



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2012

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

[AH111]

WEDNESDAY 6 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 Thomas Cranmer in achieving the Royal Divorce. [12]

Or

(b) Explain the measures taken by the Duke of Northumberland to solve the economic and social problems England faced in the period 1550–1553. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Rebellion of the Northern Earls, 1569

Source 1

Extract from the Proclamation of the Northern Earls, 16 November 1569.

We, Thomas, Earl of Northumberland, and Charles, Earl of Westmorland, are the Queen's true and faithful subjects. All who are of the old Catholic religion know that we, along with many other noble and honourable men, have promised to uphold our faith. Other men of high rank who are in our Majesty's service, have, by their crafty dealings, advanced themselves and sought to overthrow the true Catholic religion. They have set up and maintained a new found religion contrary to God's word. The same men have deceived our Queen and brought disorder to the country; now they seek the destruction of the ancient nobility.

With the help of God and you good people, we intend to resist by force. We will restore all ancient customs and liberties of God's true Church, and this noble and great country. We must do this ourselves or we might be reformed by strangers. It is clear that foreign powers intend to invade these shores shortly.

God save the Queen.

Source 2

Extract from a letter from Sir George Bowes to the Earl of Sussex, 14 November 1569. Bowes was a firm loyalist during the Rebellion of the Northern Earls. He lived near the Earl of Westmorland and reported events to the Earl of Sussex, who was Lord President of the North during the rebellion.

Yesterday, at four o'clock in the afternoon, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, accompanied by many others, entered Durham Cathedral. Also in attendance were 60 horsemen armed with muskets, daggers and spears. They took all the books, as well as defacing and destroying the communion table. After this they made a proclamation in the Queen's name that no man should use any Protestant service and they declared that they would put right this wrong. After an hour they placed a guard of 24 townspeople in Durham.

Source 3

Extract from P. McGrath, *Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I*, published in 1967.

The Earls were reluctant to rebel, but there were plenty of gentry who urged them on, and as a result Elizabeth had to face the only serious rebellion of her reign.

The Rebellion of the Northern Earls was not supported by Catholics in other parts of the country; they had no desire to be involved in a rebellion. Nevertheless, it underlined in the eyes of the government the potential danger from Catholic opposition. It provided William Cecil with excellent material which could be used as propaganda against all English Catholics, the more so since the rising was related to the decisive step about to be taken by the Pope, the excommunication of the Queen.

© *Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I* by Patrick McGrath, published by Blanford Press, 1967. ISBN 0713704632

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the causes of the Rebellion of the Northern Earls of 1569? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess to what extent the Rebellion of the Northern Earls was a significant threat to Elizabeth I. [35]

Option 2: England 1603–1649

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

1 Either

- (a) Explain the effectiveness of James I's policies towards Catholics in the period 1603–1625. [12]

Or

- (b) Explain the impact of royal favourites in the period 1603–1629. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

Ship Money and the Growth of Opposition to Charles I during his Personal Rule, 1629–1640

Source 1

Extract from a letter from John Burghe to Charles I's ambassador in Paris, October 1637. Burghe was a royalist and a well-known academic at Cambridge University. He is explaining the impact of the King's collection of Ship Money.

At the moment everything here is calm and there is very little of significance for me to write to you about. As far as I can see, there is no real change in the situation at the Royal Court or in the nation as a whole. Although the amount of money people are having to pay is certainly large, considering that they are not used to paying such high sums, they seem content to pay them and only in private do they express their dissatisfaction. I think that Ship Money is now so well accepted that it will become a permanent, yearly source of revenue for the Crown. Indeed, if men would consider the vast amount of taxes paid in other countries for the services of the state, Ship Money would not appear such a burden. I believe that, given time, everyone will accept the situation.

Source 2

Extract from a letter from the Sheriff of Suffolk, Sir Simonds D'Ewes, to the Privy Council, June 1640. D'Ewes is explaining his problems in collecting Ship Money.

I promise you that I am in no way guilty of not trying to collect the money and, in fact, I have tried harder than any of the former sheriffs to do so. There are a number of possible reasons for the slow payment of the tax such as the lack of trade, the low price of agricultural products and the general shortage of money. The large amount of money required for the King's military campaigns during the last year has caused considerable distress.

Source 3

Extract from Alan Smith, *The Emergence of a Nation State*, published in 1984.

The growing disillusionment of the gentry with Charles I's government coincided with a difficult period for the country's economy. At first sight the financial achievement of the government in this period looks very impressive and the Crown's revenue increased significantly. However, the Crown's methods of raising the increased finances gave rise to much discontent. All the measures were arguably legal, but Charles and his advisers, more and more out of touch with the opinion of the country at large, failed to see the political cost of imposing them. The most controversial of these financial policies was Ship Money and it was to do the most damage to the King's popularity. The general unpopularity of the King's financial demands during the 1630s was intensified by the dislike of his Arminian policies which Archbishop Laud introduced.

© *The Emergence of a Nation State: The Commonwealth of England 1529-1660*, by Alan Smith, published by Longman, 1984. ISBN 0582238889

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the impact of the collection of Ship Money during the Personal Rule of Charles I (1629–1640)? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the collection of Ship Money was responsible for the growth of opposition to Charles I's Personal Rule. [35]

Option 3: England 1815–1868

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

1 Either

(a) Explain why the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 was so significant. [12]

Or

(b) Explain why the Chartists failed to achieve their aims by 1846. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

Divisions in the Tory Party, 1827–1830

Source 1

Extract from a letter from Lord Anglesey, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to a colleague, Lord Gower, 2 July 1828. He is writing about Daniel O’Connell’s recent victory in a by-election in County Clare, which formed part of his campaign to achieve Catholic Emancipation.

Those who are agitating for Catholic Emancipation have such extraordinary power that they are capable of leading the people here in Ireland to open rebellion at a moment’s notice. The organisation behind this Emancipation campaign is extremely formidable. I believe that its success is inevitable and that no power on earth can prevent its progress. There may be a rebellion, and you may suppress it by putting thousands to death, but it will only put off the day of compromise. The only possible solution to this crisis is to deprive the extreme elements of their power to influence people. This objective could be accomplished if we allowed Daniel O’Connell and his colleagues to take their places in the House of Commons.

Source 2

Extract from the political diaries of J. W. Croker, a leading Tory MP and friend of Sir Robert Peel, 1829. Croker is describing events following the decision of the Prime Minister, the Duke of Wellington, and the Home Secretary, Peel, to change their policy of opposing Catholic Emancipation.

When Peel told me that he had changed his mind and would no longer oppose Catholic Emancipation, I was very glad, though I was concerned about the reaction of the public to his position. I told Peel that the greatest surprise of the public was not so much the fact that a concession was being made to Catholics, but that he was behind it. When Peel informed the House of Commons of his decision to support Catholic Emancipation, only the Whig opposition cheered him, as used to happen to Canning in 1827. The Duke of Wellington informed senior Tories that, if he did not receive their support, he would resign. The Duke, along with Peel, received a sudden summons to meet with the King, who was greatly distressed about this Catholic question. After the meeting, the Duke returned home ready to resign his post, but later in the day a messenger arrived informing him that the King had given way.

Source 3

Extract from Derrick Murphy, *Britain 1783–1918*, published in 2004. He is writing about the Tory Party in the period 1827–1830.

Many Tories, known as “Ultras”, were firmly against parliamentary reform and Catholic Emancipation. This placed them in direct conflict with the “Canningites”, the supporters of Canning. The divisions in the Tory Party had been partially exposed in 1828 when an opportunity arose to grant some limited parliamentary reform to the under-represented cities of Manchester and Leeds. Wellington was opposed to the idea and this led to the resignation of the leading Canningite, William Huskisson.

© Britain, 1783-1918 by Derrick Murphy, published by Collins Educational, 2003. ISBN 0007150784

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the problems facing the Tory Party in the period 1827–1830? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess to what extent Wellington was responsible for the divisions in the Tory Party between 1827 and 1830. [35]

Option 4: Unification of Italy and Germany 1815–1871

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

1 Either

- (a) Explain the aims of those who took part in the revolutions which broke out in the Italian states in 1848. [12]

Or

- (b) Explain the importance of Cavour in achieving the unification of Italy. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

Economic Factors and the Unification of Germany

Source 1

Extract from a report sent by the Office for Trade and Industry in Württemberg to the Ministry of Finance in Württemberg, 17 December 1851. The *Deutscher Zollverein* (German Customs Union) was established in 1834 under the leadership of Prussia; Austria was not a member of it.

We are faced with two alternatives: either we renew the *Deutscher Zollverein* (German Customs Union) with Prussia or strive for a Customs Union with Austria. In making its decision, Württemberg has to act in its own economic interests. Prussia has a rich supply of raw materials. Its coal and steel production is growing rapidly, while its railway network covers 3000 kilometres. We enjoy important economic benefits from the *Zollverein* and the loss of our commercial links with Prussia, which controls large stretches of the River Rhine, would have very harmful effects on our trade and industry.

If we abandon Prussia and join an Austrian-led Customs Union, it would cause us huge economic problems. Geographically we are too far from the centre of the Austrian state. Austria would be too dominant and we would have little or no influence. But it is different with Prussia. The combined population of the medium-sized and small states of Germany is only slightly less than that of Prussia. This will guarantee us a stronger influence on the *Zollverein's* affairs.

Source 2

Extract from the diary of Baroness Hildegard Spitzemberg, 8 July 1866. She was the wife of Baron Karl Spitzemberg, one of Württemberg's senior diplomats in Berlin.

On 3 July 1866 the Battle of Sadowa [also known as Königgrätz] took place. Austria has never suffered such a frightful defeat. Prussia's victory was due partly to irresponsible mistakes by Austria's military leaders. Other key factors were the superior power of the Prussian army, which was equipped with the needle-gun, and the speed with which Prussia was able to mobilise its troops due to its extensive railway network.

Source 3

Extract from Michael Gorman, *The Unification of Germany*, published in 1985.

The economic strength of Prussia was undoubtedly of great significance for the unification of Germany. Prussia was given a considerable boost when it gained new territories such as the mineral-rich Ruhr district in 1815. The *Zollverein* removed numerous tariff barriers and business boomed. Prussia also benefited from influential financiers such as Gerson Bleichröder whose activities helped to finance Prussia's wars against Denmark, Austria and France. But other factors need to be taken into account in explaining the unification of Germany, especially the role played by Otto von Bismarck who was the most important figure in German political life in the nineteenth century.

© *The Unification of Germany* by Michael Gorman, published by Cambridge University Press, 1989. ISBN 0521317304

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the reasons for the changing balance of power between Austria and Prussia between 1849 and 1859? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which economic factors were responsible for the unification of Germany by 1871. [35]

Option 5: Germany 1918–1945

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

1 Either

- (a) Explain why the Nazis rose to power between the Wall Street Crash of October 1929 and Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on 30 January 1933. [12]

Or

- (b) Explain the impact of Nazi racial policies on the lives of Jews in Germany in the period 1933–1939. [12]

2 Read the sources and answer the questions which follow.

The Creation of the Nazi Dictatorship, 1933–1934

Source 1

Extract from Hitler's address to the German Reichstag, 13 July 1934. He is giving his version of the events which occurred before and during the "Night of the Long Knives" which took place on 30 June 1934. The address was broadcast on the radio to the German people.

By the spring of 1934 there was strong written evidence that references had been made by the leadership of the Stormtroopers (SA) to the necessity of a second revolution. In fact, they had received instructions to prepare for this. From May 1934 onwards, there could no longer be any doubt that Röhm, the Chief of Staff of the SA, was involved in ambitious plans for a second revolution. A group began to develop within the SA which formed the core of a conspiracy directed against the security of the State. I decided that I would dismiss Röhm from office, place him in custody and arrest a number of other SA leaders. However, at 1.00 am on the morning of 30 June 1934, I received two extremely urgent and alarming communications from Berlin and Munich about SA demonstrations. Only ruthless and bloody intervention was capable of preventing the spread of revolt. Mutinies are crushed only by the law of the iron fist. Every person should know for all time that if he raises his hand to strike out at the State, certain death will be his fate.

Source 2

Extract from a statement made by the Defence Minister General Blomberg at a Cabinet meeting. It was reported in the Nazi newspaper, *The People's Observer*, on 5 July 1934.

The *Führer*, with military decisiveness and admirable courage, has himself attacked and crushed the traitors and murderers. The army as the protector of the entire German people, far removed from the conflicts of domestic politics, will show its gratitude through devotion and loyalty.

Source 3

Extract from Geoff Layton, *From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany 1918–1945*, published in 2008.

It would be difficult to overestimate the significance of the “Night of the Long Knives”. In one bloody action Hitler overcame the radical left in his own Party and the conservative right of traditional Germany. The German army had clearly sided with the Nazi regime. The incident marked the emergence of the SS. German Generals had feared the SA, but they failed to recognise the SS as the Party’s elite instrument of terror. Hitler had secured his own personal political supremacy. His decisions and actions were accepted, so in effect he had managed to legalise murder. When Hindenburg died on 2 August 1934, there was no political crisis. Hitler was able to merge the offices of Chancellor and President. The Nazi regime had been stabilised and the threat of a “second revolution” had been completely removed.

© From *Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany, 1918-1945* by Geoff Layton, published by Hodder Murray, 2008. ISBN 0340965819

- (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying Hitler’s attitude towards the SA between January 1933 and July 1934? [13]
- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess to what extent the “Night of the Long Knives” was the most important factor in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship between 30 January 1933 and 2 August 1934. [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.