrity of British rule and helped to sway opinion into sympathy and support for Sinn Fein and its objectives.

In the December 1918 Election Sinn Fein won 73 seats (to the Irish Nationalists 6) and formed the Dail. Undoubtedly the crucial period of change in aims of overall Irish nationalism had taken place during the war. An initial factor was the decision in 1914 to postpone the implementation of Home Rule until after the cessation of hostilities. However, the major turning point was from Easter 1916. British mistakes in brutal suppression of the Rising and execution of its leaders had greatly intensified support for Sinn Fein and its political agenda of independence and republicanism. It was not so much the whole impact of the First World War itself which explains the change in Irish politics and support for different Parties, but the Easter Rising, consequent events and British authorities' reactions to them. Until 1914 Irish nationalism was led by moderate leadership, which worked peacefully and constitutionally (and especially through the Third Home Rule Bill making slow progress under the terms of the Parliament Act from 1912–1914) with the clear aim of Home Rule. By 1918 Irish nationalism was led by Sinn Fein and other republicans, who were prepared to act unconstitutionally, violently and demanded full independence for (a republic in) Ireland.

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 was economically underdeveloped in 1750.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Focus of the Question

By all modern day definitions Britain was an under-developed country in 1750, although by contemporary definitions it demonstrated key elements of development for example in its trade and the trading and financial centre of London. There were however, marked variations in the levels of development and answers to this question should explore the variations in development.

Characteristics of development:

- Much of England was farmed productively. Some regional specialisation was taking place following early innovation in East Anglia. Changes in land use had been facilitated by the drainage of the fens and also by Parliamentary enclosure on the Midland Plain. This had led to the development of regional economies based on market towns. A high percentage of the population participated in the regional economies through the sale and purchase of surplus produce

- there is evidence of a development of regional specialisation of manufacture in England 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. There was some limited development in the textile industry in the North of Ireland

- London was a very wealthy market for luxury goods and also for foodstuffs. It provided employment in crafts and a centre for export. London was also the major money market and the merchant banks were able to provide funding for further wealth creation either in trade or in manufacture. The London 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 mount of specie increased from 10 to 15 million pounds between 1688 and 1750 and bank notes increased from 2 to 5 million pounds.

Characteristics of underdevelopment:

- Wales, Scotland and Ireland were much less advanced than England. The vast majority of the population were engaged in subsistence agriculture in small rural communities. The only real exports were cattle, which were exported to England. The urban areas, even the capitals were much less developed than in London. (It could be argued that the provincial towns of England were also underdeveloped)

- demographically, Britain exhibited the characteristics of an undeveloped economy. The death rate was still high and life expectancy was still low. Although the regional market economy in English agriculture had alleviated the fear of famine, lack of food was still a serious problem in Scotland, Wales and Ireland. The population of all four countries were still subject to the vagaries of disease

- the majority of manufacture which took place in Britain was the production of very basic goods for local consumption. This was certainly the case with agricultural and domestic implements and footwear and clothing

- although legislation was passed to improve the quality of roads around London in the early eighteenth century the majority of the country had a poor transport network which limited the development of a wider market economy.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750–1830

B: **The Standard of Living of the Working Classes, 1780–1830**

Examine the extent to which the quality of life for the working classes improved 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 asks candidates to focus on the quality of life for the working classes rather than asking them to approach the topic from a quantative approach which formed the basis of the original standard of living debate. This focus is much more subjective but considers relations between employer and employee, unemployment, housing conditions, types of food eaten, demographic changes. As with the original debate about the standard of living the overall assessment has much to do with which elements are considered to be important.

The extent to which the quality of life improved:

- over the period 1780 to 1830 the birth rate increased and the death rate decreased. These could be used as proxy indicators to suggest that the quality of life was improving. It could be suggested that more children were being born, as more people were marrying and marrying earlier owing to the opportunities for employment and wages. The decline in the death rate could be the result of a decline in fatal diseases such as the plague and smallpox. Both together would suggest that people were living longer

- agricultural improvements underpinned the increase in the population. Not only was there a secure supply of bread/wheat to ensure that the population did not starve but there was also a wider range of foodstuffs available including meat and dairy products, coffee, tea and sugar. It is difficult to assess the actual quantities of these foodstuffs

that were purchased by the working class but the changes in life expectancy suggests that there was some improvement in the nutrition of the population

- increased opportunities in employment would seem to suggest that there was greater security of income for the working classes. Under employment in rural areas could be offset by migration to areas of manufacture either in the towns or in rural manufacture where there would be paid employment available. Whilst there was unemployment in urban areas the old poor law would provide limited support.

The Speenhamland system can be interpreted two way for rural areas, either it can be argued that it provided a safety net for the agricultural poor or, more convincingly, that it led to a decline in the quality of life in rural areas by keeping the rural labourer in the countryside throughout the year on a subsistence income to provide labour at harvest time.

Extent to which life worsened:

- workers lost the independence of employment in their own homes. This can be seen most significantly in the case of the handloom weavers

- working opportunities were dictated by the vagaries of the market and could be laid off on a daily basis. There was little paternalism between employer and employee in the town as there had been in countryside

- conditions in factories and mills were described as 'inhuman'. Long hours were worked for limited pay. Workers were exploited by the manufacturers through time management and the payment of workers in tokens, which could only be exchanged in factory shops for over-priced adulterated food

- conditions in proto-industry such as frame-work-knitting declined as frame-rents were increased and prices for goods fell

- housing conditions in towns were appalling with over-crowding , lack of sanitation, air pollution and diseases rife. Life expectancy in towns was significantly lower than those in the countryside

- parliamentary enclosure in the countryside deprived the working classes of access to the common land, to gleaning catching small game, gathering firing. It deprived some squatters of their homes.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS** **HS03**

Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848

A: **The Significance of the 1832 Reform Act**

Examine the relative importance of liberal, humanitarian and utilitarian
ideas as influences on the 1833 Factory Act and the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should examine the 1833 Factory Act and the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act and should explicitly consider the relative importance of the three 'ideologies' identified. Answers can consider each act in turn, looking at each motive, or consider each motive in turn, considering each act. Balanced answers should consider both acts and all three ideas. Judgement should involve considering the relative importance of the three motives, either in a developed concluding paragraph, or as an explicit and developed argument that runs throughout the answer.

Previous questions on this topic have allowed a general consideration of motives, which therefore include the influence of the 1832 Reform Act. Whilst the utilitarian ideas that played a role in 1832 are explicitly relevant, general arguments in relation to 1832 are not relevant.

1. **Humanitarianism** was a key factor

• there was a growing influence of **humanitarian thinkers and campaigners** both inside and outside Parliament

• humanitarianism was a factor behind the **1833 Factory Act**, with its attempts to prevent the exploitation of children

- children under nine were banned from working in the factories, those aged between nine and thirteen had their hours limited and two hours of compulsory schooling had to be provided

- the compulsory registration of births in 1836 might be used as evidence that the former measure was a genuine attempt to tackle the issue of child labour

- however, the reality of the 1833 Factory Act was that unscrupulous owners easily circumvented the Act , as there were only four unpaid overseers for the whole country

- it is difficult to see humanitarian influence behind the **1834 Poor Law Amendment Act**. The principle of less eligibility made the workhouse the very last resort for any right-minded person, where humiliating and degrading conditions existed. Husbands were separated from wives, regardless of age, work was hard (picking apart old ropes etc.) and at Andover inmates were found to be eating ground up bones.

2.   The **Utilitarian principles** of Bentham (the greatest good of the greatest number)

- the **Utilitarian movement** contained the followers of Jeremy Bentham who argued that the test for institutions and laws should be their utility to society; in particular he advocated that actions should provide the greatest good to the greatest number

- Benthamites therefore judged actions by their efficiency and accountability. They believed in investigations to gather information to provide the evidence on which action could be based – a 'scientific' test

- actions should then benefit the greatest number of citizens, though their view of a citizen meant a man of property and means – those responsible enough to have a say in society

- these principles can be seen at work in the drive for efficiency that the Poor Law Amendment Act represents

- they are also seen in the narrow conception of the causes of poverty that the Benthamites accepted. They believed that the vast majority of poverty was caused by idleness and therefore the idle poor should be removed from the community, receiving relief only in workhouses, where conditions should be worse than outside to encourage people to work – the principle of 'less eligibility'

- the presence of Benthamites like Chadwick, Bishop Sumner, Bishop Blomfield, Bourne and Lewis on the 1832 Poor Law Commission are significant, as they placed great emphasis on utilitarian principles like uniformity.

3.   **Liberal Ideas**

- the economic liberalism advocated by Adam Smith was the central economic belief of most MPs

- this argued that government intervention was a hindrance to wealth creation, but that selfishness was beneficial to society as a whole as 'if by a hidden hand' the selfish pursuit of wealth would do good to the whole community (e.g. the factory owners provided jobs, but if government intervened with minimum wages this would cause unemployment)

- for this reason taxation should be as low as possible

- the Poor Law Amendment Act sought to limit government intervention in terms of taxation

- however, the principle of intervention that the Factory Act in particular, but also the Poor Law Amendment Act represented, are not consistent with liberalism.

Judgement may take the form of:

- arguing that one factor was most important, offering reasoned explanation of a factors primacy

- arguing that one factor was the most important by arguing that other factors were not as important, for example, arguing that the Poor Law Amendment Act was not influenced by humanitarian concerns at all

- arguing that one factor was most important for one reform, but that another factor was more significant as a motive for the other reform, for example the Factory Act was mainly influenced by humanitarian motives, but these were ignored in the Poor Law Amendment Act which clearly was the work of the utilitarians.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848

B: Chartism and other Radical Movements, 1838–1848

Examine the degree to which Chartism can be considered a revolutionary movement.

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 define 'revolutionary'. They should assess the nature of Chartism, showing awareness of the changing nature of the movement over the ten-year period. Some answers may address the extent to which it was revolutionary by considering the nature of each wave of the movement. Balance would be achieved by considering evidence that the movement was not revolutionary.

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.   The famous Charter set out six specific demands namely:

- Secret Ballots

- Universal Suffrage

- Equal Constituencies

- Annual Elections

- Payment for MPs

- The abolition of the property qualification for MPs.

Evidence Chartism was revolutionary:

- the language used was often revolutionary. The Commonwealthsmen newspaper ran articles in praise of Oliver Cromwell, whilst posters advertising meetings in Leicester in 1842 talked of liberty, equality and fraternity. Both therefore had sinister connotations of regicide. The Chartists used symbols like the redcaps of liberty

- methods were typical of revolutionaries – mass meetings and processions, petitions, threats of strikes, rioting – Peterloo in 1819 was the forerunner for the mass meetings of the Chartists, initial on the moors, and then increasingly in the towns and the cities

- it might be argued Chartism was revolutionary in its methods – 22 killed at Newport in 1839, with more people killed than in any other comparable incident in the nineteenth century (Davies), whilst Wellington was called out of retirement to defend London in 1848

- revolutionary in demands – annual parliaments, secret ballots and payment of MPs meant a total change in the purpose of parliament, as MPs would become answerable to constituents

- E. P. Thompson and Dorothy Thompson have stressed the class consciousness of the movement; Marx saw the movement as revolutionary

- the Chartist movement was much narrower in its aims than the radical movement, which incorporated other aims and interest groups, for example the Trades Union movement, the Factory Reform Movement, the Anti-Poor Law Campaign, the Anti-Corn Law League.

Evidence that Chartism was not revolutionary:

- Chartism was part of the radical tradition, not revolutionary: the demand for political representation and an end to taxation without representation (set out at the August 1838 mass meeting at Newhall Hill in Birmingham) drew on the ideas of Paine, Cobbett in the Political Register and the Reform movement

- many of the supporters of the radical agenda from 1832 were attracted to Chartism which drew on existing radical journals and organisations, e.g. Bronterre O'Brien had edited the Poor Man's Guardian which first appeared in 1831, O'Connor had fought against the Poor Law Amendment Act, Francis Place helped draw up the Charter, having helped get the Combination Law repealed, initially at least, Thomas Attwood, who founded the Birmingham Political Union supported the movement; as Edward Royle has commented 'a generation of radical leaders cut its teeth on the struggle'. In this way it was radical, not revolutionary

- O'Connor was a direct descendant of the radical Henry Hunt in his oratorical style, whilst the use of white hats echoed the head gear Hunt had favoured. In this way Chartism was radical not revolutionary

- there were clear connections between leading Chartists and other radicals, e.g. William Lovett had worked with radicals like Francis Place

- Chartism was much more a 'knife and fork' movement than a political movement – the waves of support coincided with the waves of unemployment and low wages for workers in manufacturing.

Judgement might take the form of arguing one of the following:

- Chartism was a revolutionary movement that sought to destroy the old system, rather than a moderate, radical movement that sought further reform of parliament

- alternatively that it was not revolutionary but more economic or based on traditional moderate radicalism.

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 Labour Governments had, by 1951, fulfilled the hopes of those who had supported a 'welfare state'.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The main thrust of the question is for candidates to evaluate the extent to which Attlee's governments had fulfilled the ideas for a welfare state current by 1945. Answers should refer primarily to the period from 1945 to 1951. Candidates may well identify groups who supported the idea of a 'welfare state' and discuss what was understood by the term. In examining the various expectations and motives, candidates may well need to make reference to events and ideas before 1945 and this should be credited as long as made relevant. A wide range of groups might, briefly, be considered. These ranged from medical and welfare professionals, through politicians, to voters of various social backgrounds. Conservative ideas about a 'welfare state' such as those advocated by Henry Willinck were different from those of Labour politicians such as Bevan. Inevitably, however, most answers will focus on Beveridge and on Bevan. Reference to those opposing various aspects of the welfare state such as Churchill, other Conservative politicians and sections of the medical profession could be made relevant and should be credited where this is done.

In examining how far Labour fulfilled the hopes of 1945, candidates may well consider specific policies such as the National Insurance Act 1946 or the implementation of the National Health Service in 1948 but well-informed candidates might also look at the low level of unemployment, at housing and environmental legislation and also education. Other candidates may consider the question from a more thematic point of view, e.g. the widening of the scope of social insurance; the principles of universalism and comprehensiveness; the wider role for state planning; and the creation of a more socialist society.

The degree of success in fulfilling hopes could also be approached in different ways. Some candidates may argue that Labour did tackle a much wider range of factors leading to poverty, e.g. by National Insurance covering all employees, by paying family allowances, by a fully comprehensive free health service and by maintaining full employment. Such candidates may also give statistical evidence, e.g. showing the increase in numbers of those being treated for a variety of medical complaints, or figures showing health improvement by 1951, or the numbers of houses built. Some answers, probably good ones, will place the question in a wider context, may make some statistical comparisons with the 1930s and/or argue that what Labour achieved was especially remarkable given the dire economic position of Britain in the late 1940s. Others might argue that Labour did move a considerable way towards a socialist society with the nationalisation of the hospitals – as well as key industries – providing a free, universal and comprehensive health service together with state economic planning.

Balanced answers are likely to consider the limitations and disappointments of Labour's programme as well as the successes. Candidates may bring in the 1951 split between Bevan and Gaitskill over prescription and other charges which technically departed from the principle of treatment free at the point of need. Candidates who discuss whether Labour's programme was fully socialist in its details should certainly be rewarded. They may point to Bevan's compromise over private practice and private beds in the NHS; the way independent education was left untouched; to the potential divisiveness of the tripartite secondary education system; that social insurance continued to be based on flat rate insurance contributions; and the low level of child allowances.

High level answers will show not only sound knowledge and understanding but analytical depth, balanced assessment and at least some awareness of the economic constraints on Labour in an age of austerity.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951

      B: **Winston Churchill in opposition and government, 1929–1945**

          How important was the part played by the Labour Party in explaining why
          Winston Churchill became Prime Minister in May 1940?

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 could argue that Labour's role was crucial in leading to Chamberlain's resignation in May 1940 so opening the way for Churchill to become prime minister. Evidence to support this argument might include:

- Labour had refused to join Neville Chamberlain's government in 1939 so that even in early 1940 there was still no War Coalition

- Labour were critical of Chamberlain's conduct of the war in the autumn of 1939 and suspected him of still wanting to appease Hitler

- Labour's lack of faith in Chamberlain was deepened by his failure to foresee Hitler's attack on Denmark and Norway

- critically it was Labour's motion to censure on the Chamberlain government on the 7th May 1940 which began a two-day debate which showed the extent of criticism that existed in Parliament even amongst former supporters of Chamberlain. Although the government won the debate on the 8th May by a majority of 81 this was well below its normal majorities of over 200. The vote began the process which led to Chamberlain's resignation so opening the possibility – though not certainty – that Churchill would succeed him

- another crucial decision by Labour came on the 9th/10th May when first Attlee advised, and then the Party Executive declared, that it would not serve in any war coalition led

by Chamberlain but that it would serve in a coalition under another prime minister. It was this statement which finally decided Chamberlain to resign

- Labour's relations with Churchill were no longer as problematic as in the past. Relations between Churchill and the Labour leaders had improved since the mid 1930s and Churchill's opposition to the Nazi regime and to the policy of appeasement had earned him increasing respect in Labour ranks. The Labour leader, Attlee, and leading trade unionists such as Bevin and Citrine, preferred Churchill to any other candidate as Prime Minister.

However, candidates could also argue that though Labour's actions helped bring Chamberlain down they did not make it certain that Churchill would succeed him. Candidates might argue that the role of rebel conservatives was of equal or greater importance.

- there had been a growing number of Conservative rebels opposed to Chamberlain's policies ever since 1938

- it was Conservatives opposed to Chamberlain's policies toward Nazi Germany and his conduct of the war who were amongst his fiercest critics in the key debate on the 7th/8th May

- Labour could not bring down Chamberlain without substantial support from the dissident Conservatives. The vote of censure on the 8th May 1940 allowed the extent of Conservative discontent with Chamberlain to be voiced and it was this rather than Labour opposition which forced Chamberlain to consider resignation. In fact it was the rebellion by 80 Conservative MPs – 40 who voted against the government and 40 who abstained – who really shook Chamberlain

- The Conservative rebels demanded a war coalition government to include Labour and since Labour refused to serve under Chamberlain it made resignation a near certainty.

Candidates might also argue that in the end it was the actions of key individuals such as Lord Halifax which enabled Churchill to gain the premiership.

- Halifax could well have succeeded Chamberlain rather than Churchill. There was still deep suspicion of Churchill within the Conservative Party as the leading critic of the National Government during the 1930s. Both Chamberlain and the King, George VI, preferred Halifax. Labour would have served in a government led by Lord Halifax just as readily as one led by Winston Churchill

- it was Halifax's decision that he did not want to become prime minister for a variety of reasons which in the end left no alternative but for the King to ask Winston Churchill to become Prime Minister

- Churchill's behaviour too since joining Chamberlain's government in September 1939 was also important. Outwardly he had remained loyal to Chamberlain defending him during the vote of censure on the 8th May. Equally Churchill had been building up his reputation in the country as the man best equipped to conduct a war against Hitler. His pugnacious attitude at the Admiralty, naval successes such as the River Plate, his regular broadcasts on the radio all strengthened his reputation with the public and in the press. His appointment as Prime Minister was well received

- Chamberlain's attitudes and actions also contributed. Relations between Chamberlain and the Labour Party were poor and this was certainly one reason for their refusal to serve under him. The Labour leaders and generally saw Chamberlain as essentially a peacetime leader not a wartime leader. His statement in April 1940 that 'Hitler had missed the bus' seemed to confirm this and was certainly unfortunately timed since four days late Hitler invaded Denmark and Norway. Crucially Chamberlain failed to win over his critics within the Conservative Party.

Some candidates may also argue that it was in the end external events which played the decisive role in bringing Churchill to power.

- the Nazi invasion of Denmark and Norway ended any hopes by Chamberlain and the country that war with Germany would be short and limited

- the subsequent failure of the British expedition to Norway to stop the Nazi conquest led to Labour's censure motion and the critical two-day debate of the 7th/8th May, 1940

- the German invasion of Holland and Belgium on the morning of the 10th May was a key factor in Labour's decision later that day that they would only serve under a prime minister other than Chamberlain. It was also crucial in deciding the country and the newspapers that it needed a war leader and Churchill fitted that description better than anyone else.

As always, good answer will assess a variety of factors using precise knowledge to argue a case. High quality answers will try to differentiate the relative importance of various factors in 1940.