



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2016**

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

[AH111]

FRIDAY 10 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 role played by Emperor Charles V 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. Answers may typically mention that Charles V was the nephew of Catherine of Aragon and therefore did not support the divorce because of family ties. 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. Charles V was Catherine of Aragon's nephew and, because of this, Catherine sought his support against the divorce. Since Charles did not want to see the family held in disgrace and was unhappy at the treatment of Catherine by Henry VIII, he did not support the 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. Answers will begin to consider a range of roles played by Charles V in the divorce proceedings. He was unhappy about the treatment of Catherine of Aragon as she was known to hold favour in his heart. Charles was also a devout Catholic and opposed divorce on religious grounds. At this time he had taken control of Rome and the Pope was, effectively, his prisoner. Even if the Pope had wished to grant the divorce, he could not because of these circumstances. The Pope feared Charles and so he told Campeggio to delay the divorce hearing, hoping that Catherine would die or Henry VIII would tire of Anne. 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 played by Charles V in the divorce. He may have controlled Italy by 1529 but the Pope was very much his own man and it could be suggested that it was the Pope rather than Charles who prevented the divorce. Charles was much more concerned with his international role than events in England. By this time Charles was concerned about the growth of France and only wanted England as an ally against France. He had denounced the divorce proceedings and did not want to appear weak by then accepting the divorce. Charles played a minor role in the divorce proceedings as Catherine sought his advice. In reality his role had little impact as the Pope would not grant a divorce and, with Anne becoming pregnant, Henry needed a divorce quickly. 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 measures taken by the Duke of Somerset to solve the economic and social problems England faced between 1547 and 1550.

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 make some remarks about the rule of Somerset but little about the social and economic problems he faced and his attempts to address them. 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 response contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information. Somerset faced the problem of a growing population and enclosure. He did establish a commission to investigate the issue of enclosure but it achieved nothing. This helped to lead to The Many Headed Monster rebellions. A constant state of war also weakened the economy and by 1549 Somerset was at war with both France and Scotland. 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 economic and social problems Somerset faced and how he addressed them. A series of bad harvests and a growth in the population put a great deal of pressure on the economy, as did the continual war with France and Scotland. Enclosing the land had caused unrest in the countryside. Somerset set up a Commission to look into the problem of enclosure but rather than improve the situation, this created much hostility. The landed class was unhappy about his interference and the peasants became disaffected as this Commission achieved nothing. In 1547 he also established the Vagrancy Act which stated that anyone out of work for three days would be branded with the letter “V” and sold as a slave for two years. He also weakened the economy by further debasement of the coinage and introducing a tax on sheep and cloth. His policies were unsuccessful and led to rebellion in 1549 which would eventually lead to his downfall. 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 measures taken by the Duke of Somerset to solve England’s economic and social problems between 1547 and 1550. Somerset inherited a weak economy and greater pressure was added by a rise in population and continual war. He did attempt to solve the problems but proved unsuccessful in his methods. He lacked originality and followed many of the policies introduced by Henry VIII. Further debasement of the coinage weakened confidence in the currency. Somerset continued to sell church land and chantry land which provided money in the short term but did not strengthen the economy. When he borrowed money, he did so at a high rate. Somerset needed to reform the financial administration to improve the economy. Due to the dissolution of the monasteries, he had to deal with a newly emerging vagrancy class. His Vagrancy Act was unpopular, though very rarely enforced. Somerset did attempt to address the social and economic problems but his resources were limited. 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 reasons for Wyatt’s Rebellion of 1554?

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 Renard’s fears about a possible rebellion in England.

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, it is feared that the English will rebel soon as many are unhappy about Queen Mary’s religious policies and the prospect of a Spanish marriage, even though the nobility approve of it. There is also fear that, if the English rebel, they may be supported by the French.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. Answers 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, the source is an extract from a letter written by the Spanish ambassador, Simon Renard, to Prince Philip of Spain. It is written in 1553 before Wyatt’s rebellion and the Spanish marriage occurred. Renard believes that there is unrest in the country due to Mary’s religious policies and the proposed Spanish marriage. The purpose of this letter is to encourage Philip to visit England quickly and settle the situation with marriage. Renard fears rebellion from the English, as well as help from the French, if Philip does not arrive soon. He writes with urgency. The source implies that there will be trouble in the kingdom if Philip does not arrive soon.

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, the source is written by Simon Renard, who worked for both Charles V and Philip. As an eye witness, he is in a position to comment on events leading to Wyatt’s Rebellion. Since he had a very close relationship with Mary, he would be able to judge the feelings in England. After Mary married Philip she relied less on Renard. It is written near the beginning of Mary’s reign and before the marriage or rebellion had taken place. Mary has just been crowned Queen and the people were happy with her, even though she was a Catholic. The source suggests there is some opposition to her religious policies but this was minimal at this time. However, due to Henry VIII’s propaganda, the majority of the people disliked Spain and did not support the Spanish marriage. This source suggests that there is growing discontent in the country which could lead to rebellion. It puts forward a number of reasons for this: Mary’s religious policy, the unpopularity of the nobility and the prospect of a Spanish marriage. From their own knowledge candidates will be aware that there were a variety of reasons for Wyatt’s rebellion. Some of the leaders were concerned about losing their influence within the kingdom in the event of a Spanish marriage. Philip is reluctant to marry Mary and only consents to it as a duty to his father and Catholicism. This source is limited in that it does not tell us anything about Wyatt’s Rebellion and merely suggests that there may be discontent and an uprising. It does not tell us anything about the

demands of the rebels. Renard was in England but he was not English and therefore did not really know how the majority of Englishmen felt about Mary Tudor and her policies; for example, despite Renard's view, many councillors were unhappy with the marriage. [13]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which hostility towards the Spanish marriage was responsible for the outbreak of Wyatt's Rebellion of 1554.

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 response may be a narrative account of Wyatt's Rebellion. There will be little reference to the causes of the rebellion. 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 the extent to which Wyatt's Rebellion was a response to the proposed Spanish marriage.

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, the Spanish marriage was unpopular with many of the people of England. A climate of xenophobia existed. They feared they would become a satellite of Spain and England would be overrun by the Spanish. There will be no reference to other factors which contributed to Wyatt's rebellion. There may 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 refers to some discontent in England regarding religion. Source 2 suggests that Mary was able to gather support from her people at the beginning of her reign. Source 3 mentions that the marriage sparked off a wave of nationalism which led to the rebellion.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, contemporary opinion was against the marriage, while later interpretations suggest this was not the only factor which led to the rebellion.

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. It might be noted that the rebellion was caused by opposition to the Spanish marriage for a variety of reasons. The English feared that they would be dominated by the Spanish and lose their place in Europe. As Mary was female, it was assumed that her husband would rule on her behalf. During the Reformation Henry VIII had discredited Spain and this had left a legacy of hatred towards all things Spanish. This led to an increase in nationalism. The answer may also assess the role religion played in Wyatt's Rebellion. Many associated the Spanish marriage with a return to Catholicism, since Philip regarded himself as the "most Christian King" and Mary was a devout Catholic. 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 suggests that the Spanish marriage was not the main reason for rebellion in the countryside. It suggests that there was also discontent regarding religion and the nobility. Source 2 illustrates that Mary was popular at the beginning of her reign, even though she professed her support and desire for the Catholic religion. Source 3 also mentions the increase in nationalism and unpopularity of the Spanish.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, they may mention the opinions of the rebels and their reasons for a rebellion. They may also refer to opinion in Europe. Later opinion differs in that it places some emphasis on the role of religion and the fear of a counter-reformation.

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 extent to which the Spanish marriage was responsible for Wyatt's Rebellion. The Spanish marriage was used by the rebels to gain support for the rebellion as this would appeal to many of the lesser ranks within English society. However, it was not the only factor. There was a fear of a counter-reformation, not just for religious but also for political reasons. Since many of the gentry had benefited politically and financially from Protestantism, they were reluctant for a return to Catholicism. Political power had much to do with Wyatt's Rebellion. Those in power feared that, if Mary married Philip, they would be replaced by the Spanish. Mary already relied heavily on pro-Spanish and Spanish advisers, and England's political elite did not want this to increase. They feared that, if this marriage occurred, they would lose what influence they had over Mary. Many also supported the rebellion for local reasons. Kent had a tradition for rebellion. Therefore, the proposed Spanish marriage contributed to Wyatt's Rebellion but it was not the only reason why the rebellion occurred. 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. Responses will highlight that Source 1 suggests a variety of reasons for the rebellion but it does imply that, if the marriage happened quickly, the discontent would be easily removed. Source 2 suggests that Mary was popular with the people of England. From the beginning of her reign she used the proclamation to state her support for Roman Catholicism. At the time she would not press her people to conform to her religious policy. Source 3 suggests a variety of reasons for the rebellion, such as the rise in nationalism and local grievances. It also suggests that political reasons played a role in the rebellion.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may refer to contemporary loyalty towards Mary at this time. They may also refer to the opinion of Mary herself. She did not regard the marriage as a cause of opposition as she went ahead and married Philip. Some within her Council approved of the marriage. Later opinion suggests that there were many other reasons for the rebellion and at the heart of it was a fear of losing political power and not the fear of the Spanish. [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 aims of James I's religious policies in the period 1603–1625.

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 the aims of James I's religious policies. 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 aims of James I's religious policies. James sought to appeal to moderates within both Catholics and Puritans but was intolerant of extremists. 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 the aims of James I's religious policies. James was suspicious of Puritan extremists and was determined not to allow them to undermine the unity of the Church of England. He intended to defend the episcopal system of church government and his position at the head of it. James I did, however, want moderate Puritans to support the Church of England and remain within it. He aimed to appease them with limited concessions. As for Catholics, James was much more moderate than many of his contemporaries. He did not wish to remove Catholics from England or bring about their forcible conversion. Rather, he wished for law abiding Catholics to be left alone from interference, preferring instead to focus state action against Catholic extremists, proselytizers and Jesuits. As a result, he tolerated the presence of many noble Catholics at Court. Answers at this level may focus more on the early years of James's reign. 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 aims of James I's religious policies. He wanted to maintain the Elizabethan legacy of a 'via media' church. To this end, he reached out to moderate Puritans by such means as the Hampton Court Conference and the appointment of Archbishop Abbot. He hoped that by such gestures, the majority of Puritans would be persuaded to remain within the Established Church. He was also, however, anxious not to offend the majority of mainstream Anglicans who were alienated by the rigour and emphases of Puritan doctrine. To this end, he enforced the Canons of the Church in 1604 and occasionally opposed Puritan over-reach. An example of the latter is his promulgation of the Book of Sports in 1618. James I also aimed to defend the Calvinist doctrine of the Church, although he did promote Arminian bishops towards the end of his reign. This is another example of his aim to maintain a balanced church. With regard to Catholics, James intended to distinguish between moderates and extremists. He approved the harsh penal legislation of 1606, but made provision for moderates by providing them with an opportunity to demonstrate their loyalty through the Oath of Allegiance. At the beginning of his reign, James also hoped for a reconciliation with Rome, but his position hardened after the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. 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 reasons for the changes in the English economy in the period 1603–1649.

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 the changes in the English economy in the period 1603–1649. 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 more important changes in the English economy in the period 1603–1649. The sustained growth of England's population led to inflation, as agriculture could

not keep pace with the growth. A larger population did, however, provide a greater market for goods, which stimulated economic growth. 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 the reasons for changes in the English economy in the period 1603–1649. London became the centre of commercial activity and its population more than doubled due to migration from rural areas. The population of other towns such as Norwich and Bristol increased to over 10 000 inhabitants, although most towns remained small. Despite these changes, however, England remained an overwhelmingly rural society. Industrial and agricultural production was stimulated by rising prices, which in turn were stimulated by population growth. Agriculture became increasingly efficient, extensive and intensive. Technical innovations emerged, including water meadows and alternate husbandry. Enclosure became more common and new crops were introduced. Increased industrial production provided more goods for internal and external trade and encouraged the beginnings of a consumer society. The cloth industry remained the mainstay of the English economy, despite the Cockayne Project. 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 reasons for changes in the English economy in the period 1603–1649. Level 4 answers will explain more fully many of the points raised in Level 3. For example, London's influence grew with its population, and by the end of the period, a national price standard had been established for goods such as coal, grain and textiles. London dominated the export trade, with Europe the most common destination for English products, although trade with the Far East and the colonies in America was also increasing. The growth in population and the resulting inflation placed severe strains on English society. The number of poor and vagrants grew and regional famine occurred intermittently. 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 attitudes towards Charles I's use of the royal power to raise revenue during the period 1629–1640?

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, Pym reveals his strong opposition to monopolies and Ship Money – both were examples of prerogative taxation.

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, Pym argues that monopolies and Ship Money are great grievances. He also suggests that Charles I's collection of Ship Money was illegal as it went against 'precedents and laws'. Furthermore, Pym objects to the use of a prerogative court, Star Chamber, to enforce the King's revenue schemes.

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 author was John Pym, who delivered the speech in 1640. Pym was well informed on the subject of prerogative taxation and on public opinion. As an MP, he will be familiar with the views of his electorate and might be expected to represent them in this source. The speech was made in 1640, the year in which the Personal Rule came to an end. Thus, the memories of Charles I's policies remain fresh. Pym, it could be argued, is representing views that are current. His audience is the House of Commons, many of whom shared Pym's views. It is useful to an historian to see how he presented his case before them, especially as he emerged as a leader of the parliamentary opposition to Charles I. His motive was clearly to provoke a debate in the Commons and bring about an end to both prerogative taxation and also what he saw as an abuse of prerogative courts. It is useful to an historian to see that Pym held these views before the meeting of the Long Parliament.

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, answers might indicate that monopolies were controversial for various reasons. They had been outlawed in 1624, led to increased prices and, as in the case of the soap monopoly, had been sold to Catholics. Ship Money was regarded by many to be illegal because it was collected in peacetime. This is possibly what Pym means when he argues that it goes against 'all precedents and laws'. He also attacks the use of Star Chamber by the Privy Council, arguing that it has become 'a means of raising revenue'. The court had once been seen

as a way of securing speedy justice, but this changed during the Personal Rule, when it became much more overtly political and a tool of the Crown. Candidates at this level will also identify the limitations to the source's utility. As Pym is addressing the House of Commons, he may have a motive to exaggerate the extent to which the 'people [are] oppressed'. His motive is to persuade his audience to support legislation to address these 'grievances', and, therefore, he uses more colourful language and adopts a more emotive tone. The fact the source was produced in 1640 might also be seen as a limitation. For example, candidates may point out that the sense of grievance felt by Pym and others was exacerbated by events after the Hampden Trial and the Bishops' Wars. There may have been less anger during the 1630s. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the use of controversial taxes and fines was responsible for the opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I in the period 1629–1640.

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, it may point out that prerogative taxes were unpopular and controversial, with many believing them to be illegal. 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 the use of controversial taxes and fines was responsible to the opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I in the period 1629–1640.

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 a partial account of the impact of controversial taxes and fines. It may be argued that nuisance fines and Ship Money affected broad social groups. As they had not been approved

by parliament and represented a break with precedent and tradition, they were regarded as illegal. 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 prerogative taxes and fines were discussed in parliament in 1640 and were regarded by Pym as a ‘grievance’. Source 2 suggests that Pym’s anger was felt more widely. Source 3 confirms that prerogative taxes and fines caused ‘alarm’ and ‘disquiet.’

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations. For example, answers may describe the views of courtiers, Privy Councillors, MPs or of Charles 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. The use of the royal prerogative to increase royal revenue was deeply controversial. Controversial taxes and fines were seen by many as an assault on property rights and a dangerous step towards absolutism. Such prerogative devices provided Charles with such a considerable income that he had become independent of parliament, a development which threatened the prerogatives and indeed survival of that institution. Some of the schemes, such as Knighthood fines and Forest fines, also offended notions of justice. The use of prerogative courts was also deeply unpopular. The Court of Star Chamber, the Council of the North and the Council of the Marches were all used to enforce payment of prerogative taxes and fines, and handed down brutal punishments to many who refused or protested. There were, however, other important reasons for the growth in opposition to Charles I’s Personal Rule. In particular, the reforms to the Church of England carried out by Archbishop Laud raised fear of popery. The enforcement of uniformity and the emphasis on ritual alarmed Puritans in particular. So too did the Catholic tone of Charles I’s court. 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 that Charles I’s controversial taxes and fines were regarded as oppressive by his subjects. Pym attacks monopolies and Ship Money in particular, but his criticisms could apply to a wide range of financial devices. Source 2 also demonstrates the combined use of Star Chamber and prerogative revenue schemes, and gives evidence of the hostility this provoked. In particular, the source shows public anger at the harsh sentences handed down by Star Chamber. Source 3 states that

disquiet at the King's controversial taxes and fines was widespread, even if not expressed publicly before the Bishops' Wars.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. Many contemporaries were opposed to Charles I's use of the prerogative to increase revenue. Pym certainly was, as were most of his contemporaries in the House of Commons. Petitions complaining about Charles I's prerogative taxes and fines poured into Parliament in 1640, suggesting wider public concern. Charles I, however, believed that he was acting legally. Parliament had failed to provide him with adequate supply before 1629 and so he felt justified in turning to 'new counsels'. Historians such as Ann Hughes recognise the importance of Charles I's use of prerogative taxes and fines in provoking opposition to the Personal Rule.

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 various factors responsible for the opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I in the period 1629–1640. The King's use of prerogative taxes and fines was certainly controversial. The fact that such use was explicitly outlawed by the Long Parliament is evidence that the various taxes and fines used by Charles aroused hostility. Ship Money, in particular, was hated. The trial of John Hampden generated widespread attention and the rates of payment declined sharply after 1638. Ship Money also affected a broader section of society than many of the other devices. Forest fines and Knighthood fines affected the propertied classes particularly badly. Candidates may argue, however, that the King's religious policies did more to provoke opposition to the Personal Rule than prerogative taxes and fines. The most controversial cases before Star Chamber were those which concerned Church reform, such as the case of Bastwick, Burton and Prynne. Laud's reforms created a sense that Protestantism was in danger and undermined the balance and consensus within the Church of England. Good candidates might also argue that the King's policies in Scotland and Ireland, along with his support of Spain, generated deep hostility in 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 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. Source 3 makes the point that many of the MPs elected in 1640 were renowned for their opposition to Charles I's financial policies. This is supported by Source 1, in which the leading opposition figure in the Commons lists monopolies and Ship Money as grievances. However, Pym's anger is also focused on the Privy Council's use of Star Chamber to enforce royal policy – a theme that is continued in Source 2. Source 3 hints at other reasons for opposition to Charles I's Personal Rule. It refers to cultural and religious divisions and to 'opposition to the King's religious policies.'

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. They may refer to contemporary opinion to illustrate the role of controversial taxes and fines in contributing to the opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I. Pym’s opposition was clearly motivated by a sense that Charles I’s controversial taxes and fines were contrary to law and precedent, but he also, on other occasions, attacked the King’s religious policies. Indeed, these were perhaps even more important in provoking Pym’s anger. He believed that Parliament was in danger and was concerned that Charles I’s policies threatened England’s constitution. Historians such as Ann Hughes take a balanced approach when explaining the causes of the opposition to Charles I’s Personal Rule. She agrees that prerogative taxes and fines played an important role but also stresses the importance of religious policy and Charles I’s actions in Scotland. 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

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

- 1 (a) Explain the circumstances in which the Parliamentary Reform Act was passed in 1832.

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 circumstances in which the Parliamentary Reform Act was passed in 1832. 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 a limited account of the circumstances in which the Parliamentary Reform Act came to be passed in 1832. For example, there may be reference to the agitation of the political unions and the work of the reformer Francis Place. 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 circumstances in which the Parliamentary Reform Act was passed in 1832. Divisions within the Tory Party, especially over the granting of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, weakened Wellington's government and ultimately led to its fall in November 1830, when Tory Ultras took revenge on the Prime Minister. Associated with the decline of the Tories was the revival of the Whigs under Earl Grey, a known supporter of moderate political reform. The Whig Party was in general much more in tune with the political mood of the time, particularly the aspirations of the rising middle classes. 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 circumstances in which the Parliamentary Reform Act was passed in 1832. In addition to Tory weakness and Whig strength, candidates may also note the impact of the revolution in France in July 1830, which saw the monarchy overthrown when it refused to concede political reform. Some feared a similar revolution in England, and saw parliamentary reform as a way to avoid further unrest. The death of George IV and accession of William IV in June 1830 also raised reform expectations, because, while William IV was not an enthusiastic reformer, he was more realistic than his brother about the need to respond to a reform movement that was growing in strength. Perhaps the most important circumstance that led to the passing of the Parliamentary Reform Act was the political alliance between the middle class and working class, facilitated by organisations such as the Birmingham Political Union, created by Thomas Attwood. The success of the Whigs in the election of April 1831 gave reform further momentum, as did outbreaks of violence in Derby, Nottingham, London and Bristol when the Tories in the Lords rejected the first two Reform Bills. A third Bill passed the Commons and was sent to the Lords on 26 March 1832. The Lords threatened to reject it, so Grey resigned. Wellington attempted to form a ministry but was unable to do so. William IV sent again for Grey, who agreed to resume office but only on the condition that the king would create sufficient new peers to ensure the passage of the Bill through Parliament. Whilst the politicians argued and bargained, the people resorted again to violence. The Duke of Wellington, always eager to avoid bloodshed, ordered the Tory Lords either to vote for the Bill or to absent themselves from the session when the vote was taken. Over 200 Tory Lords missed the vote and the Bill passed through the House of Lords on 7 June 1832. 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 reasons for the divisions in the Tory Party in the period 1846–1865.

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 divisions in the Tory Party in the period 1846–1865.

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 a limited explanation of the divisions in the Tory Party in the period 1846–1865. For example, there may be reference to the split in the party caused by the repeal of the Corn Laws. 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 divisions in the Tory Party in the period 1846–1865. For example, candidates may refer to the split in the party between Peelites and anti-Peelites, not only over the matter of repeal of the Corn Laws, but also over Peel's Irish policy in general, and particularly the Maynooth grant. Therefore there were already signs of division before Peel formally moved to repeal the Corn Laws in 1846. The liberal wing of the Conservative Party – the Peelites, including Gladstone – remained loyal to the party leader, Peel, and refused to seek any rapprochement with the rest of the party, that is, the protectionists, even after Peel died in 1850. It is reasonable to focus on Peel himself, because ultimately he was prepared to sacrifice his party in what he saw as the national interest, both in Britain and Ireland. 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 divisions in the Tory Party in the period 1846–1865. Candidates may note that, while the actions of Peel in 1846 were critical in dividing the Conservative Party, with many Peelites refusing to re-ally with their former colleagues and instead becoming part of the new Liberal Party, there were other individuals who played a part in fostering party disunity. Chief among these were Lord George Bentinck and Benjamin Disraeli. While it was Bentinck who officially succeeded Peel as Conservative Party leader, it was Disraeli who most effectively articulated opposition to Peel's free trade policies and defended the traditional Conservative landed interest. However, Disraeli himself was a controversial and divisive character. Many within the Conservative Party were suspicious of him because of his Jewish background and literary tastes. Furthermore, Disraeli had effectively abandoned his protectionist position by 1852 and was in the process of fashioning a new form of Conservatism based on an alliance between the aristocracy and the working class, in opposition to the middle class who were associated with the new Liberal Party. The process of reshaping the Conservative Party, and giving it a new ideology, was inevitably slow and did not lend itself to a quick healing of the wounds of past party disputes. Better responses will probably attempt a balance between the polarities represented by Peel and Disraeli in response to this question. 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 unrest in England in the period 1815–1820?

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 the loss of life that resulted from the action of the authorities.

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 the meeting was legal and nothing had apparently occurred to justify the deployment of the cavalry against the crowd, resulting in chaos and loss of life. It also notes the involvement of the radical agitator, Henry Hunt.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. Answers 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 John Tyas, the correspondent of *The Times* who was present at the political reform meeting at St Peter’s Fields in Manchester, which he is describing. This arguably gives the source great value, as not only is Tyas an eyewitness to the events, but his position is that of an impartial observer. The mode and audience of the source – an account that is to form the basis of a *Times* editorial on the massacre for the information of the general public – are also useful as the report is likely to be accurate since it is open to public scrutiny. Furthermore, *The Times* is a newspaper of repute and distinction, adding value to the source. The tone of the source is quite dramatic, reflecting the fact that the author found himself caught up in the midst of terrifying events, but also perhaps suggesting that this may have affected his judgement. The motive of the source is to inform the public of what happened at the meeting on 16 August 1819, but also to raise the question of how appropriate the authorities’ handling of the affair was.

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, mode and audience, the source does have limitations, most notably its date and related content. Written in August 1819, the source is well placed to comment on one of the most controversial and significant events in the period 1815–1820 – the Peterloo massacre – but makes no reference to the preceding years of 1815–1818, which witnessed notable civil disturbances

such as the Spa Fields riots (1816) and the Pentrich Rising in Derbyshire (1817). Nor is the source in a position to comment on the Cato Street conspiracy of 1820, when would-be revolutionaries led by Arthur Thistlewood planned to assassinate the Tory Cabinet and Prime Minister Lord Liverpool. It would be reasonable for candidates to argue that in terms of content, the source fails to provide an overview of the period in question. Nonetheless, better candidates may appreciate that the source does give some insight into one of the causes of unrest in this period, the call for parliamentary reform, and that the meeting in Manchester was to be addressed by one of the leading radicals of the time, Henry “Orator” Hunt. Indeed, it was the presence of Hunt that was at least partly responsible for the local magistrates sending in the Cheshire Yeomanry to prevent him fomenting revolution. Contextual knowledge might be further applied in relation to Tyas’ comments in the last few lines of the source about the over-reaction of the authorities to the meeting in St Peter’s Fields. These observations might be linked to the further over-reaction of the Tory Government when it drew up and passed a programme of repressive legislation known as the Six Acts in response to the Peterloo disturbance. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 was due to the actions of the Tory Government.

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 a general reference to Liverpool’s government 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 extent to which the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 was due to the actions of the Tory Government. For example, Source 1 describes the Peterloo massacre, while Source 2 focuses on the parliamentary debate on the Six Acts.

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)

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 reference to the actions of the Tory Government in this period, such as the passing of the Corn Laws in 1815. 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, Tyas' description of the Peterloo episode, is an example of a misjudged action by the authorities, while Source 2 is critical of proposed Government legislation. Source 3 introduces an additional factor to explain the unrest, with its reference to working conditions and unemployment.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations. For example, there may be reference to the views of Government ministers.

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. A strong case could be made that the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 was due to the actions of the Tory Government. Apart from the introduction of the Corn Laws in 1815, which clearly benefited the landowning class to the disadvantage of the labouring class, and was the cause of much protest, Liverpool's administration also introduced other measures which agitated an English public already suffering as a result of the economic depression after the Napoleonic Wars. The abolition of income tax in 1816 – which had always been regarded as a wartime expedient by the Government – and its replacement by a number of direct sales taxes, was also seen as a naked piece of class legislation, adding to the general discontent in the country in the period 1815–1820. At the same time, it could be noted that the Government's hand was forced on this issue by the House of Commons, which rejected the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal to temporarily retain income tax. The outcome, however, highlighted the need for parliamentary reform in the eyes of many, but this was an issue that the Tory Government would not consider. Liverpool's Government tended to make no distinction between the parliamentary reform movement and the prospect of violent revolution. For this reason it suspended Habeas Corpus in February 1817 and introduced a Sedition Act the following month. 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 Tyas’ account of the reform meeting at St Peter’s Fields, and Source 2, an extract from George Tierney’s speech criticising the Government’s legislative programme, provides evidence in support of the proposition, while Source 3 provides a wider focus on unrest in England in the period 1815–1820.

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 Tories, such as the Home Secretary, Lord Sidmouth, or the Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool. Historians’ interpretations might include opinions on the impact of Government policy in the period in question, and its perceived inequity and lack of proportion.

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 unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 was due to the actions of the Tory Government. Much Government action in these years seemed both excessive and likely to exacerbate rather than calm an already volatile situation. For example, in response to an attack on the Prince Regent’s carriage after the State Opening of Parliament in January 1817, the Government introduced the so-called “Gag Acts”: *Habeas Corpus* was suspended; seditious meetings were prohibited; and Sidmouth, the Home Secretary, ordered the Lord Lieutenants to apprehend all printers and writers responsible for seditious and blasphemous material. The Derbyshire Insurrection (or Pentrich Rising) of June 1817 also demonstrated Government miscalculation. It was worried because there was so much discontent but thought it was caused by the “poison” of the French Revolution. Consequently, the ruling classes feared a revolution in England. Sidmouth had to rely on spies and informers whom he sent out to tour Britain and investigate centres of discontent. Unfortunately, these spies were paid by results and so became *agents provocateurs* who stirred up rebellions if they could not find them, so that they would be paid. “Oliver the Spy” went to Pentrich disguised as a depressed worker, found discontent and incited the villagers to rebellion. The Six Acts of late 1819 were also seen as a disproportionate response to the Peterloo episode, involving legislation relating to public assembly and the printing of political opinion. Better responses might argue, however, that the fundamental cause of unrest in the period 1815–1820 was a general economic depression following the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, reflected in the March of the Blanketeers in March 1817. While Government action often did not help the situation, and sometimes made it more acute, it does not solely explain the social and political discontent in England between 1815 and 1820. During the Napoleonic Wars, Britain’s export and re-export trade increased, but after 1815 this virtual monopoly ended, and trade declined between 1815 and

1820 because continental markets were impoverished by the wars, while manufacturers abroad were re-establishing themselves. Bad harvests between 1816 and 1819 affected agriculture and industry, prices, wages and markets. The price of manufactured goods began to fall with the ending of the Napoleonic Wars because there was no need for war manufactures. The government cancelled its contracts, leaving industry to find its own salvation. In 1814, prices were twice their 1793 level but after 1814 prices fell constantly. Industry was affected by falling prices and expansion was checked because of the slump in domestic and foreign sales. As grain prices fell, landowners reduced workers' wages at a time when unemployment was high and bread prices increased. Industrial wages also began to fall, exacerbated by the demobilisation of 300 000 soldiers and sailors and also the increased introduction of machinery and use of child and female labour in factories. More generally, harsh factory and living conditions increased the discontent of the working people. Some answers might note, however, that in relation to the post-war economic slump, the British Government cannot be absolved of all responsibility. For example, in 1816, income tax was repealed, shifting the burden of revenue-raising to indirect taxation, which fell proportionately more heavily on the poor. These taxes were used to pay off the interest on the national debt, effectively going into the pockets of the rich who had loaned money to government, and who were not hit now by income tax. 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 John Tyas' account of Peterloo, gives first-hand evidence of the Government's heavy handedness in dealing with what Tyas himself considered to be a legitimate and peaceful political gathering. That *The Times*, universally regarded as a pillar of the establishment, should be so critical of the Government was a serious indictment of the Tory administration. While the decision to send in the cavalry to break up the meeting had been made by local magistrates, they had the unequivocal backing of the Home Secretary. Indeed, Source 2, Tierney's speech to the House of Commons, confirms that the Government was not to be deflected from its single-minded pursuit of what it believed to be revolutionary forces at large in the country. The Whig leader's argument that repressive legislation will simply "inflame the situation" was one that could serve as a general criticism of the Government's action between 1815 and 1820. Joseph W. Hunt, in Source 3, presents a more balanced analysis of the period, noting the general economic distress and how it can be linked to political agitation. However, this source also acknowledges that the Government often acted irrationally in the face of a "threat" that did not really exist.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. **Contemporary** opinions might include observations from newspapers of the time or leading radical politicians such as William Cobbett, Francis Place or Sir Francis Burdett, or, indeed, the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley. It would be equally

valid for a candidate to engage with the contemporary opinion offered by Tyas in Source 1 and Tierney in Source 2. **Later** interpretations may reflect on Joseph W. Hunt's observations in Source 3 about the general unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 and the contribution of Tory Government actions to that unrest. Candidates can concur with Hunt'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 the reasons for the growth of nationalist and liberal ideas in the Italian states in the period 1815–1848.

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 how nationalist and liberal ideas grew in Italy in the period 1815–1848. 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 about the growth of nationalist and liberal ideas in Italy between 1815 and 1848. They may refer to the nationalist sentiments of men such as Giuseppe Mazzini, Vincenzo Gioberti and Pope Pius IX, but their ideas will not be discussed in depth. 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 factors. They may point out that, although nationalist and liberal ideas in 'Italy' in the period 1815–1848 were closely interlinked, there were also important differences. While Italian liberals aimed to establish a constitutional monarchy which guaranteed certain rights such as freedom of speech, some nationalists advocated the establishment of a republic rather than a constitutional monarchy. Another feature of Italian nationalists was their desire for independence and freedom from foreign rule rather than unity. After 1815, secret societies flourished in the Italian states and in 1820 there were some 300 000 of them. Many wanted to end foreign rule in Italy and also had liberal aspirations. Naples was briefly granted a constitution in 1820 but this was withdrawn after the Austrians intervened in 1821. At the same time, Charles Albert briefly established constitutional government in Piedmont but this, too, was rescinded under pressure from Metternich.

The failure of the revolts in Modena, Parma and the Papal States in 1831 convinced Mazzini that the secret societies were incapable of bringing about revolution and Italian revolutionaries would receive no help from France. In October 1831 he therefore founded 'Young Italy', an organisation which promoted national aims, to be achieved through mass insurrection. Despite supporting the establishment of 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 bring about Italian independence by expelling the Austrians from the Italian states. For Mazzini the Papacy was the main enemy. In 1843 Vincenzo Gioberti, a priest from Piedmont, produced a programme for the unification of Italy. He proposed that, although the princes in the Italian states would retain their autonomy, they would unite in a Confederation under the Pope's leadership. Pope Pius IX was influenced by Gioberti's ideas and after his election in 1846 appeared to be liberal. The Pope's apparently liberal views prompted Leopold II of Tuscany and Charles Albert in Piedmont to introduce liberal measures. 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 may refer to Camillo di Cavour because, although he did not become involved in politics until 1848, he was a highly influential figure who jointly founded a liberal periodical called the *Risorgimento* in June 1847. Responses may also underline that the importance of nationalist and liberal ideas increased in the 1830s and 1840s. Answers may discuss the part played by historians and novelists in the Italian states in spreading nationalist ideas, as well as the role of the Italian language in promoting a national identity. Good answers may observe that these ideas were discussed by the intellectual elites and Mazzini's vision of a unified Italy involved only educated groups such as lawyers, students and independent artisans. While he underlined the importance of universal suffrage, he had no time for the peasantry or urban masses. 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 reasons for the difficult relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi.

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 make some imprecise remarks about the difficult relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. 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 coherent information about Cavour's relationship with Garibaldi, explaining perhaps the key issues which led to their mutual dislike. 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 both Cavour and Garibaldi were from Piedmont but were different in almost every other respect. Their background and personalities were very different. While Cavour was a well-educated, suave and intelligent nobleman who was a cautious and very skillful diplomat, Garibaldi was an uneducated but charismatic individual who was an outstanding leader of men. While Garibaldi was from the beginning wholly committed to achieving a united Italy by removing Austria from Italian soil, Cavour's attitude to Italian unification was more lukewarm and, even when he met Napoleon III at Plombières in 1858, he was still not a wholehearted supporter of unification. Answers will explore the key issues which led to the difficult relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. One issue was Piedmont's loss of Savoy and Nice to France in the Treaty of Turin in March 1860. This enraged Garibaldi, above all because he was a native of Nice. A second issue was Cavour's efforts to undermine Garibaldi's famous expedition to liberate Sicily with his army of 1087 volunteers in 1860. Cavour was unable to stop the expedition because he suspected that King Victor Emmanuel secretly supported it. However, Cavour did manage to make sure that Garibaldi did not receive the 12 000 modern rifles which had been earmarked for the expedition, obtaining instead only rusty old-fashioned flintlocks. Garibaldi was infuriated at the way he had been treated and never forgave Cavour. 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 will reveal a more comprehensive explanation of the difficult relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. They may observe, for example, that Cavour dealt skillfully with Garibaldi in some respects. While

the King of Piedmont-Sardinia, Charles Albert, declined Garibaldi's offer of help in 1848, Cavour wisely accepted the support of the National Society and allowed Garibaldi to bring together a group of volunteers in 1859. Garibaldi, however, was angry at what he saw as Cavour's unwillingness to support nationalism for fear of conflict with France. After all, a key aspect of Cavour's foreign policy was his alliance with Napoleon III and he was alarmed that, if Garibaldi marched on Rome, it might provoke a war with France since its troops were stationed there to protect the Pope. Relations between Garibaldi and Cavour reached an all-time low on 18 April 1861, two months before Cavour's sudden death, when, in a parliamentary speech, Garibaldi accused Cavour of fighting a 'fratricidal war'. While this criticism seemed harsh and unjustified at the time, evidence later came to light that Cavour had ordered Garibaldi's men to be driven into the sea if they did not give up Naples. Answers may refer to another issue which arose after the astonishing military successes of Garibaldi's volunteers. When they transferred into the Italian army, Garibaldi expected that they would all be accepted and would keep their original military rank, but Cavour supported the view of War Minister General Fanti that a distinction would be made between the regulars and Garibaldi's volunteers. 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 outcome of the Austro-Prussian War in 1866?

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, they may observe that the meeting is discussing a possible war between Austria and Prussia.

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. A meeting of the Austrian cabinet under the chairmanship of Emperor Francis Joseph is discussing whether to make preparations for a war against Prussia.

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. A key strength of the source is that it is a primary record of the minutes of a meeting of the Austrian cabinet, chaired by Francis Joseph, the Emperor of Austria. He will know better than anyone the weaknesses of Austria's position in February 1866. Since the minutes are confidential and not written for public consumption, it can be safely assumed that they accurately record

the views of the participants. The tone of the source is sober. Another strength of the source is its highly revealing content. Francis Joseph observes that Prussia's aggressive attitude on the Schleswig-Holstein issue raises the question about whether 'Austria should prepare for war'. The Emperor admits that the Austrian army was by no means ready to see action against Prussia. The number of troops, he acknowledged, had been cut back 'to the lowest possible acceptable level of a peace time army', while Prussia would be able to transport its troops more swiftly to the battlefield than Austria because of its superior railway network. The Finance and Trade Ministers also cautioned against making preparations for war because of the damaging consequences of such a conflict for the Austrian economy. This may have influenced the meeting to conclude that Austria should not 'for the time being', make preparations for war.

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, they may observe that the escalating conflict between Austria and Prussia over the Schleswig-Holstein question and, in particular Bismarck's talks with Napoleon in October 1865, is the backdrop to the meeting of the Austrian cabinet on 21 February 1866. Answers may also point out that, when the Prussian Crown Council met a week later, Bismarck argued that war between the two states was only a matter of time. Answers will not only discuss the strengths of the source but also its limitations. The source has several important limitations. One of its shortcomings is its date. The meeting of the Austrian cabinet took place on 21 February, some four months before the outbreak of war. This source therefore is not necessarily reliable in assessing the reasons for Austria's defeat because the problems outlined by the Emperor and his ministers might have been rectified in the interim. The usefulness of the minutes for an historian investigating the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War is also impaired by the fact that it focuses largely on Austria's weaknesses. A more balanced view would have been gained by reading it in conjunction with a source outlining the economic, political and military strengths of Prussia. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for its defeat in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866.

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 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]) 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/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 the extent to which Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for its defeat in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866.

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 a partial account of the reasons for the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War in 1866, referring to some of Austria's military weaknesses, as well as Prussia's strengths. There will be frequent lapses in meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, 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, the Austrian cabinet concludes that its army was not ready to wage a war with Prussia in February 1866. Source 2, a letter from the British Ambassador in Bavaria to the Foreign Secretary in London, claims that Austria was spreading its resources too thinly, while Source 3 argues that Austria's military weakness was only one of several factors which determined the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War.

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 Bismarck or one of Austria's leading politicians about the reasons for Austria's defeat in the Austro-Prussian War. The response may also outline the views of an historian about the outcome of the war.

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 will present a more detailed discussion of the extent to which Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian

War. Answers should discuss the shortcomings of the Austrian army. The number of troops fell from 434 000 in 1850 to 275 000 in 1866. The reduced size of the army was a consequence of Austria's serious financial position. Between 1847 and 1859 its national debt tripled. The Crimean War placed a huge strain on its finances, while the Italian War of 1859 brought the Austrian economy close to total collapse. In fact, the Austrian Government found it difficult to find countries willing to lend it money in the years prior to the war with Prussia. The consequent reduction in military expenditure also had a negative effect on the quality of its army and its weaponry. In fact, one of the considerations which prompted the Austrian military to reject the needle gun, which Prussia used to such effect in the Austro-Prussian War, was its cost. Austria's armed forces were also handicapped by poor strategic, tactical and operational planning and it is no coincidence that it reformed its General Staff following its defeat in 1866. The shortcomings of Austria's military leaders also contributed to its defeat in the Austro-Prussian War. The Austrian commander, Ludwig von Benedek, made a series of tactical errors and was dismissed after the war. Answers at the top of this level should also assess some of the political, economic and military strengths of Prussia which contributed to its success in the Austro-Prussian War. 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. Each of the sources provides some evidence to support the proposition. Source 1 points to the shortcomings in the size of the Austrian army and implies that its weaknesses were partly due to the severe financial restraints under which the Austrian Government had to operate. It also notes that Prussia would be able to mobilise its troops more quickly than Austria. Source 2 compares Austria's military organisation unfavourably with its Prussian counterpart, while Source 3 refers to the shortcomings of Austria's military leaders and stresses that its weapons were greatly inferior to Prussia's breech-loading needle gun. However, the sources also refer to a number of factors which would refute the proposition. For example, the British Ambassador in Bavaria, Henry Howard, claims in Source 2 that Austria's political leaders had made many political misjudgements, in particular their determination to uphold Austria's 'position in both Italy and Germany with inadequate resources'. Source 3 also observes that the shortcomings of Austria's political leaders contributed to its defeat.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers at this level will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. They may refer to the views of contemporary Austrian and Prussian politicians about the extent to which Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for its defeat in the Austro-Prussian War. Later interpretations could include historians' opinions on the importance of Austria's military weaknesses and the shortcomings of its political leaders, as well as the economic, political and military strengths of Prussia.

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 will provide a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for its defeat in Austro-Prussian War in 1866, focusing not only on Austria's military, political and financial predicament, but also Prussia's military strength, the qualities of its political leaders and its economic power. Responses may observe that, although the size of Austria's army had decreased since 1850, it nonetheless retained its numerical advantage over Prussia, whose army in 1865 totalled 214 000 men. However, Helmuth von Moltke distinguished himself as Prussian Chief of General Staff and played a very important part in Prussia's military success in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. He established a body whose task was to organise the transportation of troops to the battlefield, making effective use of the railway network. This proved very successful and Prussia mobilised its troops more quickly than the Austrians. Answers may also discuss the role of General Albrecht von Roon in modernising the Prussian army. Responses should also illustrate how Bismarck's outstanding diplomacy isolated Austria in 1866. They may discuss, for example, his efforts 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 1866 was the Prussian-Italian Treaty signed on 8 April 1866, according to which, for a period of three months, Italy would go to war with Austria if Prussia did. This was a crucial factor because it meant that Austria had to split up its army, sending 100 000 of its 275 000 troops southwards to fight the Italians. Answers at this level may also discuss the economic reasons for Prussia's military superiority over Austria. In 1865, Prussia had a railway network of some 7000 kilometres, almost double that of Austria, and this had a major impact on its military campaign during the Austro-Prussian War. It had five railway lines to transport its troops and military equipment southwards, while Austria had just one line from Vienna to Bohemia, and much of that was single track. Prussia also had superior weaponry and its needle gun inflicted heavy casualties on the Austrian army. Responses may refer to the reasons for Prussia's economic superiority over Austria, referring perhaps to the importance of the *Zollverein* and its strong industrial growth, but answers should establish a link to its military superiority over Austria. 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 Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for its defeat at the hands of Prussia in 1866. Responses at this level may establish links between the various sources. All three sources refer to Austria's military

weaknesses, such as the size of its army (Source 1), poor leadership and organisation (Sources 2 and 3) or its inferior weaponry (Source 3). Sources 2 and 3 both discuss the errors and miscalculations made by Austria's political leaders. Each of the sources also makes reference to the strengths of Prussia. According to Source 1, Prussia would be able to transport its troops swiftly to the battlefield due to its superior railway network. This hints at Prussia's economic superiority over Austria and good answers may add that the Prussian state built some railway lines as a result of military considerations. Source 2 alludes to the organisational excellence of Helmuth von Moltke, the Prussian Chief of General Staff, while Source 3 hints at Bismarck's diplomatic skill in securing French neutrality in the Austro-Prussian War and suggests that the secret Prussian-Italian Treaty signed in April 1866 had a significant effect on the eventual outcome of hostilities.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. Answers at this level will discuss fully the extent to which Austria's military weaknesses were responsible for its defeat in the Austro-Prussian War. They may discuss the views of leading Prussian politicians, such as Bismarck, and Austria's political elites, such as Friedrich Ferdinand Beust. They may also refer to the opinion of the Prussian King, William I, or his Austrian counterpart, Emperor Francis Joseph, or the views of leading military figures in Prussia such as Moltke, or his Austrian equivalent, Ludwig von Benedek. Later interpretations will take the form of historians' views on the reasons for the outcome of the Austro-Prussian War. Some may argue that Austria's military weakness was the most important factor, perhaps supporting this argument by reference to the size or quality of its army, as well as the shortcomings of its military leaders and weaponry. Others may maintain that the outcome of the war depended less on Austria's military weaknesses than the effectiveness of the Prussian army, which had modern weapons, could be transported swiftly to the battlefield as a result of its efficient railway network and was ably led by Moltke. Many historians also underline Bismarck's skilful diplomacy, which meant that Austria had to fight on two fronts. There is a general consensus that Austria's military weakness was only one of many factors which contributed to its defeat and the issue of debate among historians focuses on the importance of this consideration in relation to the others. [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 why the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 was so unpopular in Germany.

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, offer a superficial explanation of why the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 was so unpopular in Germany. 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 reasons about why the Treaty of Versailles was so unpopular but with significant omissions. For example, they may outline only a few of the unpopular terms of the Versailles Treaty such as the clauses concerning war guilt and reparations. 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 evidence to explain why the Treaty of Versailles was so unpopular in Germany. No other political issue produced such total agreement within Weimar Germany as the rejection and condemnation of the Treaty of Versailles. The Treaty's terms were seen as unfair and were described as a *Diktat* – a dictated peace. The Germans expected to negotiate a peace agreement with the Allies but a settlement was imposed on them without talks. Germans further expected that the peace settlement would be based on Wilson's Fourteen Points of January 1918 but they were disregarded. Germans dismissed the war guilt clause and, as a result, viewed Allied reparation demands as illegitimate. Article 231 of the Treaty held Germany responsible for all the losses and damage suffered by the Allies during the war and provided the basis for reparations. The total sum was not decided in 1919 but was determined by a Reparations Commission which reported in 1921 and fixed Germany's liability at 132 billion marks. The arrangements

designed to give the new state of Poland access to the sea aroused deep resentment because one million Germans were put under Polish rule without being given any say in the matter. This seemed inconsistent with the Allied commitment to the principle of national self-determination. Germany lost the “Polish Corridor,” Upper Silesia and Danzig, which became a free city under League of Nations control. The Treaty undermined the Weimar Republic by leaving political moderates looking naïve as they had argued that the Allies would behave leniently towards a democratic Germany. Many Germans shared the view of the Right that Germany should have refused to sign the Treaty and condemned Republican leaders for agreeing to it. 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 comprehensively why the Treaty of Versailles was so unpopular in Germany. In addition to the reasons outlined at Level 3, some of the following evidence could be given to illustrate the humiliation Germans felt as a result of the Treaty. Germany was stripped of the whole of its overseas empire. The colonies were passed on to the care of the Allies as mandates. The German army was restricted to 100 000 men and was not permitted to have tanks or heavy artillery. Germany was not allowed to have an air force. The German navy was permitted a limited number of ships but was to have no submarines. The Rhineland remained part of Germany, but became a demilitarised zone. The western part of it was to be occupied by Allied military forces for 15 years. The output of the Saar coalfield was to be given to France for 15 years. When the Reichstag accepted the Treaty of Versailles in June 1919, the new democracy of Weimar was forced to take responsibility for Germany’s defeat in the First World War and would be identified in the minds of all Germans as the regime which had accepted this humiliating Treaty. 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 successes of Schacht and Göring’s economic policies in Germany 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, offer a superficial explanation of the contributions of Hjalmar Schacht and Hermann Göring to the success of the Nazi economy 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 some coherent information on the contributions of either Schacht or Göring to the success of the Nazi economy in the period 1933–1939 but with significant omissions. Under Schacht's management of the economy there was an economic recovery with unemployment being dramatically reduced largely due to work creation schemes. By 1935 5 billion RM was invested in work creation schemes. In 1933, 25% of the work force was unemployed but by 1936 it had fallen to 7.4%. 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 a range of evidence to explain the success of Schacht and Göring's economic policies in the period 1933–1939. There may be an imbalance in the response with the contribution of one individual being discussed in greater depth than the other. Hitler appointed Schacht as President of the Reichsbank in May 1933. One of his first acts was to increase state control of foreign trade. In the summer of 1934 he was made Minister of Economics. He introduced the "New Plan" in September which gave the government extensive powers to regulate trade and currency transactions. This New Plan was introduced in the face of a foreign exchange crisis which was the result of Germany importing more goods than it exported. In 1934 Schacht also negotiated a series of trade agreements with countries in South America and south-eastern Europe which were aimed at preventing Germany running up a huge foreign currency deficit, whilst still being able to obtain essential raw materials. 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 comprehensively the successes of the economic policies of both Schacht and Göring in the period 1933–1939. From 1936 Hitler entrusted to Göring the aim of creating an economy which could support sustained rearmament and achieve greater self-sufficiency. Schacht had suggested a reduction in arms expenditure. Hitler asserted Nazi control of the economy through Göring who was appointed Commissioner of Raw Materials in April 1936. The 1936 Four-Year Plan was based on the policy of autarky and gradually Göring took full control of the economy.

Answers should show how the Four-Year Plan achieved a number of successes. Coal production in Germany rose by 18 per cent between 1936 and 1938, while the production of lignite increased by 23 per cent in the same period. Germany's aluminium production went up by 70 per cent in the period 1936–1938 and by 1939 it had become the world's leading producer of that metal. Under Göring, Germany's production of rayon also rose sharply. Another success was that petrol production increased by 63 per cent in the years 1937–1939 and synthetic fuel by 69 per cent in the same period. However, responses may point out that, despite these successes, Germany was not entirely self-sufficient by 1939. 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 passing of the Enabling Law in March 1933?

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 that the leader of the Social Democratic Party is giving a speech about the Enabling Law.

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, candidates will describe the reasons given by Otto Wels for the Social Democrats' opposition to the Enabling Law.

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 source is useful to an historian because it reveals that the Nazis encountered opposition from the Social Democrats during the proceedings as the members of the Reichstag considered the Enabling Law in the Kroll Opera House. By having access to the content of the speech delivered by the Social Democrat Chairman, who was speaking on behalf of all the Social Democrat deputies present, the historian gains an insight into the reasons why the Social Democrats opposed the Enabling Bill. Wels was the only person, other than Hitler, to participate in the debate on the Enabling Law. The source therefore provides a valuable partial insight into what took place on 23 March 1933 and is a useful contemporary source. Wels, in a defiant tone, reveals that the Social Democrats would oppose the Enabling Law, arguing that it would destroy democracy and create a dictatorship. According to Wels, it would also destroy civil liberties and lead to greater use of terror by the Nazi regime. Wels acknowledges that the Enabling Law will eliminate

the power of the Reichstag and predicts that the intimidation and terror that the Nazis have already directed against their opponents will increase. The content, author, date and mode of the source can all be considered as major strengths.

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. In order to obtain a top Level 4 mark, relevant contextual knowledge must be included in the answer. The major limitation of the source is that it only gives the historian a partial insight into the proceedings in the Opera House when the Enabling Law was being considered as it only provides evidence concerning the Social Democrat point of view, revealing their opposition to the Enabling Law. The source provides a one-sided perspective of the Enabling Law in that the historian only has evidence from its opponents. To gain a more balanced perspective, the historian would need to gain an insight into what Hitler stated on behalf of the Nazi government in recommending that the Reichstag accept the Enabling Law. The source does not reveal the outcome of the debate, why other political parties supported the Enabling Law or its purpose. From their contextual knowledge, candidates could reveal that the Enabling Law would effectively do away with parliamentary procedure and legislation by transferring full powers to the Chancellor and his government for four years. The successful passage of the Law depended on gaining the support or abstention of some of the other major political parties in order to get a two-thirds majority to comply with such a constitutional change. The Nazis needed the backing of the Centre Party and in his speech Hitler had promised to respect the rights of the Catholic Church and uphold religious and moral values. With Communist deputies either in prison or refused admittance to the Reichstag and with the deputies in attendance facing a barrage of intimidation from the ranks of the SA who surrounded the building, only 94 Social Democrats opposed the Enabling Law. [13]

13

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess whether the passing of the Enabling Law was the most important factor in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship between 30 January 1933 and 2 August 1934.

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. A superficial awareness of the process by which the Nazis

created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934 will be revealed. 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 passing of the Enabling Law was the most important factor in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship in 1933–1934.

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 will be a limited selection of evidence to illustrate the importance of the Enabling Law. Its purpose was to allow the government to introduce new laws and to amend the Weimar Constitution of 1919 without the approval of either the President or the Reichstag. It would turn Germany into a dictatorship in which Hitler could rule by decree. As an amendment to the constitution rather than an ordinary law, the Enabling Law had to be passed by a two-thirds majority in the Reichstag. Its passage ended any semblance of democracy in Germany. 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. Sources 1, 2 and 3 all provide evidence concerning the importance of the Enabling Law in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship in 1933–1934. Source 1 suggests that dictatorship has replaced democracy. Source 2 suggests that the Reichstag has become redundant and Hitler can pass laws like an absolute ruler. Source 3 suggests that the Enabling Law led to the death of democracy.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations. For example, there may be a contemporary or a historian's interpretations about the importance of the Enabling Law in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship 1933–1934.

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 discuss the importance of the Enabling Law in greater depth and discuss the significance

of other legal means. The legal basis of the Nazi dictatorship was the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State in February 1933 and the Enabling Law in March 1933. The former was a decree, signed by President Hindenburg in the aftermath of the Reichstag fire, that suspended important civil rights. The Enabling Law was passed by the Reichstag and gave Hitler the power to issue decrees without its approval. Legal means could also be illustrated with evidence such as the Law against the Formation of Parties in July 1933 and the Law Concerning the Head of State of the German Reich in August 1934 which merged the offices of President and Chancellor due to the death of Hindenburg. 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 omitted. Source 1 gives information on the importance of the Enabling Law in creating a dictatorship but also the use of terror. Source 2 also provides evidence from a contemporary of the significance of the Enabling Law in terms of the decline of the Reichstag and the creation of a dictatorship. Source 3 provides evidence from an historian concerning the importance of the Enabling Law in that democracy would be replaced by a one-party dictatorship as a result of the measure. It also provides useful information concerning the proceedings on the day the measure was passed.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, the views of some contemporaries and historians about the importance of the Enabling Law in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship in 1933–1934 will be discussed.

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 process by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in 1933–1934, not only discussing in some depth the importance of the Enabling Law in the spring of 1933 but also analysing other factors, such as the legal basis for their dictatorship and the use of terror in the process. Terror could be illustrated by the violence of the rank and file SA after the March 1933 Reichstag election and the Night of the Long Knives in June 1934 when the SS shot at least 90 people, including about 50 SA leaders in a purge to defeat “the Second Revolution.” The SA’s “Second Revolution” envisaged social and economic reforms and the creation of a “people’s army” merging the army and the SA. The ambitions of the SA fundamentally alarmed the conservative forces in Germany. “Big business” and the army wanted to tame the SA to preserve their own interests. The army was the one organisation that could dislodge Hitler from his position of power. Political realities dictated that Hitler had to retain the backing of the army. When it became apparent that President Hindenburg

did not have much longer to live, it seems that Hitler's hand was forced by the need to secure the army's backing for his succession to Hindenburg. On 30 June 1934, Hitler eliminated the SA as a political and military force. The purge secured the army's support and when Hindenburg died on 2 August 1934, this support was vital in enabling Hitler to take on the role of President as well as Chancellor. The army itself suggested the wording of a new oath of loyalty to its new supreme commander. The oath was to Hitler, the person, not to a constitution. Terror had been an important element in the Nazi Party's efforts to retain political control. Hitler was now a dictator with absolute power. In addition to the use of legality and terror candidates could illustrate other characteristics of the process by which a dictatorship was created by discussing factors such as popular support, propaganda, co-ordination and concessions. Popular support could be illustrated with evidence such as the Nazis gaining 288 seats in the Reichstag election of March 1933; propaganda by the creation of the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda in March 1933; co-ordination by the amalgamation of trade unions into the German Labour Front in May 1933; and concessions by the signing of the Concordat between the Nazi state and the Vatican in July 1933. 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 can be utilised to illustrate the importance of the Enabling Law in the creation of a dictatorship by the Nazis in 1933–1934 as the opposition of Otto Wels is based on the fact that he appreciates that the law will bring an end to democracy which will be replaced by dictatorship. He has realised that the power of the Reichstag is being eradicated, therefore undermining the influence of the elected representatives of the people. Wels has also recognised that, once the Enabling Law is passed, the Nazis will be able to undermine further the civil rights of people and ignore the human rights guaranteed in the Weimar Constitution. His speech also reveals that, while the Nazis are using legal means with the use of the Enabling Law, they are also using terror as a means in the process of creating a dictatorship. He refers to persecution, intimidation and oppression. His reference to the election of 5 March 1933 could also be developed. The Nazis got 44 per cent of the popular vote, securing 288 seats in the Reichstag. Hitler could claim a majority in the Reichstag only with the help of the 52 seats won by the nationalists. Source 2 can be utilised to illustrate the importance of the Enabling Law in the creation of the dictatorship by the Nazis in 1933–1934 as Erich Ebermayer, as a contemporary source, appreciates that the Reichstag no longer has any power and the Nazis no longer need it to pass legislation. His reference to absolute power suggests that he feels that a dictatorship has been created. His reference to the voting figures with regard to the Enabling Law could also be developed. The support of the Catholic Centre Party was vital for the Nazis to acquire the two-thirds majority. Source 3 can be utilised to illustrate the importance of the Enabling Law in the creation of the dictatorship by the Nazis in 1933–1934 as the historian Frank McDonough refers to the death of democracy and that it was a significant move on the road to dictatorship. He also points out that Hitler could no

longer be restrained by the Reichstag, the President or the electorate. The reference to the Communists not being able to attend could be developed. Eighty-one Communist deputies had either been arrested or were refused admittance to the Reichstag. The Social Democrats who attended faced a barrage of intimidation from the SA who surrounded the Kroll Opera House. Mc Donough’s reference to the “Legal Revolution” in 1933 and the Night of the Long Knives in 1934 should encourage candidates to illustrate the importance of other legal measures and other important events in the process by which the Nazis created a dictatorship between 30 January 1933 and 2 August 1934.

AO2b:

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Candidates could react to the implications of the statements by McDonough in Source 3 in relation to the proposition in the question concerning the importance of the Enabling Law in the process by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in 1933–1934. They can concur with McDonough’s views, qualify them or disagree with them. It is more important that they debate the issues, consider evidence and substantiate a relevant line of argument. Many other historians, while acknowledging that the Enabling Law and other legal means in the “Legal Revolution” were important elements in the process, would suggest that other means were also significant, such as terror. The Nazi dictatorship rested on a legal foundation. The steps they took did not necessarily break the letter of the constitution but they changed it beyond recognition. It was brought about by a combination of legal measures, terror, manipulation and collaboration.

[35]

Option 5

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

48

60

60