



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2011

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

[AH111]

FRIDAY 3 JUNE, AFTERNOON



TIME

1 hour 30 minutes.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your Centre Number and Candidate Number on the Answer Booklet provided.

Choose **one** option.

Answer question **1(a)** or **1(b)** and question **2** from your **chosen option**.

Indicate clearly on your Answer Booklet which option you have chosen.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark for this paper is 60.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in question **1** and question **2(b)**.

This assessment unit is an historical enquiry and candidates are advised to draw on all the relevant material they have studied when answering question **2(b)**.

Option 1: England 1520–1570

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

1 Either

- (a) Explain the role played by the Duke of Somerset in the Edwardian religious reforms. [12]

Or

- (b) Explain the causes of the rebellion of the Northern Earls in 1569. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Dissolution of the Monasteries

Source 1

Extract from a report written by Richard Layton in 1535. Layton was one of Thomas Cromwell's commissioners who was sent to investigate the monastery of Maiden Bradley.

Please understand, Sir, that I have made myself familiar with the monastery at Maiden Bradley. Rest assured that no mischief or wrongdoings can be hidden from me. I send you Holy relics taken from the monastery of Maiden Bradley which were used as indulgences to trick the good people of this parish. They include Christ's coat, Our Lady's smock and part of the Lord's Supper. In this monastery you will find that the Abbot has six children. His sons are all tall men who are servants to him. He thanks God that he never had relations with married women but only pure and innocent unmarried women, the fairest and purest he could get. The Pope has also given him special permission to keep a prostitute.

Source 2

Extract from a letter from Thomas Bedyll to Thomas Cromwell in 1536. Bedyll was a commissioner sent to investigate the conditions in the monasteries. In this extract he is reporting on a visit to the monastery at Ramsey.

With reverence and kindness I address you my Lord Cromwell. With my heart and knowledge I entrust myself to you and your service. I am now at the monastery at Ramsey, where, in my opinion, the Abbot and convent are as true, faithful and obedient to the King's grace and rule as any religious folks in this kingdom. They live as uprightly as any other religious folks have done in the King's reign. That is to say they are more given to ceremonies than is necessary. I pray to God that I find the other monasteries in no worse condition.

Source 3

Extract from K.Randell, *Henry VIII and the Reformation in England*, published in 2001.

It is clear that there was no popular demand for the destruction of the monasteries. They were not on the point of collapse because of corrupt and extravagant behaviour or a decline in their moral standards. Moreover, they posed no political or religious threat to the King or his policies. However, they did possess enormous wealth, and it was the desire to gain control of this wealth that motivated Henry to allow or to insist that Cromwell and his assistants destroyed the monasteries and transferred their possessions to the Crown.

© *Henry VIII and the Reformation in England* by Keith Randell, published by Hodder & Stoughton, 2001. ISBN 0340782153

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the causes of the dissolution of the monasteries in the period 1536–1540? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which religion was responsible for the dissolution of the monasteries during Henry VIII's reign. [35]

Option 2: England 1603–1649

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

1 Either

(a) Explain how James I's policy towards Spain developed between 1603 and 1625. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the impact of Charles I's religious policy during his period of Personal Rule (1629–1640). [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Duke of Buckingham and the breakdown in the relationship between Charles I and his Parliament, 1625–1629

Source 1

Extract from a letter from Sir Nathaniel Bacon, a Member of Parliament, to his wife, 1626.

We go to his Majesty, Charles I, with a document containing the general complaints of the nation. These include the fear of the changes being made in religious policy, the alarm at the way he is governing the country, the failures of our latest foreign policy, the poor state of our forts and castles and the decay of our shipping and trade. We have concluded that the excessive power of the Duke of Buckingham and the abuse of that power is the main cause of these evils and dangers to the kingdom.

Source 2

Extract from *History of the Rebellion*, written by the Earl of Clarendon between 1646 and 1660.

The Duke of Buckingham was an extraordinary person and no man ever rose in so short a time to so much honour, fame and fortune for no other reasons than his beauty, gracefulness and attractive personality. He alone was responsible for distributing all the honours and offices of the kingdom but offended the nobility of England by rewarding his relatives, using the land and revenue of the Crown to enrich his own family. He was of excellent character and was capable of offering wise advice and counsel. It was in his nature to be fair, open and generous.

Source 3

Extract from Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age*, published in 1992.

The most obvious, though not the most important, reason for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles and his Parliament was the personality of the King. Charles was unapproachable and uncommunicative, especially in Parliament, where his intentions and actions often went unexplained. Moreover, when Charles became King, the Duke of Buckingham's position at Court was more dominant than ever before. The Duke was disliked by the nobility as he prevented other councillors from getting close to the King. Of equal importance, Charles's accession signalled the involvement of England in war, first against Spain, and later against Spain and France. Financial and military necessities caused the Crown to use its prerogative powers, such as tonnage and poundage and forced loans, to an extent not seen since the previous century. Finally, Charles becoming King signalled an important religious change with the King's support for Arminianism being at odds with the deeply held beliefs of practically the whole of the political nation.

© *The Stuart Age* by Barry Coward, published by Longman, 2003. ISBN 0582772516

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the reasons for the growing opposition to the Duke of Buckingham in the period 1625–1629? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the Duke of Buckingham was responsible for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles I and his Parliament between 1625 and 1629. [35]

Option 3: England 1815–1868

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

1 Either

(a) Explain why there were divisions in the Tory Party between 1827 and 1830. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the role played by the Anti-Corn Law League in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Unrest in England 1815–1820

Source 1

Extract from Samuel Bamford, *Life of a Radical*, published in 1859. Bamford, a weaver from Middleton, near Manchester, was twice imprisoned for radical activities. In this extract he is describing unrest in England in 1816.

Within months of our great victory over France in 1815, there were disturbances among the labouring population of England. Much of this unrest occurred after the passing of the Corn Laws in 1815, and continued until the end of 1816. In London, riots lasting several days broke out while the Corn Bill was being debated in Parliament. In Devon, there were riots because of the high price of bread. Unemployed weavers were involved in violence in Preston, while Luddites were active in Nottingham. In Bury, the unemployed attempted to destroy machinery. In Cambridgeshire, the unrest was only put down at the cost of bloodshed. Unemployed miners rioted in Newcastle.

Source 2

Extract from a letter from Lord Fitzwilliam to Lord Sidmouth, 17 June 1817. Sidmouth was Home Secretary in Lord Liverpool's Government. Fitzwilliam was a supporter of the Whigs and the Lord Lieutenant for Yorkshire. In 1819 the Tory Government dismissed him from this post for supporting the right of protesters to hold a rally at Peterloo.

Many people believe that most of the recent unrest in the country has been caused by the presence and active agitation of government spies such as Mr Oliver. He is considered to be the person who has provoked most of the trouble. All those who are involved in the unrest consider themselves members of a great body of revolutionaries in London, acting under the instructions of someone specifically appointed for that purpose. It is quite probable that, if such people were not involved, the country would be far quieter now. I have been assured that the mass of the people are contented, while few are dissatisfied.

Source 3

Extract from Eric Evans, *Britain Before the Reform Act: Politics and Society 1815–1832*, published in 1989. Evans is writing about the revolutionary threat in England between 1815 and 1820.

Lord Liverpool's Government was probably not as alarmed about revolutionary preparations as it liked to pretend. Its spies kept it very well informed, while a good intelligence system and appropriate use of force against that minority prepared to challenge its authority proved sufficient. While some historians emphasise the danger of revolution, the evidence points more to desperation caused by hunger than by revolutionary planning. Too many radical leaders were fond of making speeches about reform, and were unaware of the effect of their words on empty stomachs and unprepared minds. Though Peterloo made the government more unpopular, radical activity remained largely concentrated in London and the textile districts. Bread prices and unemployment levels caused unrest.

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 was due to economic grievances. [35]

Option 4: Unification of Italy and Germany 1815–1871

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

1 Either

(a) Explain Mazzini's ideas for a unified Italy in the period up to 1848. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Causes of the Franco-Prussian War

Source 1

Extract from an interview given by Otto von Bismarck, Minister-President of Prussia, to a British journalist, September 1867.

There is nothing in our attitude to alarm France. There is nothing to prevent the maintenance of peace for ten or fifteen years, by which time the French will have become accustomed to German unity, and will consequently have ceased to care about it.

I told Prussia's generals last spring that "I will do all I can to prevent war; a war between such near neighbours will only be the first of at least six; and even if we won all six, what would we have succeeded in doing?" We would have ruined France and most likely ourselves as well. France buys largely from us and sells us many things we want. Is it in our interests to ruin the country completely? I strove for peace last spring and will continue to do so; but remember that German interests must be respected or I cannot answer for the people or even the King!

Source 2

Extract from remarks by Empress Eugénie, the Spanish wife of Napoleon III, shortly after the end of the Franco-Prussian War. Eugénie is explaining to Maurice Paléologue, a French diplomat and writer, the dilemma facing France as relations with Prussia worsened in July 1870. The Battle of Sadowa (or Königgrätz) on 3 July 1866 had been a turning point in the Austro-Prussian War.

We could not retreat or listen to reason; the whole country would have risen up against us if we had! We were already being accused of weakness. A dreadful saying had come to our ears: "The Hohenzollern Candidature is a Sadowa prepared in advance!" Oh, this word Sadowa! For four years our most bitter enemies in France have repeatedly raised this issue. They convinced the whole of the French people that we had brought disgrace on their country in 1866. You must remember this if you wish to judge our policy in July 1870.

Source 3

Extract from Katherine Anne Lerman, *Bismarck*, published in 2004.

Much controversy has surrounded Bismarck's role and intentions in the Hohenzollern Candidature. Bismarck wanted to gain maximum advantage from the Spanish question and by the spring of 1870 he regarded a war in the near future against France as "an unavoidable necessity". However, he was never rigid in his approach to problems and certainly did not want war under any circumstances. It was very important for Bismarck that, if such a war arose, Prussia should not be seen as the aggressor. When news of the Hohenzollern Candidature became known in July 1870 Bismarck deliberately acted with restraint, allowing a new and inexperienced French government to make a catalogue of errors.

© *Bismarck* by Katherine A Lerman, published by Longman, 2004. ISBN 978 0582037403

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying Bismarck's attitude towards France in the autumn of 1867? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Prussia was responsible for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. [35]

Option 5: Germany 1918–1945

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

1 Either

- (a) Explain the political threats to the Weimar Republic from left and right in the period 1919–1923. [12]

Or

- (b) Explain the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1945. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

Nazi Economic Policies 1933–1939

Source 1

Extract from a confidential memorandum written by Hitler in August 1936. The memorandum was given to Hermann Göring who launched the Four-Year Plan in 1936.

There must be no limit to the extent or speed of the capability of our economy to rearm. We must under no circumstances use our foreign currency to import foodstuffs if it means neglecting rearmament. I reject the view that we should restrict this rearmament. It is very important to prepare for war in times of peace. Foreign currency must not be spent in any areas where our needs can be met by German production; it should be saved for goods which cannot be obtained in any circumstances except by importing them. Therefore fuel production must now be stepped up with the utmost speed and the mass production of synthetic rubber must also be organised and achieved with the same urgency.

Source 2

Extract from the memoirs of Hjalmar Schacht, published in 1949. Schacht was Minister of Economics from 1934 until his resignation in 1937.

Göring set out with all the stupidity and incompetence of the amateur to carry out the programme of economic self-sufficiency or autarky, envisaged in the Four-Year Plan. On 17 December 1936 Göring informed a meeting of big industrialists that it was no longer a question of producing economically, but simply of producing.

Source 3

Extract from *The Nazi Economy* by Richard Overy, published in 1996.

Between 1933 and 1936 the government was the most important source of new investment in the German economy. The economic revival after 1933 was not the result of an increase in consumer spending or growth in exports; it was primarily the result of an enormous increase in government spending. Rearmament was one area of government spending up to 1936 but it was not the only one. The Nazi state also invested in railway and road building projects, including the construction of the famous motorways (*Autobahnen*), which began in 1934. It also invested in major housing projects and a large-scale building programme. By 1936 the Nazi Government had not only succeeded in restoring relatively high levels of employment and domestic investment but also in stabilising Germany's trade with the outside world.

Up to 1936 rearmament was limited. But it dominated Germany's economy between 1936 and 1939. As a result of the Four-Year Plan, two-thirds of the industrial investment in Germany between 1936 and 1939 went directly into preparation for war in such sectors as the chemical industry, aluminium, aviation and electrical engineering. The 1936 Four-Year Plan was not a complete success as in 1939 the German economy was not yet ready for a major war.

© *The Nazi Economy* by Richard Overy, published in 1996 by Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978 0521557672

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the reasons for the introduction of the Four-Year Plan in 1936? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1939 were successful. [35]

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for.
In some cases, efforts to contact copyright holders may have been unsuccessful and CCEA
will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgement in future if notified.