



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2015**

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

[AH111]

MONDAY 8 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

Level of response mark grid

This level of response grid has been developed as a general basis for marking candidates' work, according to the following assessment objectives:

- AO1a** recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner;
- AO1b** present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements;
- AO2** In relation to historical context:
- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;
 - explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

The grid should be used in conjunction with the information on indicative content outlined for each assessment unit.

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	paraphrase sources or rely on direct quotation when commenting. There may be some attempt to evaluate the sources without adequate analysis of context and limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	combine paraphrasing with partial interpretation of sources and offer some additional comment on their significance. There will be some ability to compare sources and an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the questions in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	display accurate comprehension of sources and/or the interpretation they contain and assess their utility, supported by contextual reference, e.g. author and date. There will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	display complete understanding of content and context of sources, e.g. author's viewpoint motive, intended audience, etc. and be able to comment on points of similarity and difference. There will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

Option 1: England 1520–1570

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Explain the features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically mention some features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England, such as criticism of the wealth and immorality of the clergy. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some explanation. They may mention some features of anti-clericalism, such as the immoral behaviour of the clergy which was particularly prevalent in monasteries. They may also mention the clergy's abuse of power through simony, pluralism and absenteeism. Reference may also be made to the wealth of the Church and the selling of indulgences. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will address several features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England. Many of the clergy were uneducated and not in a position to guide their laity. The Church had a vast amount of wealth and some began to question this. Indulgences were sold and mortuary fees were high. Church land and buildings were a source of great wealth, yet not enough charity was given to the people. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed

and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. There were many abuses within the Church in terms of power and wealth. Many of the clergy were uneducated and held more than one post which led to absenteeism and a neglect of their parish and duties. Many clergy also appointed family members to roles within the Church. There was also an element of moral laxity within the pre-Reformation Church in England. Many clergy used the Church as an instrument to extract money from the people. The clergy played on the superstitions of the people and extracted money in the form of indulgences. They set themselves apart from their people with Church courts. However, there is evidence that, in spite of these criticisms, the Church was well supported, highlighted in wills and donations from the time. In many wills, Churches were provided for on the condition that prayers were said and candles lit. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- (b) Explain the role played by Cardinal Wolsey in the Royal Divorce.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. It may be characterised by generalisations and a biography of Wolsey's life. Answers may typically mention his rise to power and his demise, but will fail to focus on his role in the Royal Divorce. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Response will start to explain Wolsey's role in the Royal Divorce. They may mention his status as Papal Legate and Cardinal and observe that Henry and Wolsey both believed that this would secure a divorce. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Wolsey himself was against both a divorce and Anne Boleyn, but he knew that his position at court depended

on him satisfying the King's wishes. At first, he examined the original dispensation and began to question its validity and the marriage of Arthur and Catherine of Aragon. He also sought support from foreign universities. As Papal Legate, he believed that he would be able to obtain the Royal Divorce and asked the Pope to allow the case to be tried in England. The Pope sent Cardinal Campeggio to England but the divorce was never achieved. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers will fully explain the various steps taken by Wolsey to obtain the Royal Divorce. At first, he questioned the original dispensation but the Pope could not agree to this as it would imply that Pope Alexander VI, who granted the original dispensation, had been at fault. Wolsey looked to foreign universities for support but, although many did support the idea of a divorce, they were unable to exert pressure on the Pope. To reach this level, candidates should also mention how Wolsey's failure to obtain a divorce led to his downfall. He did not have a special relationship with the Pope or indeed Henry VIII. During Wolsey's rise to power he had made many powerful enemies, particularly the Boleyn faction. This, and his inability to obtain a divorce, led to his demise and the birth of the English Church. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the opposition Elizabeth I faced from the Puritan movement?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of the historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, this source is useful as it illustrates that the Puritans were unhappy with some aspects of the Elizabethan Church Settlement.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, the source tells us that the Puritans wanted to ensure that some feast days remained. They were unhappy with the use of the sign of the cross at baptism and about kneeling during communion. They were also unhappy about the vestments which they were being directed to wear.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but will also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. For example, this is an extract from a list of demands by Puritan clergy within the Church of England. They are presenting these demands to a Church Convocation, a meeting of ordinary clergy from the established Church, in 1563. They are expressing their unhappiness with the Elizabethan Church Settlement of 1559. They believe that the Settlement did not go far enough and wish for further reform. Their demands illustrate their wish to break all links with the Catholic Church. The only feast days they want are associated with Christ. They want the sign of the cross at baptism to be removed and kneeling during communion ended. They see these outward signs as links to Catholicism. They also express discontent at the wearing of certain vestments, believing that these are also remnants of the Catholic Church. The tone is relatively forceful.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at the top of Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. For example, since this source is written by Puritans within the Church of England, it highlights that Elizabeth I faced some opposition from within her Church. This group represented the more moderate Puritans who wished to work with Elizabeth I and not against her. This source is limited in that the demands listed were not supported by all Puritans and were rejected by the Convocation, suggesting that not all Puritans opposed Elizabeth I. It is also limited in that this is only highlighting Puritan opposition from within the Church and not the Puritan movement as a whole. It does not represent the whole Puritan movement. The Convocation met in 1563 when the Elizabethan Settlement had been established and the Queen was demanding uniformity from all her clergy. Candidates may mention that Elizabeth had little concern for individual faith; all she demanded was outward conformity. From their contextual knowledge candidates may point out that the Puritans within the established Church believed that from this position they would be able to reform the Church further. By 1566 the question of vestments was proving difficult for Elizabeth. Many of her Puritan clergy refused to wear them and Elizabeth demanded that all wear the vestments or lose their position. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign many Puritans believed that they could work with Elizabeth to bring about change. As time progressed, opposition changed and the Puritans sought other ways to oppose her policies. Candidates may mention that there was Puritan opposition within her Court, Council and Parliament.

[13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess whether Catholics posed a greater threat than Puritans to the Elizabethan Church Settlement up to 1570.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b) and**, the candidate's ability as

part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2a, ([0]–[3]) AO1b, ([0]–[2]) AO2b

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, the answer will give a narrative account of the Catholics in Elizabeth I's reign. They may mention the rebellion of the Northern Earls and the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots but will not address the threat Catholics posed to the Elizabethan Church Settlement. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the question as to whether Catholics posed a greater threat to the Elizabethan Settlement than Puritans. Source 1 illustrates that the Puritans were unhappy with certain aspects of the Settlement. Source 2 suggests that there were still Catholics in England. Source 3 illustrates that the Catholic threat had dwindled.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of the subject.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2a, ([4]–[6]) AO1b, ([3]–[5]) AO2b

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, it may address the threat posed by Elizabeth I's Catholic population but will not focus on the threat posed to the Elizabethan Church Settlement. Responses may mention the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots in 1568 and the rebellion of the Northern Earls the following year. Both these events proved a threat to Elizabeth. Answers may also mention that the Catholics were a threat to Elizabeth I as they could obtain foreign support and aid. Responses may make reference to the Puritans, observing that they were of little threat as they did not rebel against Elizabeth. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, Source 1 suggests that the Puritans wished to get rid of all traces of Catholicism from within the English Church. Source 2 indicates that Catholics were allowed to move around England freely. Source 3 maintains that Catholics were not a great threat to the Elizabethan Church Settlement.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, contemporary opinion suggested that the Catholic population represented a threat. According to later interpretations, they were not a significant threat.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2a, ([7]–[9]) AO1b, ([6]–[8]) AO2b**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers will begin to compare the threat posed by Catholics and Puritans. Catholics were a direct threat as they rebelled against Elizabeth I and wished to replace her with an alternative Queen, Mary Stuart. This is reflected in the Northern Earl rebellion. Catholics were also a significant threat as they had links to foreign countries. Mary Stuart had always had a strong link with Catholic France and, after the excommunication of Elizabeth, Spain no longer protected her. The Puritans were also a threat to Elizabeth as they were present at court and had sympathisers in the Privy Council. There were also Puritan supporters in Parliament. They proved a threat to her Settlement when many protested against the wearing of vestments in 1566. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation, for example, Source 1 suggests that the Puritans were a threat to the Elizabethan Church Settlement as they wished to reform many articles of it. Source 2 asserts that the Catholics were a threat as they had freedom of movement and were able to spread their ideas. It also implies they were a threat as they had attracted the support of the gentry, Elizabeth's traditional supporters. Source 3 argues that, due to Elizabeth's moderate treatment of her Catholic population, they were not a threat to her. Dawson also suggests that, although Elizabeth viewed the Puritans as a threat, their actions did not support this.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS: ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, contemporary interpretation suggests that Catholics were a threat because many gentry and noblemen believed in the Catholic doctrine. Puritans, at the time, were unhappy and of the opinion that the Settlement was flawed. Later interpretations maintain that the Catholics had the potential to be a threat but they lacked leadership and direction.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2a, ([10]–[12]) AO1b, ([9]–[11]) AO2b**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide a comprehensive assessment of the threat

posed by Catholics and Puritans to the Elizabethan Church Settlement. The Catholics were a threat as they were outside the Church of England and thus beyond Elizabeth I's control. As a group they could not accept her Settlement and many sought to replace her with Mary, Queen of Scots. The Northern Earl rebellion was a direct attack on Elizabeth. However, it can be questioned as to whether this was an attack on her Settlement or her political power. The Northern Earls were unhappy about her political interference and wished to exert their authority over the North. However, Elizabeth produced a Settlement which she hoped could be supported by all. She accepted the title of Supreme Governor so that her Catholic population could accept her as Governor of the Church, while maintaining their loyalty to the Pope. The Book of Common Prayer said little about the actual doctrine of the Church and the wording of the mass was ambiguous. She hoped that this would satisfy the Catholics and the Puritans. Elizabeth had learnt from the mistakes of Mary Tudor. She only persecuted when necessary and therefore most Catholics remained loyal to her. The Puritans were a group returning from exile after Mary I's reign, full of hope in the new Queen. As Protestants, they believed that she would implement great Protestant reforms. Her Settlement was a disappointment to many. Doctrine remained undefined, the Catholic system of Church government remained and much of the appearance of the Church showed signs of Catholicism. The Puritans were a threat to the Settlement as many were within the Church and from here they wished to alter the Church Settlement. Grindal, a Puritan, became Archbishop of Canterbury and from this position he hoped to reform the Church and spread the Puritan message. Elizabeth faced direct opposition to her Settlement in 1563 with the Convocation. Here, clergy freely displayed their opposition to the Settlement. In 1566 they expressed opposition to the wearing of the vestments as they associated them with Catholicism. Elizabeth viewed this as a threat and in 1566 demanded that Archbishop Parker issue the "Advertisements" which laid down fixed rules about services and dress. As a result, thirty-seven clergy resigned but the majority accepted Elizabeth's demands. Although the Catholics were a direct threat to Elizabeth, the Puritans directly challenged her Religious Settlement, demanding further reform. They could influence many within her Council and Parliament. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Source 1 suggests that, although many Puritans were unhappy with the Settlement, the majority were prepared to work with and accept it. Since this source is a list of demands which were not approved, they had no effect on the Elizabethan Church Settlement. Source 2 indicates that the Catholics spread their ideas through education, referring to missionaries and seminary priests. This had the potential to threaten Elizabeth I as this group kept Catholicism alive. Source 3 concludes that Elizabeth I viewed the Puritans as a threat to her Settlement as they demanded change. The source suggests that the Catholics were not a threat, as the Pope did not excommunicate her until 1570 and Spain was not interested in supporting the English Catholics.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may refer to the opinion of Elizabeth I. She viewed the Puritans as a grave threat to her Settlement, whereas many members of her Council believed Catholics were a greater threat. Later opinion believes that Catholics had the potential to be a threat to her rule but not her Settlement, and simply rejected it. The Puritans demanded further reform and this would prove more of a threat. [35]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

48

60

Option 2: England 1603–1649

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Explain the features of Charles I's foreign policy in the period 1625–1640.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers at this level will be inaccurate and provide a superficial explanation of English foreign policy between 1625 and 1640. The meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some explanation of English foreign policy in the period 1625–1640. Charles I unsuccessfully waged war against Spain in the period 1625–1630 and France in the period 1627–1629. During the Personal Rule he carefully avoided war with foreign powers. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will be more detailed and show a greater awareness of English foreign policy in the period 1625–1640. Charles was anxious to go to war against Spain after his humiliation in Madrid in 1623. The Duke of Buckingham organised an expedition against Cadiz in 1625, but this ended in miserable failure. This was followed by another unsuccessful expedition in 1626. Relations with France also deteriorated despite the marriage treaty negotiated in 1624. War with France was declared in 1627, and Buckingham personally led a military expedition to relieve the Huguenots at La Rochelle. This expedition, along with another in 1628, was an expensive failure, causing outrage in Parliament. Charles made peace with France in the Treaty of Suza in 1629, and with Spain in the Treaty of Madrid 1630. The period of the Personal Rule saw England adopt a pro-Spanish policy and Charles carefully avoided involvement in the Thirty Years' War. Answers at this level may focus too heavily on the years 1625–1629. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the key features of English foreign policy in the period 1625–1640. Charles I's war against Spain was hampered by a chronic shortage of funds and materials, exacerbated by Parliament's failure to offer meaningful support. His pro-French policy provoked suspicion and alarm in England, especially after the French used English loan ships to attack Protestants in La Rochelle in 1625. Charles I's attempt to construct a powerful anti-Habsburg alliance failed in 1625 when France refused to join it. The outbreak of war with France in 1627 placed even greater strain on England's resources and exposed the inadequacy of the Duke of Buckingham. Answers will provide an explanation of English foreign policy after 1629. In order to avoid recalling Parliament, Charles I was careful to avoid foreign conflicts after 1630. England adopted a pro-Spanish policy and assisted Spain in its war against the Netherlands. Spanish ships taken by the Dutch were seized in English ports and returned to Spain. Spanish privateers were allowed to operate from English ports, causing great damage to Dutch trade. By 1639, Spanish troops were conveyed across English soil on their way to the Netherlands and Spanish coins were minted in England. Charles withdrew from the Thirty Years' War. In 1631 he refused to support Sweden's attempt to retake the Palatinate. Charles I also pursued closer relations with the Holy See and a papal agent arrived in England in 1634. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- (b) Explain the steps taken by Parliament to ensure victory in the Civil War between 1642 and 1646.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will be inaccurate and provide a superficial explanation of the steps taken by Parliament to ensure victory in the Civil War between 1642 and 1646. The meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some explanation of the steps taken by Parliament to ensure victory in the Civil War between 1642 and 1646. Parliament established control over the richest and most densely

populated regions of England. It was also more successful in building a truly national army. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will be more detailed and show greater awareness of the steps taken by Parliament to ensure victory in the Civil War between 1642 and 1646. One of the most immediate problems faced by Parliament was the need to construct a more efficient means of raising revenue. Existing methods were insufficient and were replaced by a system of county committees, which oversaw weekly assessments, sequestration of land and parliamentary ordinances. This allowed Parliament to exploit the vast wealth of the Southern and Eastern regions under its control. Parliament also created a professional army. Initially parliamentary forces were organised on a county basis, creating an incoherent and poorly organised force. Many of the men were conscripts and reluctant to fight outside their own counties. Parliament overcame this obstacle by forging regional armies in 1643. One of these, the Eastern Association Army, became the foundation of the New Model Army in 1645. Parliament also took steps to improve the quality of its military leadership. Many commanders lacked experience or were reluctant to inflict defeat upon the King. The Self-Denying Ordinance of 1645 took command away from such men and placed it in the hands of military professionals. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly explain the steps taken by Parliament to ensure victory in the Civil War between 1642 and 1646. As well as dealing with a shortage of funds and a military force riven with localism and poor leadership, Parliament also overcame serious internal divisions. Initially, the division was between the ‘war’ and ‘peace’ parties, who disagreed on the need to inflict total defeat on the King. It required all of John Pym’s skill to maintain unity between the war party and the moderates and prevent a collapse of the Parliamentary war effort. After the signing of the Scottish Alliance in 1643, Parliament was divided between Presbyterians and Independents. This division also affected the Parliamentary armies. The Scottish Alliance of 1643 was also an important step taken by Parliament to ensure victory in the Civil War. It added 22 000 Scottish troops, led by Alexander Leslie, to the Parliamentary war effort. At the Battle of Marston Moor, they helped to destroy the King’s control of the North of England and bring about Parliament’s first great victory in the war. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

[12]

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying attitudes towards James I's favourites between 1603 and 1625?

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2(a): as part of the historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, Osborne reveals a negative attitude towards favourites and asserts that they 'came between' the King and his people on a 'daily basis'.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, Osborne claims that James I's favourites were chosen solely on the basis of their appearance. He comments disapprovingly on James I 's displays of affection towards them and describes them as 'idols'. Osborne claims that Buckingham and Somerset cost England 'more than Queen Elizabeth had spent in all her wars.'

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The source was written by Francis Osborne, who was present at court during the reign of James I. As such, he was an eyewitness to the behaviour of royal favourites and to the role they played. He may have known Somerset and Buckingham personally and would certainly have heard others at court discuss the role of these men. His attitude may be typical of other courtiers. The memoirs were published in the relative freedom of the English Republic, which may increase their reliability since there was no longer any fear of retribution. Osborne will have been able to be honest in his account of James I's relationship with his favourites. In terms of content, answers may point out that Osborne clearly felt that royal favourites exerted a wholly negative influence. He claims that they 'magnified the heat of suffering' felt by James I's subjects, although he does not elaborate. It is interesting that Osborne describes this negative influence as occurring on a 'daily basis', which suggests that it was a serious and ongoing problem. Osborne also hints at the homosexual nature of James I's relationship with his favourites when he discusses the King's 'love and desire for them.' This suggests that the sexual nature of James I's relationship with his favourites was widely known and discussed by even relatively minor figures at court.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at the top of Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in the answer. For example, Osborne states that James I's 'son came to be ruined by the same mistake'. Answers may indicate that this is perhaps a reference to the disastrous impact of the Duke of Buckingham

on Charles I's relationship with Parliament. In referring to how James I's favourites 'cost England', Osborne may be referring to the enormous sums of money that James gave to his favourites as gifts and pensions. The source also has important limitations. Answers may point out that we are not told when Osborne wrote his memoirs, only when they were published. This detracts from their usefulness as we cannot determine whether his memory might have been defective or marred by hindsight. It might also be argued that, since Osborne was attached to the Earl of Pembroke, he was a member of a rival faction to Buckingham at court. This might explain the force of his negative opinions. Osborne was writing for the public, which may detract from his reliability. Answers may point out that his motive may have been to entertain and excite rather than merely to inform his readers. He is opinionated and the text has an outraged tone, which may suggest a lack of objectivity. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which royal favourites had an impact on political life in the reign of James I.

This question targets AO1(b): demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements; **and AO2:** as part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination; analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2a, ([0]–[3]) AO1b, ([0]–[2]) AO2b

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, the answer may point out that James I was incredibly extravagant towards his favourites and allowed them to dominate patronage. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the question as to the extent to which royal favourites had an impact on political life in the reign of James I.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2a, ([4]–[6]) AO1b, ([3]–[5]) AO2b

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be an incomplete account of the impact of Somerset or Buckingham on political life in the reign of James I. It may be

argued that they had little direct impact on the political decisions made by James I. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content. For example, Source 1 indicates that favourites cost England financially. Source 2 suggests that Buckingham had a negative impact at court. Source 3 provides a more balanced assessment of the impact of royal favourites, arguing that Buckingham's political influence grew after 1621.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations. For example, answers may describe the views of courtiers, MPs or of James I himself.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2a, ([7]–[9]) AO1b, ([6]–[8]) AO2b**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Robert Carr, the Earl of Somerset, came to the attention of James I in 1606. He was the first significant favourite in the English court of James I, although Carr was Scottish. He had little political ability and became a focus of resentment in Parliament, where there was widespread opposition to the monopolisation of patronage by Scottish courtiers. Carr was rewarded with gifts of land and was appointed to the Privy Council. After 1612, he was closely aligned to the Howard faction at court. It could be argued, therefore, that he helped to push the King towards a more pro-Spanish foreign policy. Carr's arrest in 1615 for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury had a serious impact on the King's reputation and helped to surround the court with an aura of sleaze. After Carr's fall from grace, George Villiers became the King's favourite. It can be argued that he occupied a more dominant and powerful position than Carr. Villiers, who became Duke of Buckingham in 1623, was widely rumoured to be the King's lover. He dominated life at court and exerted huge influence over patronage. It can be argued that Buckingham had little influence on politics and that the King pursued his own policies. However, answers may point out that after 1623, Buckingham exerted considerable influence on foreign policy. He joined Charles on the Madrid Expedition of 1623 and thereafter was crucial in pushing the King towards war. He negotiated the Anglo-French Marriage Treaty of 1624, securing a royal marriage that was deeply unpopular in England. He became England's chief diplomat, negotiating a series of anti-Habsburg alliances, which, in the years that followed, proved to be of little worth. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation, for example, one source

may be neglected. Source 1 provides evidence of the anger and hatred that James I's favourites provoked. It also indicates that James's relationship with them was thought to be sexual, which, in such a highly conservative age, is likely to have had a political impact. Source 2 also reveals deep contempt for the Duke of Buckingham, which suggests that the impact of James I's favourites was largely negative. In Source 3, Kevin Sharpe argues that James remained open to other sources of political advice, a reference, perhaps, to the continued influence of figures such as the Earl of Pembroke.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. Many contemporaries were disgusted by James I's open displays of affection towards his male favourites. Something of this disgust is evident in Osborne's description of Buckingham and Somerset. It was also believed that the favourites were appointed to positions of influence, not because of any merit but because of their physical appearance. This is a view shared by many later writers. Historians such as Kevin Sharpe are more balanced in their assessment of the political impact of favourites. They downplay the role of Somerset and Buckingham in politics, at least until the 1620s.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2a, ([10]–[12]) AO1b, ([9]–[11]) AO2b**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide a comprehensive assessment of the political impact of royal favourites. Answers may point out that, while favourites were deeply unpopular, they exerted less political impact than was widely thought. However, James I's excessive generosity towards them, and the reported nature of his relationship with them did have a political impact. It could be argued that resentment of the King's generosity towards Carr helped to frustrate Salisbury's efforts to negotiate the Great Contract in 1610. In terms of patronage, answers may point out that Buckingham and Somerset did not enjoy a complete monopoly. There are many examples of James discounting the requests of Buckingham to appoint a client to a position of power. James, for example, ignored Buckingham's request to appoint Cranfield Lord Keeper in 1621. It may also be argued that Buckingham had a positive influence between 1621 and 1623. He persuaded James to promote effective reformers such as Bacon and Cranfield, and he himself served as an effective Lord Admiral. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Sources 1 and 2 both paint the royal favourites in a highly negative light. Source 1 refers to the fact that they came between the King and his subjects, which suggests that they dominated the court and prevented the King from hearing alternative points of view. This is contradicted by Source 3. It suggests that James I's favourites 'did not wield great political power'. It also claims that

they did not exclude 'other courtiers and factions.' Source 3 does, however, acknowledge the role played by Buckingham in shaping England's foreign policy after 1623.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may refer to contemporary opinion to illustrate attitudes towards royal favourites. Source 2 highlights the widely held perception that the King's favourites channelled too much patronage to their own families. Sharpe lends support to Weldon's views when he states that Buckingham's relatives were 'insignificant people with no estates or influence.' This offended the sensibilities of the gentry and nobility overlooked for preferment. Historians are often more positive about the role of Buckingham. Some assert that his political impact was negligible in James I's reign and that the King made his own decisions. This is in contrast to the reign of Charles I, when Buckingham did wield significant political influence. Other historians also stress Buckingham's role as a reformer. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

[35]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

48

60

Option 3: England 1815–1868

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Explain how the Tory Governments between 1822 and 1827 reformed the criminal code and the economy.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately **AO1(a)**, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a) and** demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically be vague about how the Tory Governments reformed the criminal code and the economy in this period. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Responses will be more detailed and provide a limited account of the Tory Governments' reform of the criminal code and the economy between 1822 and 1827. For example, there may be reference to some of Robert Peel's reforms as Home Secretary and also to the general reduction of tariffs and excise duties. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors relating to the reform of the criminal code and the economy by the Tory Governments in the period 1822–1827. In terms of reform of the criminal code, reference might be made to Home Secretary Robert Peel's reform of prisons and the criminal justice system, for example greatly reducing the number of offences that carried the death penalty. In terms of economic reform, organised by Robinson and Huskisson, reference might be made to the general relaxation of restrictions on trade and the expansion of the activity of the Bank of England by allowing local branches to be established. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss how the Tory Governments reformed the criminal code and the economy in the period 1822–1827. The appointment of Robert Peel as Home Secretary in 1822 in place of Sidmouth was key to the introduction of a number of significant reforms. These included: the Gaols Act of 1823, which reformed and liberalised the prison system; the revision of laws on theft and of the administration of criminal justice in 1826; and the consolidation and simplification of the criminal code in 1827. Candidates may also refer to the Juries Act which gave more detailed instructions to juries about their duties. In terms of economic reform, the key appointments were those of Frederick Robinson as Chancellor of the Exchequer (succeeding Vansittart) and William Huskisson as President of the Board of Trade, both in 1823. Robinson and Huskisson moved the country away from protectionism and towards free trade, reducing tariffs and passing the Reciprocity of Duties Act during their first year in office. The Warehousing Act was also aimed at boosting entrepôt trade, while domestic commercial activity was stimulated by an Act of 1826 which provided for the establishment of local branches of the Bank of England. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- (b) Explain the role of the Anti-Corn Law League in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately **AO1(a)**, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a) and** demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically be vague about the role of the Anti-Corn Law League in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Responses will be more detailed and provide a limited account of the role of the Anti-Corn Law League in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. For example, there may be reference to the lectures organised by the League and to the agitation by its representatives in Parliament. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing may be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little use of specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors relating to the role of the Anti-Corn Law League in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. For example, candidates may refer to the important propaganda role played by the Anti-Corn Law League after its establishment in the period 1838–1839, especially by means of a programme of high-profile lectures and public meetings, many modelled on Daniel O’Connell’s earlier successful campaign for Catholic emancipation. The League also produced its own newspaper and took advantage of the new penny post system to mail its literature direct to the public. Candidates may also note that by 1841 the Anti-Corn Law League had representation in Parliament, where Richard Cobden put pressure on the new Conservative Government of Robert Peel to grant reform. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the role of the Anti-Corn Law League in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. Candidates may note that, while there were a number of anti-Corn Law organisations established in the 1830s, it was the creation of the Anti-Corn Law League in March 1839, after an earlier meeting in Manchester in September 1838, that brought a new drive and professionalism to the campaign for repeal of the Corn Laws. Here the work of John Bright, the son of a Rochdale cotton mill owner, and Richard Cobden, a successful businessman and member of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, was critical. Both were inspirational public speakers, Cobden taking his talents to the House of Commons to which he was elected in 1841, where he was able to challenge directly the Conservative Prime Minister, Robert Peel. Under Cobden’s guidance, the League increasingly sought to assert the moral basis for repeal, thereby cementing its relationship with the middle class. Cobden and Bright were, however, part of a wide movement that brought the Anti-Corn Law case to the general public by means of lectures, public meetings and pamphlets. In 1843 the League distributed over 9 million tracts and delivered 650 lectures. Its work in this respect was greatly facilitated by the penny post, the introduction of which Cobden had strongly supported. The League also produced its own newspaper. The organisation also sought favourable publicity through the national press, and devoted large sums of money in subsidies to this end. A strong emphasis was placed on petitioning, and between 1839 and 1843 some 16 351 petitions were tabled, with a total of 5.8 million signatures. The League also successfully recruited women to its ranks, encouraging their participation in meetings, petitions, soirées, and tea parties. Above all, the League could draw on funds to an unprecedented level – £250 000 in 1845–1846. It was without question the most successful public pressure group of the age. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the rebuilding of the Conservative Party in the period 1833–1841?

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate’s ability, as part of the historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, they may note Peel’s general opposition to radicalism.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, the source reveals that Peel recognises the importance of the middle class as a feature of politics after 1832. He states that the Conservative Party must present itself as a force for moderation.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source, but will also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. For example, the author of the source is Robert Peel, the recognised leader of the Conservative Party in the House of Commons, if not yet confirmed as the overall leader of the Party. In terms of the rebuilding of the Conservative Party, this gives the source great value. The mode and audience of the source – a confidential letter to a respected and experienced Party colleague – are also useful as they reveal Peel’s views on how the Conservatives should adapt to the new political landscape. The tone of the source is a frank appraisal of the balance of political forces and the strategy that will be most effective in helping to rehabilitate the Party with the electorate. The motive for Peel is to share his opinions with a senior Party colleague, possibly in order to demonstrate his leadership qualities but also to give some reassurance that the Party can make progress in the future.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at the top of Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. Despite its strength in terms of authorship and content, the source does have limitations, most notably its date. Written in January 1833, the source is placed at the very beginning of the period in focus (1833–1841) and therefore cannot take into account developments between 1834 and 1841, which include two general elections in which the Conservatives made significant advances. It would be reasonable for candidates to argue that, in terms of content, the source does not provide significant detail on how the Conservative Party is to be rebuilt, and that this therefore is a limitation. At the same time, Peel does lay down the broad outlines of a strategy that will facilitate the reform and re-establishment of the

Party by emphasising the importance of an appeal to the newly enfranchised middle class and positioning the Party in the moderate 'middle ground' of national politics. Better candidates will note that Peel's references to the radicals and radicalism is an indication that he does not intend to abandon all the principles with which his Party has traditionally been identified, but rather is evidence of his attempts to combine the best of the old policies with a new image. Contextual knowledge about the wretched state of the Party in the wake of its devastating defeat over the Great Reform Act (1832) will enable candidates to argue that the source was a critical stepping stone in the rehabilitation of the Conservative Party and its rebuilding in the period 1833–1841. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Peel's moderate policies were responsible for the rebuilding of the Conservative Party in the period 1833–1841.

This question targets AO1 (b) and AO2: the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b) and**, the candidate's ability as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2 (a), ([0]–[3]) AO1 (b), ([0]–[2]) AO2 (b)

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be reference to Peel's leadership in this period. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the question of the rebuilding of the Conservative Party.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2 (a), [[4]–[6]) AO1 (b), [[3]–[5]) AO2 (b)

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be some acknowledgement of the Conservative Party's success in elections in this period. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, Source 1, Peel’s letter to Goulburn, sets out his general principles, while Source 2 suggests that Peel himself is important to the Party’s rebuilding. Source 3 introduces the additional factor of party organisation.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, there may be reference to the Tamworth Manifesto by politicians or political commentators of the time.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2 (a), ([7]–[9]) AO1 (b), ([6]–[8]) AO2 (b)**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. It might be noted that the political strategy fashioned by Peel – presenting the Conservatives as a moderate alternative to Ultra-Toryism and radicalism – was an attempt to rehabilitate his Party and make it electable once again after the debacle of the defeat over the Great Reform Act. In particular, it was a clear attempt to attract votes from the newly-enfranchised middle class, while at the same time seeking to reassure traditional Tory supporters that the Party was not abandoning its traditional opposition to radicalism. The strategy, of course, cannot be separated from its author, and arguably Robert Peel was the common denominator across all elements of the rebuilding of the Conservative Party in the period 1833–1841. It was Peel, above all others, who recognised the need to modernise the Party. Other key staging posts in the rebuilding of the Conservative Party were its improving electoral performance in the late 1830s and the success, albeit short-lived, of the ‘100 Days’ Government of 1834–1835. Candidates might also note that the rebuilding of the Conservative Party in the period was also assisted by a growing disenchantment with the Whig Government and a sense that the governing party had run out of both ideas and energy. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation, for example, one source may be neglected. Source 1, an extract from Peel’s letter to Henry Goulburn, provides substantive evidence for consideration of the proposition, while Sources 2 and 3 provide a wider focus on Conservative Party rebuilding efforts in the period 1833–1841.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS [6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, there may be a contemporary comment from leading Conservatives such as Wellington, Stanley, Disraeli or Peel. Historians’

interpretations might include opinions on the impact of Peel and party organisation.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2 (a), ([10]–[12]) AO2 (b), ([9]–[11]) AO2 (b)

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which the rebuilding of the Conservative Party in the period 1833–1841 was due to Peel's policy of presenting a moderate alternative to Ultra-Toryism and radicalism. This was the basic foundation for the rebuilding of the Conservative Party, or rather the transformation of the old Tory Party into the new Conservative Party in the aftermath of the crisis of the Great Reform Act. Peel had to come to terms with the new political realities of an expanded electorate with expectations of progressive reform, and this was his attempt to do so, judging by the Party's performance up to 1841, it was successful. Hand in hand with the strategy of taking up a moderate position in politics and appealing to the middle class, went an increasingly professional approach to party organisation. The Conservative and Constitutional Associations, the forerunners of modern constituency organisations, nearly all came into being during 1834–1835. The Carlton Club was established as the Party's headquarters and nerve centre, and Sir Francis Robert Bonham was appointed as the Party's first Election Agent or manager. The increasing efficiency of the Party was evident in the gains it made in the elections of 1835, 1837 and 1841. Fundamental to the rebuilding of the Conservative Party is, of course, the Party's leader and the author of the Tamworth Manifesto, Sir Robert Peel. Peel after 1832 followed very much the same line as he had when he was in Liverpool's administration during the 1820s. He supported cautious piecemeal changes and accepted the new parliamentary system and its logical corollaries. In addition, he endeavoured to win back the moderate men and the great 'interests' in the nation who were alienated by the Tory attitude to the Reform Bill. He encouraged the removal of abuses but resisted with much determination any move to disturb the balance of that 'mixed constitution' which the Tories regarded as sacrosanct, and which, though the Whigs paid due tribute to it, their radical followers frankly derided. Peel would not have become such a dominant figure if there had been an equivalent of himself on the other side. If the Whigs had had a Peel, the Conservatives may not have made the rapid progress they did. However, the Whigs did not have a match for Peel. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Answers will note that Source 1, the extract from Peel's letter to Goulburn, argues that the Conservative Party should 'seek the goodwill of the respectable portion of the community, what is referred to as the middle class', reflecting the new political reality that, with the expansion of the electorate to include the manufacturing and commercial interests, it was necessary for the Party to

modernise. At the same time, Peel recognised the need to reassure the Party's traditional supporters, hence the identification of its main object as the need to resist radicalism. Source 2 approaches the subject of Conservative Party rebuilding from a different angle, contrasting the two principal parties' leaders. Here, the criticism of Melbourne by a member of his own administration is quite damning, especially in contrast to the impact Peel has clearly made on the political nation. Source 3 provides a wider perspective on developments in the 1830s, noting the significance of the Tamworth Manifesto in articulating Conservative principles but also reflecting the steady progress of the Party under Peel until it secures an overall majority in the House of Commons in 1841.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. **Contemporary** opinions might include observations from leading Conservative and Whig politicians such as Lord Stanley, Lord Melbourne or Lord John Russell. It would be equally valid for a candidate to engage with the contemporary opinion offered by Peel in Source 1 and by Lord Holland in Source 2. **Later** interpretations may reflect on Blake's observations in Source 3 about the recovery of the Conservative Party from the mid-1830s onwards. Candidates can concur with Blake's views, qualify them, or disagree with them. It is more important that candidates debate the issues, consider evidence and substantiate a credible line of argument. [35]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

48

60

Option 4: Unification of Italy and Germany 1815–1871

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Explain Mazzini's ideas for the unification of Italy between 1815 and 1848.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers at this level will be inaccurate and demonstrate a superficial understanding of Giuseppe Mazzini's ideas for the unification of Italy in the period up to 1848. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information on Mazzini's ideas for the unification of Italy up to 1848, perhaps considering the importance of 'Young Italy' which he founded in 1831. However, there will be significant gaps and omissions. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation and / or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of Mazzini's ideas. He became a nationalist as a result of the poverty and suffering he witnessed after the revolution in Piedmont in 1820. He believed that all human beings and races were equal. Mazzini was also a fierce opponent of xenophobia. He advocated free and compulsory education and strongly supported women's rights. The failure of the revolts in Italy in 1830–1831 convinced him that the secret societies were incapable of bringing about revolution and Italian revolutionaries would receive no help from France. He therefore founded 'Young Italy', an organisation which promoted national aims, to be achieved through mass insurrection. For Mazzini the existence of an Italian 'nation' was based on its common culture. He envisaged that the existing rulers would be deposed from 'below' and Italy would become a republic espousing the principle of equality and having a written constitution, including universal suffrage. According to Mazzini, kings had impeded the progress of Italian nationalism. Despite his support for a republic, Mazzini was willing to accept a constitutional monarchy as an interim solution. In 1831 he offered to support Charles Albert of Piedmont

as King of a new unified Italy if Charles was willing to achieve Italian independence by expelling the Austrians from the Italian states. For Mazzini the Papacy was the main enemy. He wanted an end to the Pope's power and spiritual influence over the Italians and advocated a secular Italy with Rome as its capital. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers at this level will clearly discuss Mazzini's ideas for the unification of Italy. He advocated that the unified Italy should include all Italian speaking states, since they had the same culture. According to Mazzini, 'Italy' therefore should include the South Tyrol, Corsica and Malta. Mazzini believed in unitary nationalism and refused to accept that states such as Sicily and Sardinia had separate cultural traditions and identities. He saw the unified Italy as a central, unitary entity and fiercely opposed those who advocated a federalist structure. Good answers may observe that, while Mazzini underlined the importance of universal suffrage, he had little time for the peasantry or urban masses. On the contrary, his vision of a unified Italy involved only educated groups such as lawyers, students and independent artisans. To sum up, Mazzini's ideas for a unified Italy involved the establishment of a unitary republic, based on liberty, democracy and universal suffrage. Only after the establishment of a republic would it be possible for Italians to enjoy freedom and self-determination. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- (b) Explain the role of France in the unification of Italy in the period 1849–1860.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers at this level will be inaccurate and demonstrate a superficial understanding of the role France played in the unification of Italy in the period 1849–1860. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a

greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the role France played in the unification of Italy, referring perhaps to the secret negotiations Napoleon III held with Cavour at Plombières in July 1858 when it was agreed that they would wage war against Austria if the opportunity arose. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little use of specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors. They may observe that Louis Napoleon had in the 1830s expressed a desire to support Italian unification but, after his election as President of the French Republic in December 1848, his forces destroyed the Roman Republic in 1849. But after Louis Napoleon became Emperor Napoleon III in December 1852 he promised to support Piedmont and developed a close relationship with Cavour. Although Napoleon regarded himself as a liberator of people living under foreign rule, his most important motive for supporting Piedmont's expansionist policies was to weaken Austrian rule in Northern Italy. Answers may point out that when Piedmont supported France and Britain in the Crimean War against Russia, the issue of Italian unification was debated at the subsequent peace conference in Paris. The closer co-operation between Napoleon and Cavour following the failed assassination attempt on Napoleon III by an Italian republican, Count Felice Orsini, culminated in their secret meeting at Plombières on 21 July 1858. Napoleon agreed to support Piedmont in a war against Austria if a pretext could be found for his entry into the war. As a result of the subsequent Austro-Italian War in 1859, Austrian power in Italy was substantially weakened, while France gained Nice and Savoy. Answers may make the point that Cavour was heavily reliant on Napoleon III since the failure of the revolutions in the Italian states in 1848–1849 had convinced him that the unification of Italy could not be achieved without foreign help. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers at this level may provide a more detailed response, pointing out perhaps that in the Austro-Italian War Napoleon III's troops won a series of military victories but, to Cavour's disgust, the Emperor became alarmed at the prospect of an escalation of the war, and signed an armistice with Austria on 8 July 1859. In the subsequent peace treaty Piedmont's only gain was a large part of Lombardy and, as a result, Cavour resigned as Prime Minister. Garibaldi's successful expedition to Sicily in July 1860 placed Napoleon III in a predicament because, while he wanted to prevent Garibaldi from threatening Rome and the Pope, he could not publicly condone the invasion of the Papal States by Cavour's army which aimed to intercept Garibaldi.

But while he severed diplomatic relations with Piedmont, Napoleon III reached a secret agreement with Cavour that he would intervene only if Garibaldi reached Rome. In practice, Napoleon III acquiesced in the unification of most of Italy by 1860 when the entire peninsula, except Venetia and Rome, belonged to the Kingdom of Italy. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the attitude of the liberals to Bismarck in the period 1862–1871?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, responses may refer to Baumgarten's attitude to Bismarck.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. Hermann Baumgarten, an influential liberal, is urging his fellow liberals to abandon their opposition to Bismarck.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The strength of the source lies in the fact that its author is a leading liberal who is attempting to convince his fellow liberals to abandon their long-standing opposition to Bismarck because the Prussian Minister-President has waged successful wars against Denmark in 1864 and Austria in 1866. Baumgarten justifies his support for Bismarck by arguing that, even though he 'looks different from the liberal image', he has 'obtained the first significant extension of the German frontier for centuries' as a result of the Danish War. Baumgarten argues that, while the liberals despaired in 1860 that their policies would not be implemented until 'the Prussian sword cut through the net of Austrian intrigues', the sword 'is glittering splendidly in the sunshine' following Prussia's victory over Austria in the summer of 1866. The date of the source is useful because the article was written shortly after the Treaty of Prague in which Prussia annexed Schleswig, Holstein, Hesse-Cassel, Hanover, Nassau and Frankfurt. The audience for Baumgarten's article was his fellow liberals, especially those in Prussia who had been engaged in a bitter conflict with Bismarck over the Army Bill since 1860. His motive was to create party unity by convincing liberal deputies and their supporters that they should abandon their opposition to Bismarck since he was 'a man of rare power' who was fulfilling their aspirations for the unification of Germany. In addition, Baumgarten points out that the Prussian army, the cause of the conflict between Bismarck and the liberals, had made 'a huge contribution' to 'this glorious success'.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at the top of Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. Responses may observe that Baumgarten's plea 'for Prussia to postpone all internal dissent' refers to the divisions among the liberals as a result of the Constitutional Crisis. Roon's Army Bill in 1860 to reform the Prussian army was blocked by the liberals and their allies who had a majority in the Lower House of the Prussian Parliament. After Bismarck was appointed Minister-President of Prussia in September 1862, he ignored the parliament and illegally collected the taxes to finance the re-organisation of the army. He then proceeded to fulfil the foreign policy aims of the Prussian Liberals by acquiring Holstein through the Danish War and defeating Austria in 1866 as key steps towards a unified Germany dominated by Prussia. As a result, the German liberals faced a tricky dilemma; either they retained their principles and continued to oppose Bismarck or they abandoned their principles and supported him. Answers will not only discuss the strengths of the source but also its limitations. It has several important limitations. Baumgarten's views are not necessarily representative of all German liberals, as is shown by the split in the Progressive Party and the establishment of a new party, the National Liberal Party, in 1867 which supported Bismarck. Baumgarten was simply one individual from one of the thirty-nine German states. Another limitation is the date of the source (October 1866) since it cannot shed any light on liberal attitudes to Bismarck between the autumn of 1866 and the unification of Germany in 1871. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Bismarck was responsible for the unification of Germany by 1871.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements; and **AO2(a):** the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways;

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b), ([0]–[2]) AO2(b)**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and grammar or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources and fail to utilise the source content to address the question about the extent to which Bismarck was responsible for the unification of Germany by 1871.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2(a), ([4]–[6]) AO1(b), ([3]–[5]) AO2(b)**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a partial account of the extent to which Bismarck was responsible for the unification of Germany by 1871. There will be frequent lapses in meaning due to shortcomings in legibility with some defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, in Source 1 Hermann Baumgarten argues that Bismarck made a major contribution to Prussia's triumphs in both the Danish and Austro-Prussian Wars. Source 2, a record of Bismarck's statement to Benjamin Disraeli, a future British Prime Minister, suggests that the future Minister-President of Prussia had meticulously planned the unification of Germany even before he came to office, while Source 3 outlines some of the other factors which brought about the unification of Germany.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): Answers at this level will have some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. They may refer to a comment from a leading politician in one of the German states about Bismarck's role in German unification or outline the views of an historian about its most important causes.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2(a), ([7]–[9]) AO1(b), ([6]–[8]) AO2(b)**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers at this level are likely to present a more detailed discussion of the extent to which Bismarck was responsible for the unification of Germany, focusing perhaps on his skilful diplomacy. Answers should focus on Bismarck's role in bringing about and winning the Danish War of 1864, the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871. Responses may discuss Bismarck's skill in handling the Schleswig-Holstein crisis. They may argue that he used this crisis to lure Austria into initial co-operation with Prussia against Denmark, with the aim of engineering conflict between the two major powers to settle the issue of which of them was the leader of 'Germany'. Answers may also discuss Bismarck's efforts, prior to the Austro-Prussian War, to secure French neutrality in any conflict with Austria and show how he achieved this in his meeting with Louis Napoleon at Biarritz in October 1865. Another key reason for Prussia's victory in the war against Austria was the Prussian-Italian Treaty negotiated by Bismarck and signed on 8 April 1866,

which stipulated that, for a period of three months, Italy would go to war with Austria if Prussia did. Answers should also assess Bismarck's skill in engineering the Franco-Prussian War. They are likely to present a discussion of the Hohenzollern Candidature, the immediate cause of the conflict, and the importance of Bismarck's editing of the Ems telegram, which made the Prussian King's rejection of French demands more uncompromising. France responded by declaring war on Prussia. Answers may observe that, prior to his editing of the telegram, Bismarck had secured promises of support from the South German states in the event of a war with France. Responses will also begin to discuss some of the other factors which contributed to the unification of Germany, such as Prussia's economic and military strength, the excellence of its military leaders and the favourable international situation. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation; for example, one source may be neglected. Baumgarten's article (Source 1) supports the proposition in the question by showing Bismarck's political skill in dealing with the Prussian Liberals during the Constitutional Crisis. It also illustrates the scale of the task Bismarck faced when he became Prussian Minister-President because 'all the major political forces in Germany were solidly ranged against him'. Bismarck's importance to German unification is reinforced by Source 2 in which he accurately predicts how he would implement army reform in Prussia, wage war against Austria, win across the medium-sized and smaller German states and achieve German unification under Prussian leadership. Source 3 reinforces the key role Bismarck played in bringing about German unification but also refers to the importance of the Prussian army, Prussia's strong economic position and the decline of Austria after the revolutions of 1848.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers at this level will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers may include the views of contemporary politicians from Prussia or any of the other German states about Bismarck's role in the Prussian-led unification of Germany. In addition, they may include the views of later historians on the scale of Bismarck's achievement. Answers may react to Source 2 in which Bismarck maintains that, from the very beginning, he had a master plan for the unification of Germany. They may agree with this interpretation or contradict it, perhaps arguing that Bismarck had no detailed plan for German unity but exploited any available opportunity to increase the power of Prussia.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2(a), ([10]–[12]) AO1(b), ([9]–[11]) AO2(b)

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Answers at this level are likely to present a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which Bismarck was responsible for the

unification of Germany by 1871. As well as demonstrating Bismarck's political acumen, they will assess the importance of the other factors which brought about the unification of Germany. Prussia's economic strength played an important part in German unification. It had excellent natural resources, including rich coal deposits in the Ruhr, which laid the basis for its rapid industrialisation. The establishment of the *Zollverein* in 1834, to which Austria did not belong, promoted Prussia's economic development by removing tariff barriers and its strong economy contributed to the military defeat of Austria in 1866. For example, Prussia had five railway lines to transport its troops southwards, while Austria had just one, from Vienna to Bohemia. As a result of its economic strength, Prussia also had superior weaponry and its needle-gun inflicted heavy casualties on the Austrian army in the Seven Weeks' War. Prussia also had outstanding military leaders, especially Helmuth von Moltke, the Chief of General Staff, and General Albrecht von Roon, Prussian War Minister from 1859 to 1873. Answers may also refer to the unusually favourable international climate in the period 1862–1871, as well as the role of nationalist ideas in bringing about the unification of Germany. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry using this information to inform the response. Answers will interpret the sources with complete understanding and use them with contextual knowledge to provide a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which Bismarck was responsible for the unification of Germany. Answers at this level may establish links between the various sources. All three sources support the proposition to varying degrees. Baumgarten in Source 1 praises Bismarck's 'huge contribution' to Prussia's success in the Danish War and, with reference to Prussia's victory over Austria, describes him as a bold 'man of rare power'. Source 2 suggests that Bismarck had a detailed plan for German unity even before he came to power, while Source 3 reiterates that 'German unification came about largely as a result of Bismarck's actions'. However, Sources 1 and 3 also suggest that Bismarck was not solely responsible for achieving German unity. Both sources refer to the pivotal role played by the Prussian army, while Bismarck argues in Source 2 that army reform was a precondition for German unity. Alan Farmer and Andrina Stiles in Source 3 also point out that Prussia's military power was dependent on its economic strength, while nationalist sentiments in the North German states, Austria's weakness and the fact the great powers underestimated Prussia all contributed to the unification of Germany.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. They will discuss fully the extent to which Bismarck was responsible for the unification of Germany. Responses may refer to his diplomatic skill and his willingness to go to war to achieve his foreign policy objectives, as well as engaging in the debate sparked by Source 2 about whether Bismarck had a long-term plan to bring about German unification through wars with Austria and France or whether his most important quality was to

display flexibility, have several different policy alternatives at any one time and take advantage of opportunities which presented themselves. While contemporary figures stressed the importance of Bismarck's contribution to German unification, later historians have produced a more balanced assessment and answers at this level should react to the views expressed by Farmer and Stiles in Source 3. They may argue that, while Bismarck played a key role in achieving German unity, a wide range of other factors must also be taken into account, including economic considerations, the role of nationalism, the strength of the Prussian army and the underestimation of Bismarck by the great powers. [35]

Option 4

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

48

60

Option 5: Germany 1918–1945

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Explain how the Nazi Party developed in the period 1924–1929.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically reveal a superficial awareness of how the Nazi Party developed between 1924 and 1929. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide an understanding of how the Nazi Party developed between 1924 and 1929 but with significant omissions. Responses may only discuss the adoption of parliamentary, legal tactics as the new Nazi strategy for attempting to get into power. After the failure of the Munich Putsch in November 1923, Hitler changed the strategy of the party. An armed coup was no longer an appropriate tactic and the only way to succeed was to work within the Weimar Constitution and gain power by legal means. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Responses will reveal a competent awareness of how the Nazi Party developed between 1924 and 1929. The adoption of a legal strategy necessitated the creation of a national party structure geared to gaining success in elections. At the Bamberg Party Conference in 1926 Hitler re-established a degree of unity within the Party and mobilised sufficient support to re-establish his supremacy. A reorganisation of the party structure followed. The whole of Germany was divided into 35 regions which reflected the electoral geography of Weimar's system of proportional representation. The control of each region was placed in the hands of a *Gauleiter*, who had responsibility for creating district and branch groups. Responses at this level may omit to discuss the contributions of Strasser and Goebbels. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the

style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will reveal a comprehensive awareness of how the Nazi Party developed between 1924 and 1929. Gregor Strasser was mainly responsible for building up an efficient Party structure and this was reflected in an increasing Party membership of 108 000 by 1928, partly due to the creation of associated Nazi organisations that were geared to appeal to the specific interests of particular groups. Joseph Goebbels increased support for the party in Berlin and showed a real interest in propaganda, creating the newspaper *Der Angriff* (The Attack). The Nazi Party had been revitalised. It was no longer a small provincial party in Bavaria but had become a national party with an effective political machine. Despite the disappointing performance in the Reichstag election of 1928, significant gains were made in state elections in 1929. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

[12]

12

- (b) Explain the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1939.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately **AO1(a)** and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically reveal a superficial awareness of the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1939. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide an understanding of the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1939 but with significant lapses. Nazi ideology stressed that most women should be confined to a domestic role in society. This idea was summed up by the Nazi slogan *Kinder, Küche, Kirche* (children, kitchen, church). Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing may be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little use of specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will reveal a competent awareness of the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1939 with few omissions. The Nazis wanted to reverse many of the trends that had increased opportunities for women, such as increased female employment and a declining birth rate that was partly due to wider access to contraception. The Nazis had a clear vision of women performing what they considered to be their traditional role as homemakers and childbearers. In the racial struggle for survival, women had a vital role to breed genetically pure Germans to ensure German supremacy. The Nazis also emphasised the role of the family as the “germ cell of the nation” and this had implications for the position of women in the state. From 1933 the regime embarked on a pro-natalist policy – a policy encouraging the birth of children – aimed at women. In 1933 marriage loans were offered to newlyweds on the condition that the wife would not work outside the home. For each child born to couples taking part in the programme, the amount to be repaid was reduced by 25 per cent. The status of mothers was raised by a series of propaganda campaigns, including the introduction of the Mother’s Cross in 1939 for those with large families. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will reveal a comprehensive awareness of the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1939, discussing Nazi attitudes to their role within the family and the economy. The early years of the regime forced women out of employment and encouraged traditional family structures. In 1933 the Law for the Reduction of Unemployment linked the fight to reduce unemployment with the introduction of Nazi policies towards women. This was soon followed by restrictions on women’s employment in the Civil Service. However, after 1936, partially due to the rearmament drive, the economy was suffering from a labour shortage and the number of women in all types of jobs increased. Maximum level four marks should be awarded to responses which, in addition to the above, discuss Nazi attempts to coordinate women. From 1934 Gertrud Scholtz-Klink was the leader of the NSF (National Socialist Women’s League), an elite women’s organisation within the Nazi Party which controlled the DFW (German Women’s Enterprise). This was an umbrella organisation which tried to absorb all previous women’s organisations and activities for women. It never had a mass membership. There were women’s sections in the Reich Labour Service and the German Labour Front. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

[12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying opposition and resistance to the Nazis from the Christian Churches in Germany in the period 1933–1945?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate’s ability, as part of the historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, they may refer to Galen’s condemnation of Hitler’s euthanasia programme.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. Galen’s sermon on the Nazi policy of euthanasia publicly reveals opposition on the grounds of Christian morals from an important cleric within the Catholic hierarchy in Germany.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but will also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The content reveals that, on the orders of the Nazi government in Berlin, mental patients in the diocese of Münster are being murdered. Bishop Galen publicly opposes the implementation of a policy of euthanasia on the grounds of Christian theology and morality, in particular the sixth commandment. Galen urges Christians within German society to protect the mentally ill and actively oppose the authorities who attempt to implement the policy. The nature of the source has several strengths. It is a contemporary public document by a significant individual within the Catholic Church condemning the Nazi policy of euthanasia with the intention of influencing Christians into actively opposing the policy. The mode, date, author, tone, audience and motive of the source can all be assessed positively, making it a useful source to an historian studying a particular instance of Christian opposition. Due to the fact that this was a public sermon delivered to a large gathering in a cathedral in Münster, such outspoken criticism was an audacious attempt by a bishop within the Catholic hierarchy in Germany to oppose the Nazi policy of euthanasia which up to this point had been implemented in secret. The subsequent publication and distribution of the sermon by Catholic elements ensured that the Nazis could no longer conceal the policy of euthanasia from the German people.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at the top of Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. The source has some limitations with regard to content. Galen alleges that the authorities in Berlin have authorised the policy of euthanasia but offers no proof of his claim. He claims that “we”

have heard reports about what is going on in the mental asylums but does not indicate who the reports are from and who else in addition to himself is receiving them. He himself acknowledges that it is only a “general suspicion” that the patients have been deliberately killed. The historian would need to see more evidence to substantiate Galen’s claims than is contained in this particular document. Other sources concerning the policy of euthanasia would need to be consulted. Another limitation is that Galen is only referring to what is supposedly going on in his diocese of Münster. The historian would want to take a wider perspective and discover if similar actions were taking place in other mental asylums in the rest of Germany. In terms of an historian studying opposition and resistance from the Christian Churches in the period 1933–1945, the source only covers one instance of opposition from within the Catholic Church on the specific Nazi policy of euthanasia from the particular year of 1941. From their contextual knowledge candidates may point out the consequences of the sermon after 1941, as the public reaction to the sermon persuaded Hitler to call a temporary halt to the euthanasia programme, making the sermon one of the most effective instances of opposition towards the Nazis. Candidates may also point out from their contextual knowledge that opposition was not confined to Catholicism within the Christian Churches but also occurred from within Protestantism. Martin Niemöller was one of the founders of the breakaway Confessional Church in 1934. In 1943 a synod of the Prussian Confessional Church criticised those involved in the extermination of people on health and racial grounds. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess whether the Christian Churches mounted the most effective opposition and resistance towards the Nazi regime in Germany in the period 1933–1945.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b) and**, the candidate’s ability as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2a, ([0]–[3]) AO1b, ([0]–[2]) AO2b

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the question as to whether the Christian Churches mounted the most effective opposition and resistance towards the Nazi regime in Germany in the period 1933–1945.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations as to whether the Christian Churches mounted the most effective opposition and resistance towards the Nazi regime in Germany in the period 1933–1945.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2a, ([4]–[6]) AO1b, ([3]–[5]) AO2b**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a partial assessment of whether the Christian Churches in Germany mounted the most effective opposition towards the Nazi regime in the period 1933–1945. Among Protestants, the Confessional Church, established in 1934 with Pastor Martin Niemöller as one of the co-founders, opposed the Nazi regime but it was more concerned to defend the Church than weaken the regime. In 1937 Pope Pius XI attacked the Nazi system in an encyclical. Hundreds of Protestant pastors and Catholic priests were to die in concentration camps for their refusal to co-operate with the regime. They included Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who was a member of the Confessional Church. He was arrested in 1943 and executed in 1945. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, Source 1 reveals opposition from within Catholicism towards a particular policy of the Nazis. Source 2 provides information on the formation of the breakaway Confessional Church within Protestantism. In combination Sources 1 and 2 provide information on the Christian Churches. Source 3 provides information on the Christian Churches and other opposition groups such as the Left, the Right and young people.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, a contemporary comment from an individual or a group involved in the German Resistance may be quoted.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2a, ([7]–[9]) AO1b, ([6]–[8]) AO2b**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may compare the significance of the opposition from the Christian Churches with another form of opposition such as youth and student protest. The White Rose Movement could be classified as passive resistance. This student resistance movement was led by brother and sister Hans and Sophie Scholl. The White Rose was the name given to a series of leaflets printed in 1942–1943 and

distributed initially amongst the students of Munich University but eventually to many towns in central Germany. In February 1943 the six leaders were arrested, tortured and executed. Answers may discuss other forms of opposition and resistance from young people such as the Swing Youth and the Edelweiss Pirates. The Swing Youth consisted mainly of middle-class youngsters who took up the music and imagery associated with the dance-bands of America. Edelweiss Pirates is a general name given to a host of working-class young people who formed urban gangs and had been alienated by the military emphasis and discipline of the Hitler Youth. Unlike the White Rose Movement, they became involved in more active resistance in some instances, for example in Cologne in 1944 when twelve of them were publicly hanged because of their attacks on military targets and the assassination of a Gestapo officer. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation, for example, one source may be neglected. Sources 1 and 2 provide evidence of opposition from the Christian Churches. Source 1 provides evidence of one of the most significant instances of opposition by an influential individual to a specific policy of the Nazis during the Third Reich. The Catholic Bishop Galen raised awareness of the racial policy of euthanasia and condemned it publicly on the grounds of Christian values. The public reaction to the sermon temporarily undermined the Nazis' willingness to continue to pursue the policy. Source 2 provides evidence of Niemöller's public criticism of the Nazi regime. Source 3 provides information and an evaluation of the significance of opposition from the Christian Churches, the Left, including the Communists and the Social Democrats, the student protest group, the White Rose Movement, and from the Right, including the Conservatives such as the Beck-Goerdeler group and elements of the military who attempted to assassinate Hitler and overthrow the Nazi regime in Operation Valkyrie in 1944. This was the most serious internal threat to the survival of Hitler and the Nazi regime in the period 1933–1945.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of whether the Christian Churches in Germany mounted the most effective opposition and resistance towards the Nazi regime in the period 1933–1945. Galen's sermon in Source 1 is a public appeal to fellow Christians to take action to assist the potential victims of the Nazi policy of euthanasia which could be used to support the proposition concerning opposition. Niemöller's public criticism of the Nazi regime in Source 2 could also be used to support the proposition to a lesser extent. While it reveals opposition from an important leader from the breakaway Confessional Church, the fact that he was arrested suggests that the opposition was not that effective. In Source 3 the historian D.G. Williamson highlights the importance of the opposition from the Christian Churches but also challenges the proposition by claiming that resistance from the Right was potentially the most effective. Opposition from the Confessional Church was not a political threat to the Nazi regime. Galen's protest over euthanasia was restricted to a successful protest over

one particular policy of the regime.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2a, ([10]–[12]) AO1b, ([9]–[11]) AO2b

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide a comprehensive assessment of the significance of the opposition and resistance from the Christian Churches compared to other forms of opposition such as from young people, the Left, the Conservatives and the military. Right-wing resistance from the traditional elites included the Kreisau Circle and the Beck-Goerdeler Group who were associated with Operation Valkyrie in July 1944, when elements of the military, including Stauffenberg, Tresckow and Beck, failed to assassinate Hitler and overthrow the regime. On the Left, communist cells continued to operate as underground movements in many large German cities. Groups included the Uhrig Group, the Home Front and the Red Orchestra. The New Beginning was a Social Democrat group which preserved democratic ideals. Industrial unrest during the war in the Rhineland area was organised by the Mannheim Group. Since there was no serious attempt by the Left to overthrow the Nazi regime in the way the Right attempted to do in the 1944 bomb plot, it could be argued that the resistance from the Right was a greater threat to Hitler and the Nazi regime. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2a:

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Answers will interpret the sources with complete understanding and use them with contextual knowledge to provide a comprehensive assessment. Source 1 is evidence of one of the most effective instances of opposition to the Nazis. The consequences of Galen's sermon were significant in that the Nazis halted the euthanasia programme due to the public outrage it provoked. Source 1 could stimulate candidates to support the proposition that the opposition from the Christian Churches was the most effective in the period by arguing that Galen's opposition temporarily succeeded in undermining one of the most extreme racial policies perpetrated by the Nazis. The temporary subversion of a particular Nazi policy by an important individual within the Catholic Church could be considered as being more successful than the rebellion against the Nazi state attempted in 1944 by the Right which completely failed in its objective. Source 2 provides further evidence of opposition from the Christian Churches by revealing opposition within Protestantism towards the Nazi regime. The source reveals that Martin Niemöller's arrest in 1937 was ordered by Hitler due to the pastor's criticism of the arrest of members of the Confessional Church. It was a breakaway movement within Protestantism wanting institutional independence from the Nazi state. Although this opposition was probably not as significant as Galen's opposition to euthanasia in terms of its consequences, the Confessional Church was never completely suppressed by the Nazi state. Source 3 provides evidence of groups who opposed the Nazis. It also

suggests that the opposition from the Confessional Church and Galen's criticism of euthanasia were "major" and "considerable" victories. However, it also challenges the proposition by suggesting that resistance from the Right was potentially the most effective as it culminated in an organised attempt to overthrow the Nazi regime in 1944 with the active resistance of Operation Valkyrie. Source 3 should stimulate candidates to consider the significance of opposition from the Christian Churches as opposed to the Social Democrats, the Communists, the White Rose group, the Beck-Goerdeler group and ultimately the resistance of elements within the military centered around Stauffenberg.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may react to the views of the historian D.G. Williamson as expressed in Source 3. With his emphasis on the Conservative opposition being potentially the most effective resistance to Hitler, culminating in an attempt by elements within the military to assassinate Hitler and overthrow the regime in a *coup d'état* in July 1944, Williamson is suggesting that, with its access to arms, the army had the real capacity to resist. Therefore, the development of the active resistance of the Conservative elites formed around the army. On 20 July 1944 the Bomb Plot, which involved elements of the Conservative and military resistance was the most serious threat to the survival of the Nazi regime from within Germany, even though it failed. Therefore it could be argued that this was the most significant form of resistance. Unlike the Right in 1944, the Left made no serious attempt to try to overthrow the Nazi regime from within by a coup. Other forms of opposition from other groups may have undermined the regime but they never threatened to bring it down. Galen's opposition towards euthanasia was a protest over a single issue. It was not a root and branch attack on the regime. Opposition from the Confessional Church was not a political threat to the survival of the regime. As the attempted coup of 1944 failed to assassinate Hitler and overthrow the Nazi regime, it could be suggested that such resistance was ineffective, whereas the opposition of the Christian Churches was more effective because it had less ambitious aims.

[35]

Option 5

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

48

60

60